DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 229 287 SO 014 496

AUTHOR Shapiro, Karen; And Others
TITLE Programming in the Arts: An Impact Evaluation.
INSTITUTION Far West Lab. for Educational Research and Development, San Francisco, Calif.
SPONS AGENCY National Endowment for the Arts, Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE 1 Sep 80
NOTE 271p.; Some pages in the Appendices may not reproduce clearly due to small and broken print type.
PUB TYPE Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC11 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Artists; Audiences; Cultural Activities; Cultural Enrichment; Financial Support; *Fine Arts; Fund Raising; History; Mass Media; Organizations (Groups); *Program Evaluation
IDENTIFIERS *Programming in the Arts

ABSTRACT

To assess the impact of Programming in the Arts (PITA), a funding category of the National Endowment for the Arts, personal interviews were conducted with 225 individuals in 13 cities, and archival material (e.g., project proposals and final reports) and secondary data sources (e.g., Nielsen ratings) were analyzed. PITA supports television, film, video and radio programs on the arts, and has made major grants to such series as Live from Lincoln Center. The evaluation report consists of seven chapters. Chapter 1 provides an historical context for PITA and describes the major PITA funded series and specials. The quality and accomplishments of the series and specials and their promotion and distribution histories are discussed in chapters 2 and 3 respectively. Financial, technological, production, and programming impacts of PITA on the media are examined in chapter 4. The financial and creative impacts, as well as indirect impacts, of PITA as reported by artists and art organizations and disciplines are reported in chapters 5 and 6. A summary is provided in chapter 7. Appendices describe the major series and research design and methodology, contain the interview instrument, and list the interviewees. (RM)

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

ED229287

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)
X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it
[ ] Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy

PROGRAMMING IN THE ARTS: AN IMPACT EVALUATION

by

Karen Shapiro
Donna Lloyd-Kolkin
Debra Lieberman
Sol Katzman
Beth Hall

SP 017 196

submitted to the National Endowment for the Arts

September 1, 1980

Far West Laboratory for Educational Research and Development
San Francisco, CA

ERIC

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Far West Laboratory for Educational Research and Development conducted a three-month post-hoc evaluation of the impact of support from Programming in the Arts (PITA), a funding category within the Media Arts program at the National Endowment for the Arts. Interviews were conducted in person with 225 individuals in 13 cities to assess the impact of PITA on artists, on the media, and on arts organizations and the arts disciplines. Archival material and secondary data sources including A.C. Nielsen ratings were reviewed and analyzed. The major findings are presented below.

PITA Funding Pattern

- Between 1972 and 1979, PITA funds to support media projects amounted to $11,213,784. Sixty-three percent (63%) of these funds were granted to broadcast organizations with more than half of these funds awarded to two of the 269 public television stations. Arts organizations received 19% of PITA funds for media projects; 11% was awarded to independent artists, filmmakers and production companies, and 7% of the funds were granted to schools and other recipients.

- Beginning in 1974, PITA began concentrating its funds in support of five major public television series and one public radio series. Support of these major series amounted to over two-thirds (69%) of PITA funds between 1972 and 1979.

- The type of programs most extensively supported by PITA has been performance programs (71%).

- Funding for projects is done on a matching basis. Many smaller projects which received funding from PITA have not been completed due to insufficient funds. The difficulty for these projects in raising additional funds suggests that Endowment support has been essential for the media arts.

Quality of Funded Projects

- The quality of the major performing arts series -- LIVE FROM LINCOLN CENTER, LIVE FROM THE MET, and DANCE IN AMERICA was rated very highly by most respondents: VISIONS received mixed ratings with many respondents admiring its concept but divided about its execution. The high quality of these series has been recognized by the conferral of several Emmy and Peabody Awards and the TV Critics Circle Award, among others.

- Respondents did not feel that PITA projects had achieved a "fusion of media and art," although many praised the PITA major series for innovativeness and technological and production breakthroughs.

Program Distribution

- Those programs funded by PITA which have been broadcast nationally on PBS are more likely to find an audience than those not broadcast nationally. Series attract higher audiences than specials.

- Programs on public broadcasting which have been promoted are more likely to achieve higher audiences than programs which have not been promoted. Many respondents in the media called for more funding for promotional efforts.

- The cost to PITA per viewer has ranged across the major series from 2¢ per viewer for LIVE FROM LINCOLN CENTER to 16¢ per viewer for VISIONS.

- Some secondary distribution of PITA programs has occurred, primarily sales to schools and libraries, and international broadcasts.

Size and Nature of Audience

- The audiences for each program in the major performing arts series funded by PITA have been well over a million people. The audience for these programs is predominantly female and over 50 years of age.

- Major performing arts series on television funded by PITA are reaching audiences older and broader in their socio-economic characteristics than audiences at live performing arts events.

Impacts on the Arts

- Participating arts organizations and artists who were broadcast nationally benefitted from PITA support by building audiences and gaining in credibility. Artists and technicians derived income from ancillary product sales, and arts organizations were able to increase membership.

- Support of performing arts on television by PITA impacted on non-participating artists and arts organizations by creating new audiences for local arts organizations, increasing their interest in appearing in television, communicating standards of excellence and creating a more exciting environment in which artists and arts organizations can thrive.

Impacts on the Media

- PITA support has impacted the public broadcasting media by providing necessary monies to support arts programming which has in turn attracted new audiences, other funders, and public contributions to programs and local stations.

- Arts programming is currently being developed by local public broadcasting stations and commercial stations. Arts programming for cable services is planned.

- Technical innovations, developed with the support of PITA among other funders, have been adopted by public and commercial television producers for the live coverage of arts events.

- Additional arts programming is under development at many local stations despite a lack of experienced locally-based performing arts producers.

Funding Policies

- PITA staff and the Endowment were highly praised by respondents for their non-interference in the creative and broadcasting process. National public television organizations and other funders regard PITA as a cooperative partner.

- PITA will face hard decisions during the Eighties about the size of grants and their funding policies. Issues which emerged during the evaluation concerned who shall receive funding? at what levels? and based on which criteria? Distribution is an area in which the Endowment is being encouraged to take a leadership role.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The evaluation team for this project wishes to extend its thanks and appreciation to the 225 individuals across the nation who took the time to answer our questions and provide their thoughtful and often thought-provoking opinions to this study. Their cooperation, enthusiasm and interest made the project a joy to work on.

Special thanks are also extended to Lawrence Wilkinson, KQED, San Francisco who so patiently explained the intricacies of public broadcasting again and again and who was always available to answer questions and clear up misconceptions. Drs. Michael Scriven and Barbara Gross Davis of the Evaluation Institute at the University of San Francisco willingly gave of their time and expertise to the study. Last but not least, a special note of thanks to Research Assistant Jocelyn Coblenz who kept the project organized and running, coordinated field interviews, and provided a cheerful countenance whenever deadlines loomed and tempers frayed.

PREFACE: THE STUDY IN BRIEF

In December, 1979, the Evaluation Division of the National Endowment for the Arts (NEA) contracted Far West Laboratory for Educational Research and Development, San Francisco, to conduct an evaluation of the impact of support granted by the Programming in the Arts funding category of the Media Arts program at the Endowment. Programming in the Arts is one of several funding categories* within Media Arts. It supports television, film, video and radio projects on the arts, and has made major grants to such series as DANCE IN AMERICA, LIVE FROM LINCOLN CENTER, LIVE FROM THE MET, VISIONS, and EARPLAY. Descriptions of these series including a list of the programs within each appear in Appendix A. This report presents the results of this three-month evaluation of the impact of Programming in the Arts upon artists, cultural institutions, the media, and the public.

The research utilized an illuminative approach to evaluation, allowing the experiences of respondents and the issues of concern to emerge freely during the study. Information was gathered from artists, administrators of arts organizations, media managers, other funders of media arts projects and professional critics in thirteen cities across the United States. In-person, semi-structured interviews were conducted with 225 individuals, some of whom had received support through Programming in the Arts and many of whom had not. A list of cultural institutions whose representatives were interviewed as well as a list of individuals who contributed their opinions to the study appears in Appendix B. Many of their comments are reproduced verbatim in this report to illustrate the major points discussed.

Far West Laboratory also collected archival materials such as proposals and final reports on the funded projects, relevant research reports, reviews, press releases and press packets, and sample advertisements, whenever they were available. Nielsen audience ratings were re-analyzed and interpreted for the programs supported by Programming in the Arts under a subcontract with an independent firm, Research and Programming Services.

*In 1978, other funding categories of the Media Arts program included Major Media Centers, Aid to Film/Video Exhibitions, In-residence/Workshop Program, Endowment/CPB Joint Program, American Film Institute, Production Aid, Services to the Field, and General Programs.

The overall research design and methodology employed in the present study are discussed at length in Appendix C. Interview schedules used in the study may be found in Appendix D. Throughout the present report, a differentiation is made between "participants" and "non-participants." "Participants" are defined strictly to mean either a) individuals or organizations who have received direct grants under the Programming in the Arts funding category of the Endowment; or b) individuals or organizations who have been paid for their involvement in projects funded by Programming in the Arts. Projects which have received funds from Programming in the Arts are indicated by the use of capitalized titles. In most sections, an obvious distinction is drawn between participants affiliated with media organizations and participants affiliated with arts organizations. Anyone who does not fall within the "participant" category is a "non-participant." Non-participants might be individuals who have received support from a funding category within the Endowment other than Programming in the Arts, as well as individuals and organizations that have participated in arts projects on the media funded by sources other than the Endowment.

The experiences of some non-participants overlapped with those of participants. Their comments contributed significantly to our understanding of the impacts of Programming in the Arts projects on participants, although their comments have been attributed to non-participants. One group of non-participants had received grants from other funding categories that are part of the Media Arts Program at the Endowment. Their experiences with the staff and procedures of the program were not unlike those of participants. A second group of non-participants as defined in this research were recipients of grants under other programs of the Endowment. They share with the participants the perspective of a recipient of federal support for their artistic work. The third group of non-participants who helped to illuminate the impacts of these projects were individuals or representatives of organizations who had been involved in media arts programming without NEA support. The significance of media programming on their organizations, their work or themselves provided a measure of comparison for Programming in the Arts projects.

Chapter 1 provides an historical context for Programming in the Arts, followed by a discussion of the background of this funding category and an analysis of its funding history. The major series and specials which were the focus of the present study are described for the reader. Chapter 2 discusses the quality and accomplishments of these major series and specials. Chapter 3 describes how public television programs are produced and distributed with an eye toward Programming in the Arts projects, and presents evidence about the size and nature of the audience for the major series. Chapter 4 looks at the impact of Programming in the Arts on the media while Chapter 5 discusses the impact of support granted under Programming in the Arts on the people and organizations in the arts who have participated in the projects. Chapter 6 reports on the impact these NEA funds have had on the arts disciplines across the nation. Finally, Chapter 7 summarizes the present relationship of the arts and media, and discusses unresolved issues that emerged in the course of the research.

At the initiation of this research thirteen questions were proposed by staff members at the National Endowment for the Arts. Answers to the questions have been interwoven throughout the chapter presentations. The questions are listed below along with the chapter of the present report in which related findings are discussed.

NEA Evaluation Question	Chapter
1. What quality levels have been achieved by the supported series and programs from the point of view of a) the arts disciplines showcased; b) the media field; and c) fusing arts and media into a new art form?	2
2. Have the supported series and programs been distributed effectively?	3
3. What was the size and nature (socio-economic factors) of the viewing audience achieved?	3
4. Is there evidence that people who are not considered part of the "usual" arts audience were exposed to the arts?	3
5. Did active, direct participation in these series and programs help the arts organizations through a) increasing their audiences at live events; b) increasing their membership; c) attracting new financial resources; d) other types of benefits?	5

	Chapter
6. What are the participating arts organizations' plans to extend their audiences through new technologies such as a) cable; b) video cassette and disc; c) other?	3
7. Beyond the arts organizations participating directly in the series and programs, have the broader arts disciplines been helped? In what ways?	6
8. Did individual creative and performing artists benefit? In what ways?	5,6
9. To what extent has the Programming in the Arts funding category to date achieved the following:	
a) demonstrated how the variety within an art form can be communicated?	2
b) encouraged acceptance of arts programming through the media?	5
c) generated interest in follow-up or spin-off activities?	5
d) encouraged commercial media to present the arts?	5
10. How essential is Endowment funding to the supported series? Would most of them have come into existence and occurred without Endowment support?	1,4,5
11. How are the impacts of Programming in the Arts distributed among the various Endowment goal and policy areas?	7
12 & 13. (PBS, CPB, and NPR) What are the advantages and disadvantages to the partnership with NEA? How does arts programming fit into the upcoming program plans and priorities?	1,5 4

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ERIC

TABLES

FIGURES

Chapter 1

Programming in the Arts

Media Art: A History in Brief

The performing arts -- dance, opera, theatre and music -- and the media -- radio, film, television and video -- are not strangers, but the history of their tenuous marriage is a troubled one. As early as 1907, in the infancy of the film industry, France's Film d'Art was formed to introduce film audiences to the greatest artists of the French national theatre. Sarah Bernhardt, Mme. Rejane and the entire cast of the Comedie Francaise graced the celluloid screen in plays by Victor Hugo and Anatole France, along with dances filmed with Regina Badet, Trouhanova and La Belle Otero. The score for Film d'Art's first venture, The Assassination of the Duc de Guise (1908) was composed by Camille Saint-Saens. While these early films were not artistically sophisticated nor commercially successful, they attracted new audiences to the cinema and spawned an international interest in translating the arts for film. In the United States, Adolph Zukor cultivated interest with the filming of Queen Elizabeth (1912) starring Sarah Bernhardt. Her remark, upon being invited at age 65 to make the film, was "This is one chance of immortality."

Indeed, these early events in the history of the cinema presaged many of the issues -- artistic technique, audience size and demographics, distribution and the preservation of ephemeral performance -- that have characterized the marriage of arts and media through to the present day. Between 1910 and 1940, the film medium made significant technological advances while continuing to explore the presentation of the performing arts. Film was joined in 1927 by radio which brought regular drama and symphonic concerts to the home audience during the next few decades.

By 1939, a new communications medium appeared on the horizon. In that year, at the New York World's Fair, RCA pioneer David Sarnoff revealed his iconoscope television camera and predicted that one day television would

bring music, opera and dance into every home. The Forties and Fifties were in many ways a halcyon period for the arts and media. In 1940, Texaco began sponsoring Saturday afternoon radio broadcasts of the Metropolitan Opera, a programming effort that has continued unbroken for forty years. Drama continued as a staple of radio schedules during these years. On television, the NBC Opera Theatre under the direction of Peter Hermann Adler began to broadcast live studio productions of original and standard repertory works in 1948.

During the Fifties, there was a continuing presence of live drama on television in regularly scheduled series such as Playhouse 90, Kraft Theatre and Studio One. Many of these provided a showplace for original American drama and programs like "Requiem for a Heavyweight" by Rod Serling and "The Days of Wine and Roses" by J.P. Miller were not atypical in television's infancy. In 1954, NBC commissioned Gian-Carlo Menotti to write the opera, "Amahl and the Night Visitors" for the Hallmark Hall of Fame. It pioneered the television "spectacular."

By the Sixties, as television increased its market penetration, the portrait of the arts and media changed. Drama on television competed strongly with radio and soon preempted it. Drama on radio disappeared almost completely. It was replaced with radio channels programmed for specialized audiences containing all-news programs or distinctive musical profiles. Classical music survived in most markets, however, with one "good music" station. In 1960, Texaco created the Metropolitan network by linking 108 stations across the country to reach 95% of America. This network has since grown to 300 stations including 140 commercial ones.

With the introduction of videotape and filmed drama, live drama all but vanished from the small screen while serial westerns, situation comedies, and game shows proliferated. The performing arts of dance, music and opera appeared sporadically on variety programs like the Ed Sullivan Show, sandwiched between circus and animal acts. Only a handful of regular series such as Omnibus and Camera Three provided regular offerings of the performing arts to television. These cultural series both appeared on CBS; Omnibus was heavily subsidized by the Ford Foundation. Commercial television, with its emphasis on audience size and advertising

revenues, was less and less willing to serve smaller audiences with programs on the performing arts. Intermittent series like the Hallmark Hall of Fame, the Bell Telephone Hour and the CBS Children's Concerts with Leonard Bernstein provided occasional oases in an otherwise arid wasteland.

As commercial television reached adolescence, in large part it chose to ignore the arts. A few of the then-infant public television stations began some small-scale experiments with the performing arts. In the late Fifties, WGBH in Boston produced and broadcast a series called A Time to Dance. By the mid-Sixties, National Educational Television (NET) in New York was producing and distributing Arts U.S.A. including Dance U.S.A., The Dance Theatre of Jose Limon, and Jacob's Pillow Dance Festival. During this period NET also produced the classic Four Pioneers about modern dancers Graham, Weidman, Humphreys and Holm. According to several television representatives, these early efforts were frustrating to media producers and performers alike. Since the programs were expected to have an instructional purpose rather than a performance emphasis, performing artists were rarely given the facilities or resources to which they were accustomed.

By the early Seventies, presentation of the performing arts on the media--particularly on television--was obstructed by several factors. Too little funding was available for the exploration, experimentation and development of performance programming. Too few television producers had developed the skills or sensitivities required to work well with performing artists. And little effort had been devoted to the development of a technology that would serve both the performing artists and the audiences at home: television cameras required exceedingly bright lights which were disturbing to performers; television receivers provided poor sound quality for the transmission of symphonic or operatic performances.

In January, 1976, two series changed the profile of the performing arts on television. Both were developed with funding from the National Endowment for the Arts, a public agency begun in 1965 to foster the arts in the United States. These series were DANCE IN AMERICA and LIVE FROM LINCOLN CENTER. While strikingly different in concept and intent, these series represented a fresh commitment to arts programming for broadcast television.

On January 30, 1976, a live performance of the New York Philharmonic conducted by Andre Previn and featuring Van Cliburn was broadcast by LIVE FROM LINCOLN CENTER across the public television system. Early funding provided by the Endowment, among others, to John Goberman for Media Development at Lincoln Center permitted the development of low-light level cameras. These cameras could record a live performance without unduly disturbing the live audience or the performers. The development of this technology paved the way for broadcasts of other performance events live, including LIVE FROM THE MET and the recent production of the San Francisco Opera in "La Giaconda" which was broadcast over satellite to the U.S. and Europe. LIVE FROM LINCOLN CENTER also pioneered in the use of stereo simulcast during that first program, thereby significantly improving the sound quality of the program received at home.

In contrast, DANCE IN AMERICA strove to fuse the television medium with the choreographers' art. On January 21, 1976, the permiere program featured the Joffrey Ballet performing works by Arpino, Massine and Joffrey. Merrill Brockway and Emile Ardolino, as director and producer for the series, assured that performing artists would have the facilities and control to which they were accustomed. Early monies provided by the Endowment to WNET to produce the dance specials AMERICAN BALLET THEATRE in 1972 and the ALVIN AILEY THEATRE in 1974 had provided a proving ground for that station to test out production techniques for presenting dance on television.

The 1976 premieres of LIVE FROM LINCOLN CENTER and DANCE IN AMERICA not only introduced American audiences to the performances of major artistic companies and heralded a new era in the marriage of media and art, they also represented an important new shift in media arts funding within the National Endowment for the Arts. Both projects received their funds from Programming in the Arts (PITA), one funding category within the Media Arts program of the Endowment.

Media Arts at the National Endowment for the Arts

The National Endowment for the Arts was created in 1965 by Congress to increase opportunities for artists and to encourage an aesthetic awareness and

involvement in the arts on the part of citizens and private and public organizations. The goal of the Endowment is:

> the fostering of professional excellence of the arts in America, to nurture and sustain them, and equally to help create a climate in which they may flourish so they may be experienced and enjoyed by the widest possible public.

To accomplish this, the Endowment has made block grants to State Arts Agencies and has empowered its programmatic areas to grant funds to competing individuals and cultural institutions. The Endowment's appropriation from Congress to support the arts has grown from $2,534,308 in 1966 to $139,660,000 in 1979.

No formal program for media arts existed at the Endowment until 1971. Prior to that time, several small grants were made through other program areas and one major media project -- the creation of the American Film Institute (AFI) in 1967 -- was undertaken. The AFI currently receives about one-third of the Media Arts funding budget and manages several activities. It offers support and training for filmmakers, it sponsors research and publication on the cinema, and it has developed an archive for the preservation of film of high artistic value.

In 1971, the Media Arts program -- then called the Public Media program -- was launched with a budget of $1,000,000. According to a position paper submitted to the Endowment by Chloe Aaron,* the four goals of the Public Media program were:

1. to expand the national audience for the arts on television, film, and radio, hopefully with the effect of stimulating broader support for the arts;
2. to create new outlets for artists;

*Chloe Aaron wrote her position paper in 1970 as a consultant to the Endowment. She was hired in 1971 to establish the Public Media program and served as its director until 1976 when she assumed the position of Senior Vice President, Programming, with the Public Broadcasting Service.

3. to encourage the development of new formats and new techniques for presenting the arts on the media; and
4. to explore the media as art forms in themselves.

Within the Media Arts program, there are several funding categories. One of these is Programming in the Arts (PITA) which expends about one-third of the total Media Arts monies. Between 1972 and 1979, this has amounted to $11,213,784.* Programming in the Arts funds for 1979 were $2,656,000.

Programming in the Arts

Programming in the Arts (PITA) has funded television and radio series, television specials, pilots, research and development projects, film and video productions, and workshops and residencies for media artists. In 1974, PITA began concentrating its funding support on a few major series for public television and one drama series for public radio.**

There are two processes by which grants are made within PITA. Unsolicited proposals for particular projects are received and evaluated by a panel of experts in the arts and medi...*** Projects funded in this way may be series, specials, pilots, or research and development. LIVE FROM LINCOLN CENTER and WOMEN IN ART are examples of series funded by the Endowment which were initiated by their creators.

*Additional grants totaling $2.4 million were awarded under PITA between 1972 and 1978 for support of State Films and Production Aid. These projects are no longer categorized as part of PITA and are not included in this evaluation.

**Support for television, film and radio projects is also provided by another funding category within Media Arts. Production Aid makes grants of up to $50,000 for smaller media projects.

***Panel review of proposals is an Endowment-wide policy established to insure professional peer review of quality in projects funded. The Programming in the Arts panel consists of individuals who ordinarily meet once a year. Individual terms on a panel are a year or more. In addition, special panels may be established for special projects where specific expertise in a performing art is required. For example, a special panel of experts in jazz and media was formed to evaluate proposals for a new series on jazz.

Other major series funded by PITA are initiated by the Endowment. This process of initiating new projects is unique among Endowment programs. PITA, in conjunction with another funding category at the Endowment, such as the Dance or Music Division, initiates new projects by holding a conference of experts to identify programmatic needs and to explore how they might be fulfilled. Other major funding sources such as the Corporation for Public Broadcasting (CPB) and the Ford Foundation are sometimes partners in these meetings. Once an area and approach have been identified, the Endowment develops a set of guidelines and sends a letter soliciting proposals to a wide mailing list which includes every public television station in the country and many independent producers. When proposals in response to this solicitation are received, they are evaluated by the media panel and a major award may be made. In the past, this process has been used to initiate VISIONS, DANCE IN AMERICA, JAZZAMERICA, and most recently, a series on Design and Architecture.

Programming in the Arts provides partial funding of media arts projects. For many projects -- particularly grants to independent artists -- partial funding poses problems. Independent producers have difficulties finding funds to complete their projects. For the larger series -- with the exception of VISIONS -- PITA funding has been consistently present over several years. This policy of long-term funding is in marked contrast to the Corporation for Public Broadcasting's stance of funding projects for a finite period, granting "seed money." The philosophy behind CPB's approach is that a successful program should be able to attract other funds once its success has been established. In general, public broadcasters feel this is an unrealistic position.

Many respondents reported that a public broadcasting series in the arts would not have been possible without Endowment funding.

> It(EARPLAY) wouldn't have happened without it.
> (Washington, DC)

> It's perfectly appropriate for the Arts Endowment to underwrite programming. Without them, what else would we have?
> (San Francisco)

> Public television couldn't exist without NEA. (Los Angeles)

Programming in the Arts works closely with CPB, The Public Broadcasting Service (PBS), and National Public Radio (NPR) -- the major public broadcasting agencies -- to provide high quality arts programming for the public networks. Officials at these agencies appear happy with their partnership with the Endowment. As one CPB official noted:

> It's been an unblemished cooperative record. I can say that without qualification.

Producing stations within the PBS system who have received grants from PITA concur that the Endowment is a "benign" funder which does not interfere with either artistic or scheduling concerns once a project has been funded. Criticism of the Endowment among producing PBS stations is more likely to focus on funding policies and procedures, including slow response to funding requests, lack of monies for promotion, and insufficient monies for television production at a time when inflation within the industry is outstripping the size of Endowment grants. Comments such as these were frequently heard:

> I feel real good about the way NEA relates to small artists. My only complaint is that the grants are too small. And there's a natural political process to spread the grants as thin as possible to give something to as many worthy applicants as they can rather than to make really hard choices and husband their money. (New York)

> You apply to NEA, they never give you what you need. They look at all the applications and say we will break it down so that if we apply for $35,000, they want to give us only $20,000. It cost us $2,000 just to make the application. (Seattle)

Between 1972 and 1979, Programming in the Arts made approximately 200 grants in partial support of 165 media projects. Funds are granted from program funds or Treasury funds which must be matched by other sources. The distribution of support granted by PITA is arrayed in Table 1.1, Table 1.2, and Table 1.3.

Table 1.1 presents "Programming in the Arts -- Support by Project Type." In 1972 and 1973, PITA did not fund series of programs for television, only specials. Support for the radio series, EARPLAY, did begin in 1973 but not until 1974 was the concept of a major television series introduced. In that year KCET received $500,000 in Treasury funds toward the production of VISIONS. This major grant accounted for more than 50% of the funding activity for PITA that year, and series have continued to capture the lion's share of the funds to the present time. Fully 73% of $11,213,784 granted between 1972 and 1979 in this funding category have gone to support series for television and radio programming. The major series, DANCE IN AMERICA, LIVE FROM LINCOLN CENTER, LIVE FROM THE MET, VISIONS, EARPLAY and WOMEN IN ART have captured $7.7 million or 69% of these funds.

Grants made to pilots and television specials often result in programming for television; in some cases, films and video productions are broadcast as well.* Many more grants have been made for film and video productions under other funding categories included in Media Arts.

Table 1.2, "Programming in the Arts -- Support for Projects by Content Areas," presents more detailed breakouts of the distribution of funds according to subject matter and form. Because the major series have focused on the performing arts, approximately $8 million or 71% of the funds over the past eight years have gone to the recording or broadcasting of performances. Another $404,015 has been expended for documentaries concerning performing artists or performing arts. Almost $2 million has gone to support documentaries on all subjects in the arts. Only 5% of the funds disbursed by PITA have been devoted to "Media as Art" types of products.

Table 1.3, "Programming in the Arts -- Support by Type of Recipient," displays the amount of grants by the type of organization receiving the award. Sixty-three percent of the grants have gone to broadcasters for the production of television programming. A large share of these funds have gone to WNET for the productions DANCE IN AMERICA and WOMEN IN ART, and to KCET for the

*Table 3.1 in Chapter 3 presents information on the broadcasts of specials and productions funded by Programming in the Arts.

TABLE 1.1

PROGRAMMING IN THE ARTS -- Support by Project Type 1972-1979

PROJECT	1972	1973	1974	1975	1976	1977	1978	1979	TOTALS
SERIES	-0-	-0-	579,788	685,032	1,690,710	1,510,500	1,896,000	1,778,000	8,140,030
TELEVISION SPECIALS	105,000	146,795	67,500	212,500	86,170	20,000	155,980	23,000	816,945
FILM/VIDEO PRODUCTIONS	25,000	94,365	160,847	69,570	216,370	-0-	111,450	315,000	992,602
PILOTS/RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT	12,000	36,850	20,000	12,500	7,500	174,500	171,500	505,000	939,850
WORKSHOPS RESIDENCY	-0-	36,000	17,177	11,000	159,005	-0-	-0-	-0-	223,182
MISCELLANEOUS	16,495	-0-	18,600	-0-	-0-	-0-	31,080	35,000	101,175
TOTAL	158,495	314,010	863,912	990,602	2,159,755	1,705,000	2,366,010	2,656,000	11,213,784

TABLE 1.2

PROGRAMMING IN THE ARTS -- Support for Projects by Content Area, 1972-1979

	PERFORMING ARTS			DOCUMENTARIES					OTHER PROJECTS				
YEAR	MUSIC/OPERA[a]	DANCE[a]	DRAMA	GENERAL CULTURE	PERFORMING ARTS	VISUAL ARTS	FOLK ARTS	ARTISTS	FILM/TV AS SUBJECTS	MEDIA AS ART	TECHNICAL	MISCELLANY	TOTAL
1972	25,000	50,000	-0-	-0-	45,000	22,000	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-	9,775	6,720	158,495
1973	-0-	15,000	31,900	-0-	23,165	78,695	20,000	-0-	25,000	96,000	14,350	9,900	314,010
1974	10,000	50,000	588,327	-0-	29,200	9,950	23,270	17,500	94,788	27,177	25,000	28,700	863,912
1975	217,500	460,000	200,000	25,000	22,500	12,070	-0-	12,500	-0-	15,032	-0-	26,000	990,602
1976	217,780	570,000	700,000	61,460	11,710	271,800	-0-	60,000	70,000	167,505	-0-	29,500	2,159,755
1977	242,500	575,000	550,000 [b]	77,000	70,000	40,000	-0-	-0-	47,500	33,000	-0-	70,000	1,705,000
1978	695,000	595,000	740,000 [b]	47,240	104,500	67,210	59,760	-0-	-0-	6,000	14,000	37,300	2,366,010
1979	506,250	568,750	378,000	415,000	98,000	224,000	-0-	-0-	255,000	191,000	-0-	20,000	2,656,000
TOTALS	1,914,030	2,883,750	3,188,227	625,700	404,075	725,725	103,030	90,000	452,288	535,714	63,125	228,120	11,213,784

KEY:

PERFORMING ARTS: Funds to support the research, development, production or distribution of projects that would present performances in Music/Opera, Dance, or Drama.

DOCUMENTARIES: Funds to support the research, development, production or distribution of films and videotapes about artists, their work, or the art form in the following categories:

GENERAL CULTURE -- projects that examine the culture of an ethnic group, a country, the arts in general.

PERFORMING ARTS -- projects that document the development of a performance, biographical material on performing artists.

VISUAL ARTS -- projects that present material on the visual art forms and visual artists.

FOLK ARTS -- projects that present material on folk art forms and folk artists.

OTHER ARTISTS -- projects that present material on artists such as composers, poets, authors, etc.

OTHER PROJECTS: FILM/TV AS SUBJECTS -- funds to support projects which have as their subject matter the development, production or effects of the media.

MEDIA AS ART -- funds to support video art and other forms of experimentation with media art.

TECHNICAL -- funds to support the development of technology related to media arts projects.

MISCELLANY -- funds for any other project; such as residencies, workshops, etc.

a. The funds for LINCOLN CENTER were divided between two categories. Music/Opera and Dance in a 75/25% ratio as the series presents live performances in both categories.

b. Includes $500,000 in Treasury Funds for support of VISIONS

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

TABLE 1.3

PROGRAMMING IN THE ARTS -- Support by Type of Recipient, 1972-1979

YEAR	INDEPENDENT FILMMAKERS VIDEO-ARTISTS $	%	PRODUCTION COMPANIES $	%	ARTS & CULTURAL ORGANIZATIONS $	%	BROADCASTERS $	%	SCHOOLS $	%	OTHER $	%	TOTALS $	%
1972	27,000	(17%)	-0-		-0-		114,775	(72%)	16,720	(11%)	-0-		158,495	(100%)
1973	55,165	(18%)	-0-		38,750	(12%)	142,795	(45%)	42,400	(14%)	34,900	(11%)	314,010	(100%)
1974	41,650	(5%)	22,000	(3%)	79,212	(9%)	676,250	(78%)	-0-		44,800	(5%)	863,912	(100%)
1975	62,500	(6%)	205,000	(21%)	15,000	(2%)	696,032	(70%)	12,070	(1%)	-0-		990,602	(100%)
1976	126,960	(6%)	30,210	(2%)	308,440	(14%)	1,424,395	(66%)	219,750	(10%)	50,000	(2%)	2,159,755	(100%)
1977	-0-		87,500	(5%)	454,500	(27%)	1,163,000	(68%)	-0-		-0-		1,705,000	(100%)
1978	47,000	(2%)	96,000	(4%)	699,500	(30%)	1,238,240	(52%)	246,990	(10%)	38,280	(2%)	2,366,010	(100%)
1979	-0-		418,000	(16%)	600,000	(23%)	1,583,000	(59%)	15,000		40,000	(2%)	2,656,000	(100%)
TOTALS	360,275	(3%)	858,710	(8%)	2,195,402	(19%)	7,038,487	(63%)	552,930	(5%)	207,980	(2%)	11,213,784	(100%)

production of VISIONS. In total, these two organizations account for approximately $6.4 million. Though the grants for LIVE FROM THE MET and LIVE FROM LINCOLN CENTER are awarded to the arts organizations involved, even these grants provided additional income to WNET in the form of fees for "cost of entry" to the public broadcasting system.

Production companies that have received grants from PITA are often operated by independent filmmakers. They are rarely large organizations; more often they are companies set up to receive and administer grants to one or two producers. The funds granted to independent filmmakers combined with the grants to production companies total $1,218,985 or 11% of the funds that have been distributed through PITA. In addition, VISIONS channeled funds for several productions directly to independent filmmakers.

It should be remembered that PITA is dedicated to the production of major series and specials that will reach a large audience with arts programming. More often than not the production facilities and staff with the expertise to successfully manage these projects have been located at broadcast stations. Most of these projects have called upon independent filmmakers, writers and artists of the various disciplines to accomplish the goals of the project. Though not direct recipients of these grants, many such artists have received funds from PITA in the form of fees and/or salary for their participation.

Projects Supported by Programming in the Arts

Major Series

Major series funded by the Endowment include EARPLAY, VISIONS, LIVE FROM LINCOLN CENTER, LIVE FROM THE MET, DANCE IN AMERICA and WOMEN IN ART. As these series received 69% of the funds expended by Programming in the Arts between 1972 and 1979, they were the content focus of the present study. Below is a brief description of each series and the role of the Endowment in its creation. The goals of the series and their accomplishments are discussed in Chapter 2. A complete listing of the programs included in these series is presented in Appendix A.

EARPLAY

EARPLAY is a radio drama series directed by Karl Schmidt and produced in alternate years through Minnesota Public Radio and the University of Wisconsin. Its goal is to present high quality dramatic material to the radio audience, and it has commissioned playwrights such as Edward Albee, Arthur Kopit, Archibald MacLeish and David Mamet to develop original material for the series. Some productions are acquired from abroad.

EARPLAY began in 1971 with an unrestricted grant of $150,000 from the Corporation for Public Broadcasting (CPB) as a variety of short dramas and features. In 1973, EARPLAY applied to the National Endowment for the Arts and and received small grants during that and the following year to continue these fifteen minute segments.

In 1973, EARPLAY expanded to an hour format and began producing full length radio dramas. Its funding from PITA increased to $200,000 per year. Between 1973 and 1979, PITA supported EARPLAY with total funds of $877,500. The annual Endowment support amounts to about 40% of EARPLAY's budget with the remainder supplied by CPB. The 1979 grant of $200,000 for EARPLAY was made directly to National Public Radio (NPR) as part of a larger package for radio drama.

VISIONS

VISIONS was the first major television series funded by Programming in the Arts. VISIONS is a series of original dramas, commissioned especially for television. Early in 1972, staff members of the Endowment and the Ford Foundation agreed that an attempt should be made to provide leadership in bringing about the creation and broadcasting of original American drama on the Public Broadcasting Service (PBS). In March, 1973, a seminar on American Television Drama, co-sponsored by the Theatre Communications Group (TCG), the Ford Foundation and the Endowment, was held in Tarrytown, New York. For the seminar, John Houseman prepared a position paper on "TV Drama in the U.S.A." As a result of the seminar, the National Endowment, the Ford Foundation, TCG and PBS jointly sent a letter to all public television stations on January 23, 1974 soliciting proposals for a new drama project.

In 1974, KCET's proposal for a New Drama Project was funded with grants from the Endowment, CPB and Ford. Thirty-two programs were produced; of these, 23 were produced by KCET and the rest were outside productions.

The Endowment contributed $2,500,000 for the support of the series between 1974 and 1978 or approximately 25% of the cost of the series. CPB withdrew its funding in 1978, and KCET was unsuccessful in attracting other corporate or foundation support for the project. In 1979, the project was formally abandoned by KCET.

LIVE FROM LINCOLN CENTER

In contrast to EARPLAY and VISIONS which focus on drama as an art form, LIVE FROM LINCOLN CENTER provides a forum for other performing arts. Between January 1976 and January, 1980, LIVE FROM LINCOLN CENTER has presented a series of 24 performing arts events broadcast live and unaltered from Avery Fisher Hall, Alice Tully Hall, the New York State Theatre and the Metropolitan Opera House, all components of the Lincoln Center complex in New York City. These broadcasts have included symphonic concerts, ballets, operas and solo recitals.

Endowment support for LIVE FROM LINCOLN CENTER accounts for 17% of the $1,600,000 budget for the current season of the series. Additional funding for production is provided by the Exxon Corporation, the Andrew W. Mellon Foundation and CPB. Funding for promotion is provided by Exxon.

LIVE FROM THE MET

After 36 years of radio broadcasts from the Metropolitan Opera House in New York City, the Met began live telecasts in March, 1977, with a production of "La Boheme." The success of that telecast encouraged the Met to plan and produce a series of three telecasts for the 1977-78 season. LIVE FROM THE MET was expanded in 1978-79 to four productions and current plans are to continue with four operas each season. The productions have been simulcast on radio and English subtitles now provide translation of the storyline.

The Metropolitan Opera was involved in the research and development for LIVE FROM LINCOLN CENTER and worked closely with Lincoln Center in the early negotiations. Corporate underwriting for the MET by Texaco and for LINCOLN CENTER by Exxon led to a separation of the two series. The Met now produces LIVE FROM THE MET with support from Texaco, PITA and the Charles E. Culpepper Foundation. PITA's contribution amounts to 10% of the total budget. The series is promoted with additional funding from Texaco and presented to PBS by WNET/13.

DANCE IN AMERICA

Currently in its fifth season, DANCE IN AMERICA takes a distinctively different approach to televising the performing art of dance. It is a series of made-for-television programs featuring the outstanding choreographers and dance companies in the United States today.

DANCE IN AMERICA was the outgrowth of several symposia on the creation of a major dance series for television. It was conceived as an alternative way to reach the growing numbers of people interested in the dance, many of whom

lived in areas rarely toured by dance companies. The project was initiated by the Public Media Program at the Endowment in conjunction with staff of the Dance Program and representatives of public broadcasting and leading dance companies.

On the basis of a proposal submitted in competition to Programming in the Arts, WNET was awarded a grant of $500,000 in 1975 to start production. CPB and Exxon have also supported the project with Exxon providing additional funds for promotion. In 1979, a grant to PBS from CPB paid for national advertisements in TV Guide, some of which have promoted DANCE IN AMERICA.

WOMEN IN ART

WOMEN IN ART is a series of seven films focusing on the lives and work of American women artists. In each of six films a portrait of one outstanding woman artist is developed. The seventh film, "Anonymous Was a Woman", relates the story of many American women in the 18th and 19th century who demonstrated their creativity through the needlework and decorative crafts that adorned their homes.

The films were produced for WNET by Perry Miller Adato and several independent filmmakers over a period of several years. Work on the pilot, a half hour film about Mary Cassatt, began in 1973 with funding from the Endowment, the Corporation for Public Broadcasting, and the Robert Sterling Clark Foundation. A Chairman's Grant from the Endowment in 1975 and funds from the Xerox Corporation and several foundations enabled Ms. Miller to take advantage of a unique invitation from Georgia O'Keeffe to film the artist at her home in New Mexico. In 1977, Programming in the Arts granted WNET $200,000 toward completion of the series.

Specials, Smaller Series, and Other Projects

In addition to funding the major series described above, PITA has made a number of grants for small series, specials, film and video projects, and research and development. Approximately 30 of these projects were selected

for analysis in this evaluation.* The list below provides brief descriptions of these projects and their current status.

TELEVISION SERIES

1976

CENTER FOR NEW ARTS ACTIVITIES $10,000

FIVE VIDEO PIONEERS A series of programs about video artists Vito Acconci, Rich Serra, Willoughby Sharp, Keith Sonneir and William Wegman. Additional funds provided by the N.Y. State Council for the Arts and a private investor were not sufficient to complete the original design of the project. PBS refused a request for post-production funds. Current plans are to edit the material into a one-hour program.

1977

SOUTH CAROLINA EDUCATIONAL TELEVISION NETWORK $40,000

STUDIO SEE Support was given toward 26 segments of a magazine-format children's series about the arts. Programs show children actively involved in the arts and adult artists performing or discussing their work. The series is no longer in production but programs are rebroadcast. Broadcasting began in 1977 with 52 programs produced in two years. It has won four awards; SECA Best Public Television Series 1976-77, SECA Special Certificate of Merit 1977, ACT National Achievement Award 1978, AWRT Educational Foundation Special Award 1978. The Public Television Library reports it has earned $7,000 in secondary distribution.

1978

PACIFICA FOUNDATION/WPFW-FM $15,000

CITY RHYTHMS FOR YOUNG PEOPLE A Radio series presenting concerts and lectures for young people in Washington, D.C. The series highlights jazz, folk, and blues. It was intended for broadcast by WPFW-FM and distribution to the five Pacifica radio stations throughout the U.S. The one-year project was completed successfully, and the tapes of these programs are now being sent to the other Pacifica stations. NEA funding provided half of the money needed to produce the series.

*Projects were selected on the bases of geographic location, project type, and accessibility of the participants. Participants whose projects were funded between 1972 and 1974 were difficult to locate and therefore are under-represented in the sample.

1979

COMMUNITY TELEVISION OF SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA/KCET $300,000 (1/2 private)

MUSICAL COMEDY TONIGHT An eight-part series focusing on the art of American musical comedy from Oklahoma to A Chorus Line, hosted by Sylvia Fine Kaye and using top performers. In 1978, KCET received $50,000 from PITA to produce a pilot. It was aired nationally in October, 1979, and rebroadcast in August, 1980. Two more 90-minute programs are currently in pre-production, and scheduled to air in early 1981. CPB and Prudential are co-funders. The pilot received a Peabody Award.

KQED, INC. $90,000

MEDIA PROBES The series will consist of eight half-hour programs which demonstrate the effect of media -- including Musak, popular photography, commercial television -- on our assumptions, judgments, and perceptions. The pilot, produced prior to the PITA grant, was aired over PBS in January, 1980. Funding has also been received from the Ford, Rockefeller and Sloan Foundations and CPB, and the series is scheduled to air beginning in April, 1981.

WGBH EDUCATIONAL FOUNDATION $50,000

CAMERA THREE This cultural magazine series was produced through CBS for 25 years, and is now affiliated with WGBH. The CAMERA THREE production staff has formed its own company, and will provide new segments to the series which will be interspersed with old segments from the CBS archives and other new segments produced by Public Television stations. Major support for the series was provided by the Atlantic Richfield Corporation.

TELEVISION SPECIALS

1972

EDUCATIONAL BROADCASTING CORPORATION/WNET $50,000

AMERICAN BALLET THEATRE: A CLOSE UP IN THE TIME 90-minute special on the American Ballet Theatre, broadcast on PBS.

1973

SOUTH CAROLINA EDUCATIONAL TELEVISION COMMISSION $46,795

THE SHADOW CATCHER A documentary on the life and work of Edward S. Curtis, a photographer who traveled to American Indian tribes and photographed them at the turn of the century. THE SHADOW CATCHER was aired on PBS and distributed as a film and shown in theatres. It has earned $8,000 through the Public Television Library and other distributors.

WGBH EDUCATIONAL FOUNDATION $60,000

VIDEO: THE NEW WAVE An anthology of video art in the U.S., which displays the work of fourteen leading video artists. The program was telecast nationally in 1974, and has been broadcast in almost all of the English-speaking countries. It is in audio-visual distribution and has been shown in museums.

1974

EDUCATIONAL BROADCASTING CORPORATION/WNET $50,000

ALVIN AILEY: MEMORIES AND VISIONS A one-hour special about the Alvin Ailey Dance Comapny, broadcast on PBS, and screened at numerous film and dance festivals.

1975

THE MUSIC PROJECT FOR TELEVISION, INC. $300,000

AMAZING GRACE: A BICENTENNIAL CELEBRATION OF AMERICAN SONG This 90-minute special combines documentary material and performance of American folk music. It was broadcast on PBS in June and October, 1976, co-sponsored by Exxon. It played on West German television in 1979, and is scheduled to air on Finnish and Swedish television as well. Screened at festivals in Italy and Belgium, it also has a wide 16mm. distribution.

1976

DOWNTOWN COMMUNITY TV CENTER $11,500

JAZZMOBILE Intended to be a one-hour special on the music, dance, theatre, and poetry performed in the streets of New York, the final version consisted of 20 minutes of video showing live performances of jazz and Latin music taken from summer concerts in New York. It has not been broadcast or distributed as a full piece. WNYC, a New York municipal TV station, has used some footage as background for the Community Bulletin Board announcing free cultural events.

1978

THE MUSIC PROJECT FOR TELEVISION $50,000

MEMORIES OF EUBIE A one-hour special with performances of songs from ragtime through vaudeville, to popular and Broadway songs, as a tribute to Eubie Blake. NEA gave 33% of the budget. The program was broadcast nationally in January, 1980. The broadcast was interrupted by a special broadcast from the U.N. so it will be rebroadcast in its entirety at a later date.

SOUTH CAROLINA EDUCATIONAL TELEVISION COMMISSION $25,000

VANESSA A recording of a live performance of the opera by Samuel Barber, performed at the Spoleto Music Festival in Charlestown, SC, January, 1979. NEA's grant accounted for 8% of the budget for the project. The program was broadcast nationally over PBS.

1979

COMMUNITY TELEVISION OF SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA/KCET $8,000

CONVERSATIONS ABOUT THE DANCE This special presents Agnes de Mille's personal view of the evolution of dance and featured the Joffrey Ballet. In 1978, NEA contributed $50,000 to videotape a performance in Los Angeles. An additional $8,000 was awarded to complete the program. Other contributors include Atlantic Richfield Co., CPB, Ford Foundation and the Andrew W. Mellon Foundation. Program was broadcast over PBS in January, 1980.

FILM/VIDEO PRODUCTIONS

1971

ALLAN MILLER $30,000

BOLERO A half-hour film about a performance of Ravel's Bolero by the L.A. Philharmonic. This film has been broadcast numerous times over PBS and is distributed widely through sales and rentals. Its distribution through Pyramid Films has earned $488,830. It received an Academy Award.

1972

LES BLANK $15,000

DRY WOOD AND HOT PEPPER Film about the music of the Cajun people in Louisiana. Distributed by Flower Films, Berkeley.

1974

WGBH EDUCATIONAL FOUNDATION $50,000

COLLISIONS A fantasy drama by six artists exploring the near future of the earth as it faces cosmic cataclysm. A collaboration between the WGBH Television Workshop and the WNET Television Laboratory, mixing dance, drama, and video art. PITA gave 40% of the budget. Other contributors were Rockefeller Foundation, CPB, Massachusetts Council on the Arts and Humanities, and WNET. It has never been broadcast, and WGBH has it available for rental on cassette. Now it is being edited into a half-hour program.

1976

MITCHELL BLOCK $10,000

A cinema-verite about the problems of breaking into feature film direction. The film centers around two directors. Due to insufficient funds, the film has not yet been completed.

LARRY JORDAN $10,000

RIME OF THE ANCIENT MARINER An animated version of the poem by Coleridge which is narrated by Orson Welles. The 16mm film is in distribution in Canada and Europe. It has been shown at experimental film institutes and museums. It has not been on television.

THEODORE TIMRECK $10,000

A GOOD DISSONANCE LIKE A MAN A film biography of American composer Charles Ives. This film was awarded the Peabody in 1979, as well as the Cine Golden Eagle and prizes at the Atlanta Film Festival, The American Film Festival and the 5th Aso.. International Film Festival in Italy. It has been broadcast over PBS.

1978

KCTS/UNIVERSITY OF WASHINGTON $10,000

ARTISTS IN THE CITY A half-hour film about four Seattle artists and the influence of the city on their work. Featured are painters Jacob Lawrence and Gertrude Pacific, poet David Wagoner, and actor John Gilbert. The program was aired locally in Seattle in January, 1980, and has been submitted to PBS.

UNIVERSITY OF WASHINGTON $6,210

THE IMAGE MAKER AND THE INDIANS A documentary about the 1914 production of LAND OF THE WAR CANOES, the film by Edward S. Curtis. The documentary uses photographs of the event and interviews with members of the original cast.

1979

PTV PRODUCTIONS, INC. $90,000

Support was given for a series of films about contemporary American folk artists by filmmakers Irving Saraf and Ali Light. The first film is about a 103-year-old painter, Harry Lieberman, who started painting at age 80. This first film has been completed.

PILOTS/RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

1973

MINNEAPOLIS SOCIETY OF FINE ARTS/CHILDREN'S THEATRE COMPANY $7,500

SUITCASE Support was granted for a film treatment of this 30-minute, one-act play by John Clark Donahue which has been shown locally.

1977

EDUCATIONAL BROADCASTING CORPORATION/WNET $40,000

THE MEANINGS OF MODERN ART Support was granted for a pilot for a thirteen-part series which would follow the development of Modernist painting and sculpture in Europe and America from 1970 to the present. One further program was funded from other scurces. The two programs produced have aired on PBS. Additional funds for the series could not be found, and the project was terminated.

EDUCATIONAL BROADCASTING CORPORATION/WNET $30,000

THE AMERICAN WIT PARADE Pilot for a series presenting comic art and cartoons in an overview of the best in American humor. The pilot was completed by WNET. It has not been aired.

NEW YORK FOUNDATION FOR THE ARTS $30,000

Support was granted for research on a 90-minute film about D.W. Griffith's early years at the Biograph Studio. The scope of the project has been expanded and filmmaker Ted Timreck is seeking additional funding.

1978

EDUCATIONAL FACILITIES LABORATORIES, INC. $20,000

Support was granted to research the practicality of a one-hour program on the arts for commercial television. Metromedia would contribute one hour of prime time for the project. Matching funds were secured from IBM. Experimental segments for a pilot were produced pointing the way for further development.

1979

EDUCATIONAL BROADCASTING CORPORATION/WNET $145,000

OPEN CHANNELS Funding was granted for a major series of alternative productions featuring the work of independent film and video artists acquired for national broadcast, coordinated by independent producers.

GLOBAL VILLAGE VIDEO RESOURCE CENTER, INC. $145,000

OTHER VISIONS, OTHER VOICES A series of independent film and video productions for national broadcast, coordinated by independent producers.

WGBH EDUCATIONAL FOUNDATION $30,000

WAREHOUSE GANG The grant was made for research and development of a major series on the arts for children between ages 8 and 12. The programs are to be set in a multi-ethnic neighborhood, using a continuing cast of children, animation, and guest artists from the visual and performing arts. Scripts and treatments have been developed. WGBH is now searching for further funding.

WGBH EDUCATIONAL FOUNDATION $60,000

Development of a short series on the life of Eugene O'Neill. In 1978, the Endowment gave $20,000 for development of this series, intended to be five one-hour programs. CPB has given $20,000. WGBH is seeking major funding.

Programming in the Arts: The Accomplishment

In 1975, the performing arts appeared only occasionally on both commercial and public television and performing artists were reluctant to involve themselves with the media. Performing arts unions were afraid the presentation of the performing arts on television would have adverse financial impacts on the livelihood of their members. Many areas in the United States were deprived of the opportunity of seeing and hearing major artistic companies.

By 1980, only five short years later, five major performing arts series have appeared on public television and three more are currently in the works.* Specials like "La Giaconda" by the San Francisco Opera have been supported by major corporations and broadcast live in the United States and Europe via satellite. NBC has revived Studio 8H, the home of the 1948 Toscanini broadcasts. Home Box Office is negotiating for rights to carry MUSICAL COMEDY TONIGHT as part of its pay cable service. The Carnegie Foundation has published a major feasibility study of the arts on cable. Independent producers are clamouring at public broadcasting's door with films and video specials. Performing artists are becoming more sophisticated in their dealings with the media and have begun to demand more equitable financial arrangements between their companies and public television. Some are even beginning to feel exploited and believe they can do it better themselves.

The interest and activity which has conjoined the performing arts and the media during the past five years has been nothing short of extraordinary. While the National Endowment for the Arts has only partially funded the programs which characterize this relationship, their support is considered crucial by the vast majority of participants and non-participants, media managers and artists whose views were gathered for this report. In the following chapters, the quality of the programs supported by PITA, the impacts they have had, and the issues that are still unresolved will be presented and discussed.

*KCET has received a grant from PITA for JAZZAMERICA; a solicitation for proposals for a television series on Opera Musical Theatre has been issued; and a new drama series is under consideration. A major visual arts series for television on Design and Architecture will receive support in the autumn of 1980.

Chapter 2

Program Quality and Accomplishments

This chapter discusses the quality of the major series supported by Programming in the Arts (PITA). After a brief description of the goals and intent of each series, three sources of information are used to evaluate their accomplishments: 1) comments of respondents; 2) tabulated responses to a quality rating checklist; and 3) awards received by programs in the series. A concluding section discusses how successfully the major series have fused the arts and media into a new art form.

The major findings discussed in Chapter 2 are:

- DANCE IN AMERICA was judged to have high technical quality and high quality performances. The series is highly regarded as an archive of the best choreographers and dancers in America.

- LIVE FROM LINCOLN CENTER was judged highly successful in capturing the quality and excitement of the live event. Its overall quality rating was extremely high.

- LIVE FROM THE MET was praised for its overall quality and production accomplishments but individual productions were judged to be of uneven quality.

- VISIONS attracted a small audience among respondents. The reaction of viewers varied from high praise for experimentation to strong criticism of program content and production quality.

- EARPLAY attracted a small audience but listeners appreciated its willingness to experiment.

- "Georgia O'Keeffe," one film in the series on WOMEN IN ART, received extremely high praise. Few respondents had seen any of the other films.

- Few respondents felt that projects supported by PITA had fused the arts and media into a new art form.

DANCE IN AMERICA

DANCE IN AMERICA is a series designed to showcase the greatest choreographers and dance companies in America today. Each program has been developed through the collaboration of television director and choreographer in an attempt to translate dance from stage to screen as effectively and as smoothly as possible. In a typical program in this series, the company and the choreographer are introduced; there is discussion of their history, philosophy of dance, and methods of training; and some dance pieces are performed.

Merrill Brockway, director of DANCE IN AMERICA, has developed an approach to televising dance that includes the choreographer in the production process. Once the rough cuts have been made, for example, choreographers help to edit the tapes to enhance their look and feel on television.

This close collaboration between television director and artist has been considered a breakthrough in television dance programming. In the past, dancers have reported bad experiences with television including: low pay, inadequate working facilities, poor treatment, and inferior quality finished products that diminished the dancers' art on the television screen. From the outset, DANCE IN AMERICA sought to make the production process enjoyable for the artists and considerate of their needs. A special dance floor was constructed in Nashville for DANCE IN AMERICA productions. Choreographers were consulted during every phase of television production to help create a finished product truly expressive of their best work.

DANCE IN AMERICA was created to take choreographic masterpieces and interpret them for television. According to the original proposal, its goal has been to create an archive of the most important American work and expose it to large audiences through national broadcast. Response to DANCE IN AMERICA has been consistently high overall:

DANCE IN AMERICA is one-of-a-kind, one of our outstanding public television series.
(Washington D.C., Media Representative)

You don't really feel you're watching a substitute of going to the theatre, you're watching something that is legitimately in and of itself.
(Los Angeles, Media Representative)

Dance is extremely difficult to photograph, and I think the DANCE IN AMERICA programs have been good.
(San Francisco, Arts Representative)

They have a concept there of only doing the top companies, and I think they're probably right.
(Los Angeles, Media Representative)

I thought DANCE IN AMERICA was wonderful, really quite wonderful.
(Columbia, SC, Arts Representative)

The greatest range of opinion fell under technical quality: camera work, staging, and pacing. Some respondents felt there were inherent limitations to televising dance, and that it would never translate effectively to the screen. Others believed that dance could carry over to the television medium, and had suggestions for improving the techniques used in DANCE IN AMERICA.

In some of the productions I wish they would use scenery in the background instead of the plain curtain backdrop.
(Columbia, SC, Arts Representative)

In my opinion, the camera sometimes becomes too technical. I prefer to see dance straightforward, without any gimmicks, and occasionally DANCE IN AMERICA throws in too many gimmicks. I would much rather see the dancers than superimposed images and things like that.
(Seattle, WA, Arts Representative)

It's tough watching dance on television. It slows things down. Perhaps that's because we're used to watching television at such a fast rate. Some of DANCE IN AMERICA seems mighty slow.
(Minneapolis, MN, Arts Representative)

I don't believe I've ever watched any of these productions and felt like it was missing something. But too often, rather than letting you see most of what's going on all the time, people want to focus in and do trick photography, and it's very frustrating unless the dance has been composed for that.
(Columbia, SC, Arts Representative)

A guiding principle for DANCE IN AMERICA has been to avoid interfering with the flow of the dance so that, in essence, the viewer is not conscious of editing and camera technique. It tries to achieve a feeling of intimacy by using close-ups and an assortment of camera angles. As with all media arts programming, respondents noted the trade-off that exists between showing a full view of the entire stage, and moving in with close-ups. The full shot shows all the action at once, but the figures are small and movement is diminished. Close-ups show detail and facial expression, but they isolate parts of an ensemble or parts of a dancer's body and it is the director who decides what the audience will see. DANCE IN AMERICA's production technique has been to provide wide-view establishing shots of the whole stage before zooming in or cutting to close-ups for detail.

In the dance stuff, I want to see the whole body all the time.
(Atlanta, GA, Arts Representative)

Sometimes the dances look too artsy-craftsy. Just present the dances and let the audience make their own judgments. Don't go through explanations and don't go through stop-still photography.
(Columbia, SC, Arts Representative)

There is still too much front-and-center orientation in filming these things.
(Seattle, WA, Arts Representative)

I'm very conscious of choreography and a dancer in relationship to space, and I kind of miss that when they zoom in on some little part, and it gets to be choppy. Sometimes you want to see what a dancer looks like, but it's not necessary to do that too much.
(New York, Arts Representative)

When I watch dance on television, I am sometimes disquieted by the fact that they seem to be concentrating on the wrong thing to look at at the time.
(Columbia, SC, Arts Representative)

A camera cannot in any way capture live dancers in the three-dimensional space. On the other hand, with TV I can see Baryshnikov up close; I can see the detail and the footwork, I can also change my point of view five times to see the most optimum view.
(New York, Media Representative)

Many respondents who knew of Merrill Brockway praised his ability to work with choreographers throughout the production process. When DANCE IN AMERICA first began production, interns were assigned to work with Brockway to learn about his directing techniques, but the general feeling later was that the internship program was not successful. It was difficult to teach artistic sensitivity and diplomacy, and much of Brockway's special talent as a director came from combining those abilities with other, more traditional television production skills. A few respondents commented on the need for more television directors and producers qualified to work in arts programming, and thought that the Endowment should contribute to the training and development of new talent in this area. For the past few years, Brockway has held summer workshops to share the knowledge and techniques acquired through DANCE IN AMERICA, but major projects have not yet been undertaken by those attending.

The majority of respondents liked the concept of presenting the top dancers and choreographers in DANCE IN AMERICA. They supported the creation of an archive of the best companies, but felt there was room for another, different dance series that could include a more diversified group of dance

companies.

A lot is happening that is not in New York. Until an art truly begins meaning something in the lives of the people of a country, it isn't making a contribution, so it's tremendously important for the future and growth and cultural life of America to have this diversity.
(Atlanta, GA, Arts Representative)

I think something like the NEA ought to see what it could do to help foster and support, to give attention to at least those groups in the country that are attempting to find their own voice and their own approach, because that is what art comes out of.
(Kansas City, MO, Arts Representative)

I would like to see more experimental dance groups on television.
(San Francisco, CA, Arts Representative)

I think you're getting a nice cross-section. There's not much you could do to expose dance here unless you got into local groups.
(Cleveland, OH, Arts Representative)

Maybe the thing to do is to include more organizations from around the country. There are certainly other organizations suitable for national exposure, and maybe the idea is to ferret out those organizations.
(Atlanta, GA, Arts Representative)

It's called DANCE IN AMERICA, and yet there were only two companies that were not from New York.
(Columbia, SC, Arts Representative)

I think it was very good, surprisingly good. One needs to to get even more experimental, and to include more ethnic dance.
(San Francisco, CA, Arts Representative)

Twyla Tharp's work was mentioned frequently. Many enjoyed the personal view provided of Twyla as an individual, and liked the program's innovative

use of special television effects in a blend with dance that would have been impossible to present in a live performance. While some commented that it was too "far out" or "pretentious," the majority liked the way the program used television's capabilities in a dance work created for television.

> The Twyla Tharp program was very successful. It followed Twyla around and talked to her as an individual and saw her through the day. The program really used television as something other than pretending you're sitting down and watching it live.
> (San Francisco, CA, Arts Representative)

> Twyla Tharp was effective in bringing dance across. She connected dance and video very strongly. She used dance as a kind of stepping-off point and was dealing with the shape of the space in terms of the video screen. She achieved effects that would not be possible in a live performance.
> (Columbia, SC, Arts Representative)

> The outstanding programs were Twyla Tharp, Pilobolus, and Dance Theatre of Harlem because they are so dynamic and use the ingredients of television and drama so well.
> (Minneapolis, MN, Media Representative)

The programs in DANCE IN AMERICA most frequently praised by respondents were "Balanchine Parts I-IV," "Pilobolus," "Merce Cunningham," "Elliot Feld," "San Francisco Ballet," "Twyla Tharp," "Martha Graham," and "Pennsylvania Ballet."

Respondents credited DANCE IN AMERICA for helping increase awareness of dance, developing the sophistication and size of dance audiences, giving exposure to the dance companies involved, and recording great choreography for posterity.

> NEA supports the best stuff on TV. Their shows reach a lot of people and make a difference in the way they perceive the world. There are ten times the number of dance companies now as there were when DANCE IN AMERICA started.
> (New York, Arts Representative)

There is now more awareness, more acceptance, more support for the arts. And now the establishment accepts people like Twyla Tharp. It wasn't so long ago that she was often barred.

(Cleveland, OH, Professional Critic)

It's brought the level of dance and its audiences way up in America.

(New York, Arts Representative)

Television can show the best in the world of a particular thing: like Baryshnikov. There are now millions of little boys in this country who will start dancing. They never had a role model and they never knew from it. Now they say, "Hey, that's neat. I want to try it."

(New York, Arts Representative)

DANCE IN AMERICA started something. It made a lot of people who had never seen dance before start thinking about it. It helped to keep dance moving and progressing and growing. It has either inspired people or aggravated them, but it has affected them in some way. It's another way of seeing art.

(New York, Arts Representative)

I think DANCE IN AMERICA especially is superb. It restaged dances instead of just picking them up. The people involved in it have decided to work with the choreographers to restage the dances in a very classy way.

(Los Angeles, CA, Media Representative)

DANCE IN AMERICA was terrific as a precedent. The series is of the highest quality.

(Columbia, SC, Arts Representative)

Table 2.1 shows the results of respondents' quality ratings of DANCE IN AMERICA. For this series and other major PITA-funded series, respondents were asked to rate the technical quality of the media production, the performance quality, and the overall quality.* Rating scores (in percentages) are based on the respondents in a group who had seen the series.

*Too few of the respondents were sufficiently familiar with WOMEN IN ART and EARPLAY to justify tabulating a rating for these series. For a general description of the quality ratings, see the subsection entitled Analysis and Interpretation of Data in Appendix C, Research Design and Methodology. See also the questionnaires used for this rating in Appendix D.

TABLE 2.1

DANCE IN AMERICA

QUALITY RATINGS

MEDIA

(Participants and Non-Participants)

20 saw series / 26 total group = 77%

	HIGH	MIXED	LOW	NO ANSWER
TECHNICAL QUALITY	80%	10%	0%	10%
PERFORMANCE QUALITY	75%	10%	0%	15%
OVERALL QUALITY	75%	10%	0%	15%

ARTS

(Participants and Non-Participants)

52 saw series / 62 total group = 84%

	HIGH	MIXED	LOW	NO ANSWER
TECHNICAL QUALITY	85%	8%	0%	7%
PERFORMANCE QUALITY	85%	8%	0%	7%
OVERALL QUALITY	81%	12%	2%	5%

PARTICIPANTS

(Media and Arts)

16 saw series / 22 total group = 73%

	HIGH	MIXED	LOW	NO ANSWER
TECHNICAL QUALITY	75%	19%	0%	6%
PERFORMANCE QUALITY	81%	6%	0%	13%
OVERALL QUALITY	63%	19%	0%	18%

NON-PARTICIPANTS

(Media and Arts)

56 saw series / 66 total group = 85%

	HIGH	MIXED	LOW	NO ANSWER
TECHNICAL QUALITY	88%	5%	0%	7%
PERFORMANCE QUALITY	82%	9%	2%	7%
OVERALL QUALITY	84%	9%	2%	5%

The majority of respondents answering the questionnaire gave DANCE IN AMERICA a high rating in all dimensions. Representatives of the arts rated the series slightly more highly than did media representatives, and non-participants gave slightly higher ratings than did participants.

Merrill Brockway received the 1978 Directors Guild of America Award for directing "Choreography by Balanchine, Part III" in the musical/variety category. The Academy of Television Arts and Sciences awarded "Choreography by Balanchine, Part IV" a 1979 Emmy for being the "outstanding classical program in the performing arts." Individual recipients of Emmy Awards for this program were Jac Venza, executive producer; Merrill Brockway, series producer; Emile Ardolino, series coordinating producer; and Judy Kinberg, producer.

LIVE FROM LINCOLN CENTER

The Lincoln Center complex in New York City has originated live television programs of its dance, theatre, symphony, and opera performances for PBS broadcast since 1976. The original concept for this series was initiated by Lincoln Center and its Media Development Department under the direction of John Goberman. Intended to expand the size of the audience beyond the seating capacity of the concert hall, to deliver high-quality performance to all geographic regions, and to increase revenues for Lincoln Center, LIVE FROM LINCOLN CENTER attempts to recreate the experience of attending a live performance. A glimpse backstage is provided for home viewers in the intermission interviews.

Prior to the first LIVE FROM LINCOLN CENTER broadcast, new technology was developed to pick up and transmit live performance with high quality sound and image. Low-light level cameras are utilized to avoid disturbing the natural lighting in the concert hall. Programs are now available through radio simulcast to 75% of the homes in the U.S.

Respondents liked LIVE FROM LINCOLN CENTER:

Superb. State of the art.
(New York, Arts Representative)

Extraordinary, wonderful.
(Washington D.C., Arts Representative)

LIVE FROM LINCOLN CENTER is just gorgeous.
(New York, Arts Representative)

This series has its own kind of electricity that goes with the performances. It has a fantastic quality to it.
(Los Angeles, Media Representative)

This brings to a larger audience the best of performance that is already to be found in the concert hall.
(Columbia, SC, Arts Representative)

Frequently, an analogy was drawn between the technical capabilities of LIVE FROM LINCOLN CENTER broadcasts and those of live sports coverage, because in both the cameras must follow the action quickly and keep it within the television frame, without interfering with the action itself. There is an element of excitement, immediacy, and risk in live telecasts of sports and performance that is missing from pre-recorded programs. As with live sports, a LIVE FROM LINCOLN CENTER broadcast conveys the atmosphere of the live event: the audience in the theatre, the packed house, the expectation, and the applause.

> I really fee much more a part of LIVE FROM LINCOLN CENTER than I do from almost any other broadcast on television.
>
> (Washington, DC, Media Representative)

> There is something that you get in the continuity of a live performance that you don't get in a studio. There is something about shooting "Swan Lake" from Act I to Act IV, and the continuity of that ballerina's concentration which is something that can't be captured in the studio.
>
> (New York, Arts Representative)

> The name has appeal. "Live." The liveness is something that television can use so well.
>
> (Los Angeles, Media Representative)

> Being live, there is more of a risk, a sense of risk that art ought to have, the right to fail as well as succeed. This is not possible in canned programs.
>
> (San Francisco, Arts Representative)

In addition, live performance broadcasts can stimulate the home audience's appetite for high quality dance, music, and drama. For home viewers who have never attended a live arts performance, this programming can make the concert hall more familiar, and it may encourage them to attend.

> Exposure is the key, because exposure leads to participation, guaranteed.
>
> (Washington, DC, Arts Representative)

There is a positive alteration in the composition of audiences for live performances, and this has been enhanced by these programs on the air. The influence of having access to close views of the great performers of our time is of enormous benefit.

(Columbia, SC, Arts Representative)

LIVE FROM LINCOLN CENTER has been a terrific show. It gets a national audience to see a first-rate New York performance, coming from a very identifiable place, on a stage, with an audience, and that gives it a certain rhythm.

(Cleveland, OH, Media Representative)

I think television has gone toward the enriching, education area which is very important because, particularly in the South and the Midwest where you don't have places for people to go, they can at least be enriched or learn about the arts through the television medium. So everybody is exposed.

(Chicago, IL, Arts Representative)

Said one corporate sponsor of LIVE FROM LINCOLN CENTER in a Washington Star article of February 11, 1976:

What we are interested in is the concept of bringing live performances from a limited to a substantially larger audience. When you move from 2,000 or 3,000 to one million or two million, I think it can be pronounced a success.

(Hal Roser, Manager of Community Programs at Exxon)

There was a wide range of opinion about the effectiveness of televising live symphony concerts. While the television image of an orchestra at work does provide unique views of the conductor's style and technique, musicians' facial expressions, and the intensity of performance, there were some who felt that overall, orchestras look diffused and diminished on the screen.

With orchestras the camera shots moving from instrument to instrument become quite a bore. I even turned off the New York Philharmonic the other day, because they were moving from Mehta to the sections and back. So what?

(Seattle, WA, Professional Critic)

One of the problems I find with live performances is that they don't have the time and capabilities to get good shots. And what is TV if not a visual medium? What is happening is that you have the orchestra on TV. So what?
(New York, NY, Arts Representative)

Some of the orchestral presentations are so stripped down. For a whole hour it gets a little monotonous.
(Atlanta, GA, Media Representative)

Others enjoyed orchestral performance on television:

I think it's exciting for the general public to be able to see the conductor, because normally all you see is his back. To be able to sit around on the other side, and see what's happening there with his face, that's incredible. I was glued to the set. I couldn't move. You were right there. The facial expression and the communication that went back and forth, you couldn't help but be moved by it.
(Atlanta, GA, Arts Representative)

Television sound quality is mediocre at best, but somehow when the performance is really artistic, it doesn't matter. Ironically, it still comes across.
(Columbia, SC, Professional Critic)

Symphonic music on TV can be just as rich as in a concert hall, particularly if you are listening to simulcast. At Carnegie Hall, you don't always get good seats.
(Boston, MA, Arts Representative)

I think that people are very interested to get that close-up of the orchestra, because you don't see that in the concert hall. You can't see what the bassoonist is doing; the bassoonist is always buried in the middle of the orchestra. I think it's up to television to do that, but it's difficult.
(Chicago, IL, Arts Representative)

In the 1978 and 1979 quarterly program evaluations from PBS station program managers, compiled by the PBS Communication Research Department, LIVE FROM LINCOLN CENTER programs received high ratings, far above average, for their importance, content, and treatment.

LIVE FROM LINCOLN CENTER has presented six televised performances each year since 1976. Favorite broadcasts reported by respondents included American Ballet Theatre - "Swan Lake," "Giselle," and Baryshnikov/Makarova; New York Philharmonic - Mehta/Perlman and Pavarotti; and Sutherland/Pavarotti.

Table 2.2 displays the quality ratings for LIVE FROM LINCOLN CENTER that were collected during interviews with respondents.

TABLE 2.2

LIVE FROM LINCOLN CENTER
QUALITY RATINGS

MEDIA
(Participants and Non-Participants)
21 saw series / 26 total group = 81%

	HIGH	MIXED	LOW	NO ANSWER
TECHNICAL QUALITY	71%	14%	0%	15%
PERFORMANCE QUALITY	67%	14%	0%	19%
OVERALL QUALITY	86%	5%	0%	9%

ARTS
(Participants and Non-Participants)
36 saw series / 62 total group = 58%

	HIGH	MIXED	LOW	NO ANSWER
TECHNICAL QUALITY	89%	6%	0%	5%
PERFORMANCE QUALITY	94%	0%	0%	6%
OVERALL QUALITY	89%	6%	0%	5%

PARTICIPANTS
(Media and Arts)
13 saw series / 22 total group = 59%

	HIGH	MIXED	LOW	NO ANSWER
TECHNICAL QUALITY	85%	8%	0%	7%
PERFORMANCE QUALITY	77%	8%	0%	15%
OVERALL QUALITY	77%	15%	0%	8%

NON-PARTICIPANTS
(Media and Arts)
44 saw series / 66 total group = 67%

	HIGH	MIXED	LOW	NO ANSWER
TECHNICAL QUALITY	82%	9%	0%	9%
PERFORMANCE QUALITY	86%	5%	0%	9%
OVERALL QUALITY	91%	2%	0%	7%

Arts representatives gave consistently higher ratings of LIVE FROM LINCOLN CENTER's technical and performance quality than did media representatives; nonetheless, over 85% of each group rated the overall quality as "high" and no respondent rated any of the quality dimensions of the series as "low." As with DANCE IN AMERICA, participants were harsher critics of the productions than were non-participants.

The series has won four Emmy Awards and has received nine nominations. In 1976 it won an Emmy for Outstanding Classical Music Programming in its production of a New York Philharmonic broadcast, and it won two Emmys in 1978 for American Ballet Theatre "Giselle" for Outstanding Classical Program in the Performing Arts, and for "Recital of Tenor Luciano Pavarotti," Special Classification of Outstanding Program Achievement. The series also won the Peabody Award for its first year of broadcasts, and a TV Critics Circle Award.

LIVE FROM THE MET

After thirty-six years of radio broadcasts from the Metropolitan Opera House in New York City, the Met began live telecasts in March, 1977 with a production of "La Boheme." The success of that telecast encouraged the Met to plan and produce a series of three telecasts for the 1977-1978 season. LIVE FROM THE MET was expanded in 1978-79 to four productions, and current plans are to continue with four operas each season. Productions have been simulcast on radio, and English subtitles now provide translation of the story line.

Assessment of LIVE FROM THE MET was mixed, with avowed opera fans expressing the greatest enthusiasm for the series. The majority of respondents approved of the basic concept of the series, and criticism centered on television's limitations as a medium for this art form, the technical quality of the programs, and the overall quality of certain performances.

Many said that opera doesn't come across on television because it is the performance art that most often presents grand, spectacular productions that are meant to be larger than life. On television, views of the full stage look "like Swiss cheese," or like "little ants covering the screen." Close-ups show detail, but cannot project grandeur.

> Television loses any of the spectacle that may be there. We either see the big picture or the small picture, and it's a difficult choice because you lose either way.
> (Columbia, SC, Arts Representative)

> Grand opera is the least effective art form on television.
> (Cleveland, OH, Media Representative)

> Opera on television is stale. There is something about the human performer in an opera which seems to be terribly important.
> (Minneapolis, MN, Arts Representative)

One could debate forever whether opera really works on the little screen in somebody's living room with the little 5-inch speaker out of the television set.
(New York, Arts Representative)

Many of the operas are too long, and some of them could have been made more visually interesting for television.
(Atlanta, GA, Media Representative)

I am a little bit dissatisfied when I'm taken right up to the soprano's throat and I don't particularly want to go there.
(Minneapolis, MN, Arts Representative)

Respondents liked the intermission film clips and interviews. They wanted background material and educational programs to supplement the performances in all PITA-funded programming, and pointed to the successful way LIVE FROM THE MET handled the intermissions to give the home viewers a personal look at the performers and the opera production process.

Education is important. Just showing all the aspects of what happens.
(San Francisco, CA, Arts Representative)

I'd like to see a documentary about how an opera is put together.*
(Washington D.C., Arts Representative)

The various elements of productions, how they get staged, may be part of the educational process that we need.
(Atlanta, GA , Arts Representative)

...more programs with historical content,
(Columbia, SC, Arts Representative)

I like having conversations with the artists, and TV can get up close and personal.
(San Francisco, CA, Professional Critic)

*A five-part series documenting the production of "La Giaconda" was underwritten by the Bank of America and broadcast over PBS in April, 1980.

Respondents were generally in favor of the subtitles used in LIVE FROM THE MET, but felt a need for more contemporary, American opera done in English. Europeans love their opera because it is based on their folk tales and regional music, close to their lives and culture. Americans would enjoy American themes for the same reasons, and no subtitles would be needed: the audience would have a more direct experience of the performance.*

> I think, because of the nature of grand opera, that the audiences will always be very limited and tend to come from the upper middle class white people. Opera will survive without this kind of support, whereas the new, innovative, more creative things should be getting the attention of this kind of funding with as broad a focus all over the country as possible.
> (Atlanta, GA, Arts Representative)

> NEA has a big responsibility to the American people. I can understand a certain amount of emphasis going on the history, but there should be a certain emphasis on what's happening right now.
> (Washington D.C., Arts Representative)

> I'd like to see more contemporary works that relate to the American audience here and now.
> (Atlanta, GA, Arts Representative)

> Besides VISIONS you don't see much minority cultural programming presented in any of this stuff. It's high culture, which is fine, but there is definitely a need for more than that.
> (Washington D.C., Arts Representative)

*PITA has recently issued a solicitation for Opera Musical Theatre proposals to develop a series of productions in English.

LIVE FROM THE MET served to expose and develop opera audiences, and helped create superstars such as Luciano Pavarotti, according to the respondents. The fact that the performance was broadcast live from the stage added a special dimension:

> People are listening to things they wouldn't have listened to otherwise. It's educational, and it's soul-satisfying to those who love this already, and it's introducing something new to people who knew it existed, who thought they'd never have the opportunity. Who could go and spend $37.50 for a seat at the opera? So it makes it within reach. It's a wonderful opportunity.
> (Washington D.C., Arts Representative)

> This series has made opera accessible to us, where it has not been before. LIVE FROM THE MET has been a great boon. The great performers, of course, have shown us where opera can actually go. People sitting in their homes see the kind of power opera can have.
> (Seattle, WA, Arts Representative)

> If you see an opera on LIVE FROM THE MET, you still want to go to the Met.
> (Cleveland, OH, Media Representative)

> The fact that you're seeing something that is original and, in a way, on a footing with a first-night or a first-run audience in New York has a peculiar excitement in itself.
> (Columbia, SC, Arts Representative)

The LIVE FROM THE MET performance of "Mahagonny" was the most controversial of the series:

> "Mahagonny" was terrible, just awful. The Met had no business doing that opera. That's a theatre piece and it's meant for a small house, but they put it on in this grandiose place and they have all these big cows and dinosaurs walking around singing that music, not being able to act for the most part. It just didn't work. It was big, hollow, and empty, but a great idea; good modern opera.
> (Atlanta, GA, Arts Representative)

I was very disappointed in "Mahagonny." It just didn't come off, and was not up to the standards set by LIVE FROM THE MET in the past.
(Columbia, SC, Arts Representative)

Just recently I saw "Mahagonny" and I'm one of the few who loved it. It was high technically, the music was wonderful, and the production was so good.
(Washington D.C., Arts Representative)

"The Bartered Bride" received a low rating on production quality and was felt to have a "heavy-handed" approach. Frequently-mentioned favorites were "Rigoletto" and "Don Giovanni."

LIVE FROM THE MET won a Peabody Award for the Metropolitan Opera Association and WNET New York in 1979. The series was cited for "building an extraordinarily successful bridge between a necessarily limited audience within the Metropolitan Opera House and the vast audience viewing the performance on television. Thanks to the use of low light level cameras placed inconspicuously in the auditorium, 'La Boheme' and 'Rigoletto' were beautifully presented to both audiences." In addition, Texaco, the underwriter of LIVE FROM THE MET, was saluted by the American Council for Better Broadcasting for sponsoring the series.

The quality ratings of LIVE FROM THE MET given by some respondents in interviews appear in Table 2.3.

TABLE 2.3

LIVE FROM THE MET

QUALITY RATINGS

MEDIA

(Participants and Non-Participants)

20 saw series / 26 total group = 77%

	HIGH	MIXED	LOW	NO ANSWER
TECHNICAL QUALITY	70%	15%	0%	15%
PERFORMANCE QUALITY	60%	10%	0%	30%
OVERALL QUALITY	75%	10%	0%	15%

ARTS

(Participants and Non-Participants)

29 saw series / 62 total group = 47%

	HIGH	MIXED	LOW	NO ANSWER
TECHNICAL QUALITY	83%	10%	3%	4%
PERFORMANCE QUALITY	76%	7%	3%	14%
OVERALL QUALITY	76%	7%	0%	17%

PARTICIPANTS

(Media and Arts)

13 saw series / 22 total group = 59%

	HIGH	MIXED	LOW	NO ANSWER
TECHNICAL QUALITY	69%	23%	0%	8%
PERFORMANCE QUALITY	62%	8%	0%	30%
OVERALL QUALITY	77%	15%	0%	8%

NON-PARTICIPANTS

(Media and Arts)

36 saw series / 66 total group = 55%

	HIGH	MIXED	LOW	NO ANSWER
TECHNICAL QUALITY	81%	8%	3%	8%
PERFORMANCE QUALITY	72%	11%	3%	14%
OVERALL QUALITY	75%	6%	0%	19%

Arts representatives rated the technical and performance qualities "high" more frequently than did media representatives, and 75% of each group rated overall quality as "high." When participants' ratings are compared with those of non-participants, 75% of each group rated the overall quality of the series as "high" and non-participants rated the technical and performance qualities as "high" more frequently than did participants.

VISIONS

VISIONS is a series of original dramas developed for television by American writers. The central aim of the series was to encourage the exploration of "new and innovative forms of drama created especially for television." The identification of new writers -- particularly women and minorities -- was also stressed. Over 3,000 ideas, outlines and scripts were received by the project staff; 1800 writers submitted material for consideration. Thirty-two programs were produced; of these, twenty-three were produced by KCET in Los Angeles and the remainder were contracted to outside producers.

The most controversial series of all, VISIONS' overall quality, use of language objectionable to some viewers, and experimental approach were frequent objects of high praise or blistering criticism. Reaction, whether favorable or unfavorable, was always strong.

On the favorable side, VISIONS was commended for taking risks in style and content. It was mixed in quality, but the unevenness was proof that there was courageous experimentation going on. This was the only major PITA-supported series that provided theatre, took chances, used unknown talent, and demonstrated a commitment to breaking new ground in television. A number of respondents wanted to see more programs like VISIONS:

> If you're going to do experimental theatre, you've got to be prepared to make some mistakes. If you are going to push to the edges, it's not always going to make the audience comfortable, and they've got to be able to take the heat.
>
> (Los Angeles, Arts Representative)

> There is room for that kind of experimentation on television. I think it's really important. That's one thing, hopefully, that public television can provide that network television is unwilling to provide. All network television does is spin off, spin off, spin off. I'd rather see these mistakes made for the sake of trying instead of for the sake of repetition or a buck.
>
> (Columbia, SC, Professional Critic)

VISIONS was great, uneven, but terrific. How else are you going to get new playwrights and new ideas on if it's not going to be uneven? The moment that you are even, that means that you are being safe.
(New York, Arts Representative)

We can't expect commercial television to experiment because Coca Cola and Kleenex and whoever else sponsors these things won't let them do that. But public television can.
(Columbia, SC, Arts Representative)

VISIONS had probably a batting average of close to 600. Even if one out of two was something well done, I think you had something there.
(Los Angeles, CA, Media Representative)

How great it would have been if they had enough money to allow a failure and not have to broadcast the failures.
(Washington D.C., Media Representative)

I say VISIONS is mixed, but that's kind of giving the wrong impression, because that's one of the more important things to be done on television, and I would expect it to be mixed. The whole idea, the whole concept of the thing was to try out some new people, and you can't expect that the films they produce are necessarily all going to be wonderful.
(Columbia, SC, Arts Representative)

Some respondents said that it was unwise to use playwrights for television productions, because writing television scripts is not the same as writing plays. Given time and training, these writers would be able to create fine material, but VISIONS expected too much too soon. VISIONS tried to do two new things at once: (1) develop new television writing talent and (2) showcase original American drama. The two experimental undertakings together produced dramas of mixed and often amateur quality.

For VISIONS it should never have been a goal to help new playwrights. The goal should have been to present the best playwrights, and if they are new and young, OK.
(Cleveland, OH, Media Representative)

They should have spent a year or two in really developing some good TV writers, and certainly they should go to the playwrights in the country, that's the resource you've got, but realize they probably aren't good TV writers just because they've got a theatre reputation.
(Minneapolis, MN, Arts Representative)

The BBC has a stable of writers who have been with them for years. I don't think public TV has any playwrights at all working with them. If I were giving out the money for VISIONS, I would take five years and develop a pool of writers. In the early 50's during the beginning of TV there were lots of exciting young writers who were writing for TV.
(Columbia, SC, Arts Representative)

Many respondents who had seen VISIONS had criticism for the series. It was dull, mediocre, "no pizzazz or gloss to it," pretentious, boring, down-beat. A big issue was its taste in language and subject matter. Some public television programming directors chose to "bleep" profanities out of some of the programs, and many received angry viewer responses to some of the topics and situations portrayed. Some stations omitted a few of the more controversial programs, reluctantly and in deference to the viewers who objected to the profanity.

We had so many problems in terms of taste in that thing. This is a very conservative area and we have to be very careful about that.
(Columbia, SC, Media Representative)

There was language that, frankly, I don't want in my home, and subject matter I don't want in my home. I don't need it.
(Atlanta, GA, Media Representative)

I'm just shuddering to see what the ratings are going to be, at the same time that I'm in support of the idea of VISIONS.
(Washington D.C., Media Representative)

Most of the respondents wanted to like VISIONS because the underlying concept was so appealing to them, but many felt that it failed too often.

> Boring as hell. That's not experimental theatre, that's just bad work.
>
> (Los Angeles, CA, Arts Representative)

> I found most of VISIONS to be rather thin in story line and plot development. I don't know what the vision is behind VISIONS.
>
> (Seattle, WA, Arts Representative)

Favorite VISIONS programs included "War Widow," "Alambrista," "The Gardener's Son," "Two Brothers," "Phantom of the Open Hearth," and "Liza's Pioneer Diary."

Table 2.4 contains the quality ratings for VISIONS. It is significant to note that relatively few respondents knew about VISIONS or had seen any of the programs. Only 36 of the 88 respondents answering the quality rating checklist had ever seen VISIONS, and of the 36, many had seen only one or two programs in the series.

TABLE 2.4

VISIONS

QUALITY RATINGS

MEDIA

(Participants and Non-Participants)

16 saw series / 26 total group = 62%

	HIGH	MIXED	LOW	NO ANSWER
TECHNICAL QUALITY	25%	44%	13%	18%
PERFORMANCE QUALITY	25%	56%	0%	19%
OVERALL QUALITY	19%	63%	13%	5%

ARTS

(Participants and Non-Participants)

22 saw series / 62 total group = 35%

	HIGH	MIXED	LOW	NO ANSWER
TECHNICAL QUALITY	50%	36%	0%	14%
PERFORMANCE QUALITY	45%	36%	0%	19%
OVERALL QUALITY	55%	32%	5%	8%

PARTICIPANTS

(Media and Arts)

14 saw series / 22 total group = 64%

	HIGH	MIXED	LOW	NO ANSWER
TECHNICAL QUALITY	21%	50%	7%	22%
PERFORMANCE QUALITY	36%	43%	0%	21%
OVERALL QUALITY	21%	50%	0%	29%

NON-PARTICIPANTS

(Media and Arts)

24 saw series / 66 total group = 36%

	HIGH	MIXED	LOW	NO ANSWER
TECHNICAL QUALITY	46%	33%	4%	23%
PERFORMANCE QUALITY	38%	46%	0%	16%
OVERALL QUALITY	50%	42%	8%	0%

Quality ratings of VISIONS were broadly distributed. Arts professionals gave it higher marks across the board than did media professionals. Participants were more critical of VISIONS' quality than were non-participants. Many respondents rated the series "mixed" in each of the three dimensions of quality rated here. To some, "mixed" is positive because it is a sign that the series took risks and tried new artistic approaches.

VISIONS won an Ohio State Award in 1979, the Peabody Award, and nine Television Critics Circle nominations. "Alambrista" won the Camera d'Or at Cannes.

EARPLAY

EARPLAY is a series of original radio dramas broadcast over National Public Radio. When it was first produced in 1971, programs were short, ranging from three to fifteen minutes in length. In 1973 a one-hour format was adopted. Writers such as Edward Albee, Donald Barthelme, John Gardner, Arthur Kopit, Archibald MacLeish, and David Mamet have written EARPLAY scripts. A few productions for the series have been acquired from abroad.

Quality evaluations were mixed for EARPLAY. A few respondents noticed improvement in the series during more recent years in terms of plot, acting, and subject matter. All approved of the concept of radio drama and supported EARPLAY's basic philosophy.

> The writer's imagination can be given much broader play in radio.
> (Boston, MA, Professional Critic)

> I liked the performances because they were written with radio in mind. They used my imagination and couldn't be visualized any way except in my head. Those ar the ones I remember and like.
> (Minneapolis, MN, Arts Representative)

> I think EARPLAY is a good thing, and they do a lot of good for playwrights. They've kept drama going. The acting quality varies a lot. Sometimes it's really super, and sometimes the acting is really awful.
> (New York, Arts Representative)

> They are doing the best quality work.
> (Atlanta, GA , Arts Representative)

> EARPLAY has settled down into something that pleases me more than it has in the last couple of seasons: a combination of quite good writing in the main, and some of the other radio production values. This has helped to enhance the real value of radio which, to me at least, is to stimulate the imagination as much as possible.
> (San Francisco, CA, Media Representative)

National Public Radio conducted an evaluation study of EARPLAY and asked the program managers of 120 radio stations carrying the series to rate it on a scale of 1-5, with 5 the highest. The ratings broke down as follows: 5-36%, 4-23%, 3-35%, 2-5%, and 1-1%. The majority (59%) rated EARPLAY 4 or 5.

EARPLAY has ranged in audience appeal from program to program, and many respondents credited the series for experimenting and taking risks. Some episodes did away with narrative form and were like sound-poems, and most respondents liked the innovations.

> The quality varies enormously in these, as it does in VISIONS, for the very same reason: that they are taking risks, and they should be taking risks.
> (Columbia, SC, Arts Representative)

> EARPLAY programs were very professionally produced, but there was a lot of variety in them. It always seemed to me to be one of the golden and valuable things on the radio.
> (San Francisco, CA, Arts Representative)

> It's alright for a series like this to experiment. Ninety percent of what EARPLAY does is still based on a good story with a beginning, a middle, and an end. Only rarely have they tried things like "Listening." On the other hand, I think "Listening" and the program that I really liked, "Departures," were on the same side of the ballpark. I think "Departures" succeeded very well, and I think "Listening" did not.
> (Columbia, SC, Media Representative)

> A lot of people hate EARPLAY, a lot of people love it.
> (Columbia, SC, Arts Representative)

EARPLAY is broadcast on radio stations that usually provide music and information. Some station managers reported a drop in audience during EARPLAY broadcasts, and said that it was to be expected. Many scheduled EARPLAY late in the evening or on odd weekend hours, when listenership was already low. The devotees of the series, the managers felt, would make the effort to tune in during these hours.

Favorite EARPLAY programs include "Properties," "Clem Maverick," "Bells in Europe," "Argive Soliloquies," and "The Great American Fourth of July Parade."

"Wings" was a winner in the radio drama category at the Milan International Broadcasting Conference in 1979, receiving the Prix Italia Prize of $10,000. In 1977, EARPLAY won the Peabody Award with the following praise from the Peabody Award Committee:

> The six-year-old EARPLAY series consistently represents the highest quality of contemporary radio theatre for a national audience by commissioning works from among America's most talented authors and by employing top-flight talent. The quality of production, writing, acting, sound effects, music, and direction adds up to a series of great distinction and provides a level of quality which has otherwise almost disappeared from radio and broadcasting.

WOMEN IN ART

WOMEN IN ART is a group of seven films about the lives and work of American women artists. The series was first broadcast on PBS in 1977 and 1978. The artists featured are Georgia O'Keeffe, Mary Cassatt, Louise Nevelson, Betye Saar, Alice Neel, Helen Frankenthaler, and "Anonymous": women who were creative in watercolor painting, needlework, cooking, and decorative household crafts in the 18th and 19th centuries.

"Georgia O'Keeffe" was first broadcast nationally as a one-hour special on the occasion of the artist's 90th birthday. The program launched a week of PBS programming on women which coincided with the National Women's Conference in Houston in November 1977.

The seven films were then telecast in the winter of 1978 as part of a larger series entitled THE ORIGINALS, which also included ten films on The Writer in America. WOMEN IN ART was rebroadcast in 1979 on PBS and six of the films are distributed as 16 mm films, filmstrips or videotapes to colleges, libraries and museums.

Most respondents were unfamiliar with this series and had not seen any of the films with the exception of "Georgia O'Keeffe." Very few saw "Nevelson in Process," and of those who had seen the other films, most were public television programming directors. "Georgia O'Keeffe" was rated highly: all who had seen it were enthusiastic about the film and wanted to see more like it.

> That was one of the finest things we ever had on.
> (Washington D.C., Media Representative)

> It was fascinating simply as information. Visual arts have been a terribly neglected area, and I think this was very valuable.
> (Seattle, WA, Arts Representative)

> "Georgia O'Keeffe" was wonderful, very, very good.
> (Washington D.C., Arts Representative)

Many respondents wanted to see more visual arts programming on television; yet WOMEN IN ART was not widely known among them. An Atlanta public television producer said:

> Television could do a good job of this because it is, in a sense, a visual art. There should be more shows like the Georgia O'Keeffe show, about those people who are working in the visual arts and what their lives are like.
>
> (Atlanta, GA , Media Representative)

Respondents from the smaller cities wanted more television programs about the visual arts because there weren't many other alternatives. An arts critic from South Carolina said:

> We need more visual arts on television. There is no other place we can get this here.
>
> (Columbia, SC, Professional Critic)

Respondents noted that some work, such as Nevelson's giant sculptures, is impossible to capture on the television screen: a long shot loses detail, and a close-up crops out sections of the sculpture. Saar's collages depend on the viewers'ability to make associations between objects without being led by another eye: the camera. As film shown in a movie theatre, these programs are more vivid and striking. On the television screen, they lose subtlety, color, size, and texture so important in experiencing works of art. What television succeeds in doing is to present a view of the artists' lives and approaches to their work. The respondents who had seen WOMEN IN ART liked this personal approach to an artist and her work.

> The O'Keeffe in particular gave a sense of the larger environment in which she lived and worked, what she was looking at when she was seeing... Television can convey what the person is about, giving a sense of what in the world outside motivates this person, that art is a response to an environment that we all experience, and it's a response we all share. That came across very well.
>
> (Boston, MA, Professional Critic)

The film "Georgia O'Keeffe" has won four awards for its producer and director, Perry Miller Adato: the Directors Guild Award for Documentary Achievement in 1977; the Christopher Award for 1977; the "Red Ribbon" from the American Film Festival of 1978; and the Clarion Award from Women in Communications.

> These programs make an audience for culture. I'm afraid too often we critics tend to preach, when the shows serve the purpose admirably.
> (Boston, MA, Professional Critic)

Fusing Media and Art

LIVE FROM LINCOLN CENTER and DANCE IN AMERICA represent two ways of presenting the arts on television. LIVE FROM ... records the live performance, utilizing television's capabilities to transmit the excitement of the live event, provide sub-titles, improve sound quality with stereo simultcasts and provide background interviews and information which extend the experience of the live audience. DANCE IN AMERICA has explored new ways to present the three-dimensional quality of movement to the two-dimensional screen using chroma-keys, dissolves, split screens and other technological characteristics of the medium. In many ways, both these approaches represent a fusion of the media and art; the performances are substantially transformed into a new experience for the audience.

One professional critic commented that American viewers are prepared to understand television's "language" in an arts performance context:

> Blending television and dance is a genuine new art form. It probably has a greater capacity for reaching the general television audience than the more traditional kinds of arts that are put on TV, about which they have many phobias. Because television dance is using many of the same techniques that are used in commercials, that are used in the montages that become titles of shows, and to some extent have been used in commercial theatrical film, the imagery seems somewhat more familiar, and the simple visual pleasure is somewhat more accessible.

Most respondents in this study, however, felt that media arts programming funded by Programming in the Arts had not yet created a fusion of the performing and television arts:

> I haven't seen much innovative combination of the performing arts and the television arts.
>
> (Atlanta, GA, Arts Representative)

> Most of the time I think it's artificial and in most of the examples I've seen of it they got carried away and lost the the performance in the process. Television can do all sorts of weird things, but whether that weirdness adds or subtracts from the beauty of the dance, usually it subtracts from the performance. (Atlanta, GA, Media Representative)

> DANCE IN AMERICA created a way to get people to see dance, but a new art form, no. I wouldn't give it that much credit. (San Francisco, CA, Arts Representative)

> Television has never represented an art form to me. To try and make an art form out of TV is a mistake. TV serves beautifully when it is really documenting stuff. (New York, NY, Arts Representative)

> They haven't used TV well enough. One of the big plusses of TV is that it gives you another way of looking at things....It's not just a vehicle to carry something. (New York, NY, Arts Representative)

VIDEO: THE NEW WAVE, one of the smaller series supported by PITA, contains some works that are pure abstractions of video shapes and colors. This abstract video art has also been blended into performances on television, the most well-known of which is the work of Twyla Tharp. A video artist whose work appeared on VIDEO: THE NEW WAVE commented that the popularity of abstract video art programs has declined in recent years, but said that there is now greater demand than ever for abstract video imagery that can be used as background for larger performance pieces.

While a few respondents saw no potential for television as anything beyond a transmission mechanism, the majority felt there was much room for improvement in creating a new art form by blending television and the arts and in designing new arts made especially for television presentation:

> Once all that technology takes over, what you should have is another form, another art form, which is a combination of the two. (Cleveland, OH, Arts Representative)

There must be an awareness and a consciousness between the two art disciplines.
(Columbia, SC, Arts Representative)

I like dance that is actually choreographed for television, taking the concept of television space into account and even using things like chroma-key. That sort of thing needs to be done more often, I believe.
(Columbia, SC, Arts Representative)

Television is one of the most important, powerful things that's happened. It's reaching out and taking everything it can get its hands on, and experimenting with all of it. It'll soon find out what it does well, and what it doesn't. The medium will have its own life, like the theatre does, in a sense.
(Kansas City, MO, Arts Representative)

Montage, short attention span, pieces that are juxtapositional rather than sequential, that's all familiar to the television audience, and it's a legitimate working vocabulary for choreographers. I would like to see more of the kind of work that Twyla Tharp does in dealing with television as a co-equal artistic fact with dance, and attempting to make dance <u>for</u> television rather than <u>on</u> television.
(Boston, MA, Critic)

There's not a true collaboration between performing artists and media artists. I want to see things that are fusions of the two arts - a third art form.
(Los Angeles, CA, Media Representative)

I believe some of the art forms may be changing slightly because of the television medium. Pilobolus and other dance people have developed dances which are for television, which are television dances. Some of the arts will change slightly to take advantage of the television medium.
(Atlanta, GA, Media Representative)

The general consensus was that television still has great potential; more money, time, and attention is needed to create examples of the artistic possibilities of television. There was a general desire for experimentation in all of the arts to create media arts programming that would develop new media art forms. While other projects funded under the Media Arts Program may have explored the fusion of media and art, the small proportion of funds expended by PITA for "Media as Art" projects (5%) has not contributed substantially to experimentation in this area.

Chapter 3

Distribution and Audiences

A primary objective of the National Endowment for the Arts has been the dissemination of high quality art to people across the United States. Several Divisions at the Endowment have instituted programs that lead directly or indirectly to the accomplishment of this goal. Support of institutions, such as the major symphony orchestras, resident professional theatres, and opera companies insure the survival and availability of these resources in many metropolitan areas. Other programs, such as the touring program of the Dance Division and many projects of the Museum Division actually transport and exhibit artistic works to people who might not otherwise see them. From its inception, the Media Arts Program was conceived to have the potential to bring artistic work to large audiences. In particular, Programming in the Arts (PITA) has been charged with the responsibility of supporting projects that would use television, radio, and film to reach a broad audience.

The major series and many of the other projects reviewed in this study were distributed to the public via the public broadcasting system. This chapter begins by reviewing the promotion and distribution histories of these series and of the specials that have been broadcast over PBS. Next, the amount of audience exposure to these programs is assessed through a reanalysis of Nielsen's audience ratings. The cost to the NEA of reaching viewers is estimated for some programs. Finally, the potential and problems of alternative channels of distribution such as foreign broadcasting, schools and libraries, cable television, video disks and videocassettes of these major programs, as well as for smaller media arts projects, are discussed.

The major findings discussed in Chapter 3 are:

- An important factor in building audiences is how a series is scheduled. Some PITA-supported series have been more optimally scheduled on PBS than others. LIVE FROM LINCOLN CENTER and DANCE IN AMERICA have benefitted from being scheduled as part of the regularly-recurring series, Great Performances, which is part of PBS' common carriage schedule.

- A second important factor in achieving broadcast audiences is promotion. PITA-supported series such as LIVE FROM THE MET and DANCE IN AMERICA which receive corporate underwriting are more likely to be promoted than other series and programs, because corporate funders are more likely to pay for promotion and advertising.

- The television audiences for DANCE IN AMERICA, LIVE FROM LINCOLN CENTER, LIVE FROM THE MET and WOMEN IN ART are predominantly female and over 50.

- VISIONS, unlike the other major series supported by PITA, attracted a predominantly younger audience (61% below 50 years of age).

- Television coverage of the performing arts reaches an audience significantly older than audiences at live performances.

- While television audiences for the performing arts are upscale in terms of education, occupation and income, the proportion of the audience that has not attended college, that is not managerial or professional and that has an income below $20,000 is higher among the television audience than at live performing arts events.

- Contractual agreements with unions and the funding policies of some funders which require repayment of grants from monies generated impede secondary (non-broadcast) distribution of PITA-supported programs.

- Co-production agreements with organizations representing the new technologies of cable and home video, and with foreign broadcasters, promise to be the wave of the future in the production of arts programming for television.

- The cost to PITA per viewer has ranged across the major series from 2¢ per viewer for LIVE FROM LINCOLN CENTER to 16¢ per viewer for VISIONS.

Broadcast Distribution of Projects Supported by Programming in the Arts (PITA)

In the United States, penetration by television and radio is virtually complete; over 98% of the 76 million households in this country can receive radio and television programming. Broadcast projects supported under PITA have been carried by the public broadcasting system rather than the commercial networks. The outreach of public broadcasting is not quite as expansive as commerical broadcasting, but it too has the potential of reaching more than 68 million homes. Until more recently, commercial stations have shied away from cultural programs due to their pursuit of the largest audiences possible. Programs such as Live from Studio 8H offered by NBC and "Baryshnikov on Broadway" which appeared on ABC during the spring of 1980, suggest that the performing arts may return to commercial TV, at least occasionally. Though no stipulations have limited the domestic broadcasting of projects funded under PITA to the public media, none of the projects has appeared on commercial television.* EARPLAY is carried on a commercial fine arts radio station in Chicago.

The public broadcasting system is composed of 269 locally controlled VHF and UHF television stations, and 217 FM radio stations. The major television and radio series which Programming in the Arts partially supported were all broadcast over the network of stations coordinated by the Public Broadcasting Service (PBS) for television and/or National Public Radio (NPR) for radio. Many of the smaller series and television specials have also been broadcast, in some cases locally by a PBS station, in other cases nationally. Although viewership of public television is lower than commercial television, the size of the audience s growing. As of November, 1979, PBS reported that 45.6% of the television households in the U.S. had tuned to public television at some time during an average week. This percentage is up from a 1973 level of 30%.

Each public broadcasting station has three sources of program materials. Some programs are produced by the station alone or in cooperation with outside producers and/or arts organizations. Such programs, if completed, will

*Programming in the Arts has made one grant to a commercial media organization for development of arts programming but the project has not been completed.

always receive at least a local airing. There are less than a dozen public television stations that are involved in a significant amount of production. These stations then offer their programs to the other stations in the system. Hence, a second source of programming is the other public broadcasters. The third source of program material is through acquisition. Stations frequently purchase programs that have been produced by outsiders such as independent filmmakers, production companies, the British Broadcasting Corporation (BBC), the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation (CBC), etc.

Distribution and Scheduling

Over the past year the Corporation for Public Broadcasting (CPB), PBS, and the individual stations have taken some steps to increase audiences for public television programs. In October, 1979, PBS began to feed a "common carriage" schedule of programs to the public television stations across the country. This schedule includes two hours of prime time programming on Sunday through Wednesday evenings. As of January, 1980, 93% of the stations which reach 98% of the public television audience, had agreed to broadcast the common carriage programs.

LIVE FROM LINCOLN CENTER and DANCE IN AMERICA are both included in the common carriage schedule. They are aired as part of Great Performances, which is broadcast during prime time on Wednesday evenings. As the commercial networks have demonstrated, the most effective way to build audiences is with a regular and predictable schedule. By presenting programs in series, the audience is given an opportunity to develop regular viewing patterns. Although neither LINCOLN CENTER nor DANCE IN AMERICA produce enough programs each season to fill their own series, WNET programs Great Performances as an umbrella series for the presentation of the performing arts. People interested in this type of programming can easily learn where and when it will be aired. In addition to DANCE IN AMERICA and LIVE FROM LINCOLN CENTER, Great Performances consists of Theatre in America and assorted specials not necessarily supported by the National Endowment for the Arts. Most of the programs broadcast within the Great Performances time slot are partially underwritten by the Exxon Corporation.

Scheduling is one area in which corporate funders are apt to influence the decisions of station personnel. Underwriters will request and, on occasion, be promised a particular time slot for programs they are supporting. Aware of the importance of scheduling for the viewership of programs, corporate underwriters tend to be more assertive than other funders in their scheduling preferences. A conflict between corporate underwriters can constrain program scheduling. Because LIVE FROM THE MET is partially underwritten by Texaco, the presenting station, WNET, would not run it under the umbrella of Great Performances which is underwritten by Exxon. LIVE FROM THE MET is not part of the core schedule, although it is picked up by most of the stations when broadcast.

The other series supported by PITA have not been scheduled as favorably. VISIONS was never successful in getting corporate underwriting and WOMEN IN ART received only a small amount of funds from Xerox to publicize one program: "Georgia O'Keeffe." Both series were scheduled later in the evening. The three VISIONS programs broadcast during the 1979-80 season were not included in common carriage. In the past, before there was a common carriage schedule, VISIONS was carried by 192 stations. The series was not well-received in some parts of the country where station managers found the language "distasteful" and content of the programs too controversial. When programs are not part of the common carriage schedule, individual stations are more apt to change the scheduling of programs. Even if the program is fed in a prime time slot, the local station can schedule it if and when it believes the program will best serve the local audience.

Public television stations usually have the right to re-broadcast programs. Standard broadcast rights allow stations four "releases" of a program within three years. A "release" is defined as unlimited telecasts within seven days. LIVE FROM LINCOLN CENTER and LIVE FROM THE MET have made different arrangements for broadcast of the live performances. Due to union agreements, these programs are available to the stations only within the week of the original broadcast. Occasionally PBS will re-broadcast a program or series during the common carriage schedule. Local stations are able to schedule re-broadcasts whenever they choose. Several of the specials, pilots, and films that were produced with support from PITA have been aired in prime time as part of the common carriage.

MUSICAL COMEDY TONIGHT, CONVERSATIONS ABOUT THE DANCE, and MEMORIES OF EUBIE are the most recent examples. Other projects have been distributed at odd hours or for a local audience. Many of the projects have been distributed through other channels but have not been broadcast. These will be discussed later in the chapter. Table 3.1 presents the national broadcast exposures for specials and films funded under PITA which were included in the study.

The broadcast schedule for EARPLAY has never been coordinated nationally. In the past, stations have received disks of the recorded dramas which can be played at the discretion of the station's programmer an unlimited number of times. This year, for the first time, National Public Radio has received the grant from PITA for support of EARPLAY (rather than the producing agency). There are some efforts to establish a standard time for broadcast of this series so that promotional activities can be coordinated.

Audiences are much less likely to be exposed to projects that have not been broadcast. Projects which were funded under Programming in the Arts but never broadcast nationally were virtually unknown to respondents in this study. Respondents were also much less likely to be aware of programs that were telecast as one-shot "specials" than they were of programs presented in series. As might be expected, representatives of the public television stations were familiar with many of the most recent specials but they too had no knowledge of the many films, videotapes, and more experimental media projects funded by Programming in the Arts.

Many projects are not broadcast because, in the opinion of public broadcasters, they would appeal to too few people. Other projects have not been aired because they do not fit into standard television formats or time slots. To rectify this situation, Programming in the Arts has recently granted funds to two organizations. In 1979, WNET and Global Village, an independent production company and media center, were each awarded $145,000 to produce series of programs for national public television. Each series will acquire program material from independent producers and package it for national broadcasting. The Global Village series, entitled OTHER VOICES, OTHER VISIONS, will be

TABLE 3.1

BROADCAST AND DISTRIBUTION OF SPECIALS

TITLE	DATE OF ORIGINAL PBS BROADCAST	NATIONAL PBS REPEAT DATES	RIGHTS #OF SHOWINGS/# OF YEARS	PBS RIGHTS EXPIRE
BOLERO	February 19, 1973	April 29, 1973 May 28, 1975 January 10, 1976	unlimited showings/3 years	February 12, 1976
AMERICAN AMERICAN BALLET THEATRE: A Close Up In Time	October 8, 1973	May 17, 1976	4 showings/3 years	October 8, 1976
ALVIN AILEY: MEMORIES AND VISIONS	May 6, 1974	September 9, 1976	4/3 years	May 6, 1977
VIDEO: THE NEW WAVE	June 3, 1974	May 29, 1975	4/3 years	June 3, 1977
THE SHADOW CATCHER	July 2, 1975	February 23, 1976	4/3 years	July 2, 1978
BUKOWSKI READS BUKOWSKI	October 16, 1975	none	4/3 years	October 16, 1978
MUSIC FROM ASPEN	January 4, 1976	June 6, 1976 December 29, 1977	4/3 years	January 4, 1979
MORE MUSIC FROM ASPEN	January 11, 1976	June 29, 1976 January 5, 1978	4/3 years	January 11, 1979
AMAZING GRACE: A BICENTENNIAL CELEBRATION OF AMERICAN SONG	October 27, 1976	September 26, 1979	4/3 years	October 27, 1979
A GOOD DISSONANCE LIKE A MAN	October 11, 1977	September 9, 1978 July 4, 1979	4/3 years	April 29, 1980
VANESSA	January 31, 1979	no	4/3 years	January 27, 1983
MUSICAL COMEDY TONIGHT	June 19, 1979	no	4/3 years	January 30, 1981?
MEMORIES OF EUBIE BLAKE	January 13, 1980	none yet	unlimited/3	October 6, 1981
MEDIA PROBES (pilot)	January 24, 1980	no	4/3 years	June 18, 1982
CONVERSATIONS ABOUT THE DANCE	January 28, 1980	none yet	4/3 years	January 12, 1983

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

ERIC

showcasing 12-15 films and videotapes, each 30-60 minutes long. The WNET series, currently called OPEN CHANNELS, will attempt to weave together several shorter pieces of programming, predominantly acquisitions, within a recurrent program format.* In providing a regular format and schedule, series such as these have the potential for greatly expanding the audiences for independently-produced media projects.

Promotion of Projects Supported by PITA

The most frequent complaint of broadcasting people interviewed for this evaluation concerned the inadequacy of funds devoted to promotion and publicity for the programs. The following comments from media people, whether or not they had participated in the production of the programs, were typical:

> The missing ingredient for a continued or enhanced success of all these series is promotion.

> I think it is foolish to fund these projects and then have no money to promote them

> A question of impact of any one of these series can't be addressed without seriously engaging in promotion. I think it's a necessary cost in programming. It isn't enough to produce and distribute a program if people don't know it's there.

Comments such as these were often directed at all of public television, not specifically at the programs supported by Programming in the Arts. A major distinction should be drawn, however, between programs and series with corporate underwriters and those without. In addition to the support granted by corporate underwriters for the production of programs, much of their support has gone into promotion. Exxon has contributed substantially to the pro-

*Both of these series were to be co-funded by The Corporation for Public Broadcasting but recent changes in personnel have interrupted the granting process at CPB and neither grant has been issued. Global Village has continued with its work on the series. The first program, "The Song of the Canary," will be aired over PBS on January 3, 1981. Other sources of funding are being sought by WNET for OPEN CHANNELS before work on the series is resumed.

motion of DANCE IN AMERICA and LIVE FROM LINCOLN CENTER. Substantial advertising and publicity for LIVE FROM THE MET is supplied by Texaco. Series which were unable to attract corporate underwriters, such as VISIONS and EARPLAY, have consequently suffered. The budget for VISIONS did include adequate amounts for promotion in the early years of the series but programs that were broadcast in the 1979-80 series received little promotion. As one of the people associated with a recent VISIONS said,

> I'm unhappy and angry and I'll tell you why. The creative experience was fine although the time was very short... Two weeks ago the show was on here and in the east and I haven't seen one word in print about it. There was no promotion effort that I know of.

Only recently has the public broadcasting system committed substantial resources to promotion of its programs and the development of its audiences. When stations exercised complete autonomy in the scheduling of programs, there were few advantages to be gained from national advertising and publicity. Stations did receive press releases, press packets, and the programs for critics to preview, but as there was tremendous variation in what a station would choose to schedule and when, national advertising seemed pointless. When the concept of a common carriage schedule was accepted by the stations, efforts were made to coordinate advertising nationally. In 1979, the Corporation for Public Broadcasting gave $1,000,000 to PBS for national advertising. This year PBS has dedicated those funds to the development and placement of advertisements in TV Guide.* Only programs fed to the stations as part of the common carriage schedule are eligible for this promotional support.

In addition to the CPB/PBS funds for TV Guide ads, there are two major sources of support for promotion. The first source is the station's discretionary allocation for advertising which must be divided among all of the programs the station is presenting. As stations have many shows to consider, they rarely can support any one show with a significant amount of advertising; stations often prefer to run weekly ads which highlight the upcoming programs.

*As of January, 1980, each half-page ad in TV Guide costs $27,500.

They are also apt to put a large proportion of their funds into ads for pledge periods. The second source of funds for promotion is corporate underwriting.

When the advertising and publicity for programs are paid for by corporate underwriting, the underwriter generally hires an advertising agency and/or public relations firm to prepare and place the promotional materials. This arrangement has worked well for underwriters because the advertising and publicity provide opportunities for informing the public of the role played by the company in supporting high quality programs. Thus far it has also worked quite well for the television stations and the audiences who are attracted to programs. Without this support, stations rarely have sufficient funds for the promotion of the programs they are broadcasting.

One potential danger lies in allowing corporate underwriters to determine the placement of advertisements. There are some indications that underwriters are concentrating their promotional dollars in the few markets where they are apt to gain the most visibility for their good work. A recent PBS study found that in the smaller markets of Seattle, Cincinnati, Milwaukee, and New Orleans, only 12% of the paid advertising was underwritten by corporations whereas in New York and Los Angeles, underwriters were estimated to cover 62% of the expense. As a consequence of this policy, people in smaller markets may be less well-informed about the programs available to them and hence less well-served by the public television system.

Direct evidence of the effectiveness of promotion on viewership of programs has not been collected for most of the programs supported by Programming in the Arts. The overwhelming audience reaction to a National Geographic program, "The Incredible Machine," has frequently been cited as an example of the power of advertising. The National Geographic series is underwritten by Gulf which put an estimated additional $750,000 into promotion for that one program. "The Incredible Machine" is the most popular program ever to appear on public television with a cumulative rating of 16, and its success is attributed by many observers to the promotional effort.

PBS has attempted to evaluate the effectiveness of the TV Guide campaign for common carriage programs. Included in their analysis were two programs supported in part by PITA: MUSICAL COMEDY TONIGHT and a LIVE FROM LINCOLN CENTER recital by Sutherland and Horne. Programs advertised in TV Guide were found to have an average audience rating that was 29% higher than the prime time average for all programs. The percent of increase varied across markets but with the TV Guide ads specifically, and all advertising in general, the audience ratings for all of the advertised programs studied were higher.

MUSICAL COMEDY TONIGHT was the most highly promoted special in the study. It received a high audience rating of 4.0.* The Sutherland/Horne special from LINCOLN CENTER was also quite highly promoted but received an average rating of 1.3. The study concludes that content of the programs, as well as promotion, has a strong influence on the audience size.

The PBS report also considered demographic distribution of the audiences. This profile indicated that for the advertised programs the audience was demographically broader. They claim that viewership increased in every age/sex group. The important point is that the audience is growing faster in the younger demographic groups.

Generally, the producers of a special or a series are responsible for the creation of promotional materials which must precede the broadcast. At a minimum, the producer will distribute a press release and photographs or transparencies associated with the program. A 30- or 60-second television spot displaying scenes from the program is frequently produced. This "commercial" is distributed to the stations who can run it as an advertisement for the show. PBS coordinates the distribution of these materials to member stations and creates their own "generic" promotional materials at the start of each season to highlight the featured series and specials. Several stations reported

*While a rating of 4 is considered high for public television, by commercial standards it is still quite low. When Live from Studio 8H premiered on NBC in January, 1980, it earned a rating of 5.5. To rank in the top 10, programs usually have ratings over 30.

problems related to delays in the distribution of the promotional materials when they came from inexperienced producers or stations but the materials associated with LIVE FROM LINCOLN CENTER, LIVE FROM THE MET, and DANCE IN AMERICA were cited as professional, plentiful, and on time.

Exxon has underwritten most of the advertising and publicity for DANCE IN AMERICA and LIVE FROM LINCOLN CENTER. Until this year, promotional activities for DANCE IN AMERICA were handled in-house by WNET: now both LIVE FROM LINCOLN CENTER and DANCE IN AMERICA are promoted through outside agencies. Each program in the series has been supported by press packets, but the majority of Exxon's support has gone to the promotion of Great Performances rather than to the individual series. Several years ago Exxon ran a television commercial for Great Performances over the commercial stations. It was not possible to measure the direct effect of the commercial and the effort has not been repeated.

Promotion for LIVE FROM THE MET has been underwritten by Texaco. Even some of the programs that have been run as specials had corporate underwriting for promotion. The promotion for MUSICAL COMEDY TONIGHT has been supported by Prudential and some promotion for "Georgia O'Keeffe," one of the programs in WOMEN IN ART, was underwritten by Xerox. "Georgia O'Keeffe" was aired as a special on the occasion of Ms. O'Keeffe's ninetieth birthday. The monies from Xerox were used for limited distribution of posters which were specifically about the special. The special did generate a tremendous amount of publicity due to the occasion. Later the program was rerun as part of the series. Respondents in this study were well aware of the program on "Georgia O'Keeffe" and a sizable proportion reported that they had seen the program. For most people, it was the only program in WOMEN IN ART that they could remember.

Generally, however, specials are not given the same amount of promotion that accompanies the major series. This year the TV Guide ads have improved the situation for programs supported by PITA which have been distributed during common carriage hours.

According to many representatives from the public radio system, the listenership of EARPLAY has suffered from a lack of promotion. Because the programs are not aired at a standard time, they are more difficult to promote on

a national basis. This year NPR is coordinating radio drama for the public system, and $25,000 will be used for a coordinated promotional effort. Radio has been less aggressive in pursuing corporate underwriters and has therefore had less corporate support for promotion. The new development office at NPR is now actively seeking corporate underwriters. While radio programs are in most cases less expensive to produce, they are no less expensive to promote.

Audience Size and Demographics

EARPLAY Audiences

The lack of a coordinated schedule and the absence of corporate underwriting for promotion are accompanied by a paucity of information on audiences for EARPLAY. At this time very little systematic data exists on the listenership for the series. The standard audience ratings generated by Arbitron measure listenership for blocks of time such as 6 am - 10 am, rather than for individual programs. Listeners for EARPLAY cannot be isolated from the listeners to other programs within the same time periods. The lack of coordinated scheduling for the series also hampers the collection of information about the audience on a national basis.

National Public Radio and the Corporation for Public Broadcasting are planning a system with Arbitron for the collection and analysis of information about the audiences for individual programs. The system, Public Radio Audience Profile (PRAP), should be in operation within the next year. Roper has conducted an annual poll since 1977 which includes two questions on EARPLAY. Of the 1000 people interviewed for the Roper survey in 1977, only 23 had heard of EARPLAY and only 10 had ever listened to a program. In both 1978 and 1979, again on the basis of 1000 interviews, 28 people (2.8%) were aware of the radio series. Fifteen people (1.5%) in 1978 and 11 people (1.1%) in 1979 claimed to be listeners. Awareness and listenership were slightly higher in 1980, at 2.9% and 1.7% respectively.

Types of Television Audience Data

The A.C. Nielsen Company has several methods for collecting data on the size and composition of audiences for television programs. These data are available in different formats to individual television stations and to the Public Broadcasting Service (PBS) at various times of the year. The following four sources of data were analyzed to construct a profile of the television audiences for the programs funded by Programming in the Arts: 1) Local Nielsen audience data from twelve of the markets in which interviews were conducted: Atlanta, Boston, Chicago, Columbia S.C., Cleveland, Kansas City, Los Angeles, Minneapolis, New York, San Francisco, Seattle, and Washington, D.C.;* 2) National Nielsen audience data from PBS; 3) The May 1979 "Report on PBS Programs" produced by A.C. Nielsen for PBS; and (4) "Overnight" ratings from the four "metered" markets: New York, Los Angeles, Chicago, and San Francisco.

Local Audience Data:

The Nielsen Station Index (NSI) consists of measurements of television audiences in local markets throughout the U.S. In any given market, television audiences are measured during several month-long time periods throughout the year. The number of such ratings periods varies from market to market and ranges from a minimum of three periods to a maximum of seven periods. The sample for the measurements are constructed as follows: for each week of the NSI rating period in each market, approximately 250-400 diaries (depending on market size) are placed in television households that agree to serve as sample households. For an entire week the members of the household keep a record of what television channel they watch at times when they are using TV and they also record which members of the household are actually watching. It is thus possible to determine from the sample the composition of the audience for a given program in any market which is measured during the program's airing.

*Interviews were also conducted in a thirteenth city, Madison, Wisconsin, with the members of the EARPLAY staff.

The data are collected in "Viewers in Profile" publications (generally referred to as "the books). For the purposes of this report, the books for the twelve markets referred to above were examined to find ratings and demographic information for the television programs funded by PITA.

Since not all markets are measured throught the year, it was not possible to obtain local ratings concerning all of the PITA programs. In addition, if a public television station fails to capture a minimum audience during a given rating period, it will be excluded from the book for its local market and there will be no ratings information available regarding any of the programs which it aired during that month. Another difficulty that arises in trying to determine audience size and composition for certain programs is related to the scope of the books themselves. As mentioned above, they cover a four-week period. Generally, they present audience information concerning a given time slot (e.g., Wednesday from 8 to 8:30 pm) on an average week basis. If a program was only aired on Wednesday at 8 pm in a single week of the ratings period, there may not be information regarding that particular program separated out from the four-week average for the time slot. It depends on whether Nielsen was supplied with the proper information regarding the station's schedule for the entire month. In recent years the books have become more complete, but prior to 1977 it was difficult to gather the data concerning programs (such as LIVE FROM THE MET) that were not presented in four consecutive weeks of a ratings period. The following table lists the programs for which local data were found and the number of markets out of the twelve for which it was extracted.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

TABLE 3.2

Programs for Which Local Ratings Were Available

Title	Date	Number of Markets
DANCE IN AMERICA		
"Balanchine Part I"	12/14/77	2
"Balanchine Part II"	12/21/77	2
"Balanchine Part III"	11/29/78	1
"Balanchine Part IV"	3/ 7/79	3
"Paul Taylor" (Repeat)	5/ 9/79	12
"Eliot Feld"	5/16/79	12
"Martha Graham" (Clytemnestra)	5/30/79	12
LIVE FROM THE MET		
"Rigoletto"	11/ 7/77	10
"Don Giovanni"	3/16/78	5
"The Bartered Bride"	11/21/78	12
"Tosca"	12/19/78	1
"Louisa Miller"	1/20/79	9
"Mahagony"	11/27/79	12
LIVE FROM LINCOLN CENTER		
"N.Y. Philharmonic" (Kubelik/Arrau)	11/20/76	2
"N.Y.C. Opera 'Manon'"	10/18/77	7
"N.Y.C. Ballet 'Coppelia'"	1/31/78	4
"Pavarotti"	2/15/78	2
"American Ballet Theater" (Baryshnikov/Marakova)	5/17/78	7
"N.Y. Philharmonic" (Mehta/Perlman)	1/17/79	3
"Sutherland/Pavarotti"	1/22/79	8
"Sutherland/Horne"	10/15/79	11
"N.Y. Philharmonic" (Mehta/Gilels)	11/14/79	4
VISIONS		
"El Corrido"	11/ 4/76	6
"Gold Watch"	11/11/76	6
"Liza's Diary"	11/18/76	6
"Great Cherub Knitwear Strike"	11/25/76	6
"Gardener's Son"	1/ 6/77	3
"Prison Game"	1/13/77	3
"Gold Watch" (Repeat)	1/20/77	3
"Two Brothers" (Repeat)	1/27/77	3
"El Corrido" (Repeat)	2/ 3/77	6
"War Widow" (Repeat)	2/10/77	6
"Iowa"	10/ 2/77	9
"Freeman"	10/ 9/77	9
"Alambrista"	10/16/77	9
"Dancing Bear Games"	10/23/77	9
"Pleasantville"	11/ 6/77	9
"You Can Run But You Can't Hide"	11/13/77	9
"All I Could See"	11/20/77	9
"Nanook Taxi"	11/27/77	9
"Secret Space"	12/ 4/77	2
"Prison Game" (Repeat)	12/11/77	2
"Phantom of the Open Hearth"	12/18/77	2
"Liza's Diary" (Repeat)	12/25/77	2
"Life Among the Lowly"	1/ 8/78	4
"Gardener's Son" (Repeat)	1/15/78	4
"War Widow" (Repeat)	1/22/78	4
"Charlie Smith"	10/ 9/78	3
"Escape"	10/16/78	3
"Fens of the Kosko Show"	10/23/78	3
"Liza's Diary" (Repeat)	11/ 6/78	4
"All I Could See" (Repeat)	11/13/78	4
"Dancing Bear Games" (Repeat)	11/20/78	4
"Gold Watch" (Repeat)	11/27/78	4
"All I Could See" (Repeat)	1/ 1/79	4
"Ladies in Waiting"	1/ 8/79	4
WOMEN IN ART		
"Georgia O'Keeffe"	11/15/77	10
"Louise Nevelson"	2/ 6/78	7
"Alice Neel"	2/13/78	7
"Anonymous"	2/27/78	7
"Georgia O'Keeffe" (Repeat)	5/ 7/79	3
"Mary Cassatt" (Repeat)	5/14/79	3
"Louise Nevelson" (Repeat"	5/21/79	3
"West Coast" (Repeat)	5/28/79	3

Local Data-Audience Composition by Age and Gender:

The local Nielsen audience data include information on the age and gender of the viewers of television programs. In particular, the number of viewers of each sex are given separately for the age groups from 18-49 years old and over fifty years old. Of course, the normal data on the number of television households in each market watching a particular program are also shown. In what follows, the material has been presented grouped by series; that is, there are separate tables for each of the series: DANCE IN AMERICA, LIVE FROM THE MET, LIVE FROM LINCOLN CENTER, VISIONS, and WOMEN IN ART.

The total audience rating for a program is the percentage of all television households that viewed a particular program. It may also be applied to a given group of viewers. Thus, the rating for a program among women aged 18-49 is simply the percentage of women in that age group in a specific market with access to television who watched the program in question. Closely related to the idea of a rating is that of a share. It represents the percentage of households (or viewers in a certain age/sex group) watching a particular program among all households (or viewers) watching television at the time. The share is thus always higher than the rating among the same group.

For the five series listed, Tables 3.3-3.7 indicate information concerning the audiences in each of twelve markets as well as the average across markets. The first column gives the number of programs for which data were available. Table 3.2 on page 78 listed those programs in each series which were measured in these markets.

The next set of columns gives information about the number of households viewing the programs in the markets. First is the rating (of all TV households, the percent tuned to this program), then the share of households viewing television at the same time (the percent tuned to this program), and then the actual number (in thousands) that these ratings and shares represent in the different markets. Next, the share for the programs among all adults (age 18 or over) is given, as well as the number (in thousands) of individuals that this represents. The remaining columns of data give information

about the four categories of adults -- men and women aged under and over fifty. The shares in each category are given as well as the percentage of all adult viewers of the programs that the viewers in a given category represent. For example, for DANCE IN AMERICA in Table 3.3, women under the age of fifty represented 34% of the adult viewers in Cleveland.

Table 3.3 shows the audience characteristics in the 12 markets for DANCE IN AMERICA. Fully 68% of the adult viewers for these programs are women and the solid majority (59%) of the adult viewers are over the age of fifty. Thus, the median age for viewers is clearly greater than fifty. Furthermore, examining the relative sizes of the shares of viewers in the under- and over-fifty age groups, it is apparent that among all adult television viewers, those over fifty are about twice as likely to watch DANCE IN AMERICA as those under that age. Some markets in which these results are not as closely followed were Cleveland, San Francisco, and Washington, DC.

Turning to LIVE FROM THE MET (Table 3.4), one finds that the female proportion among adult viewers, though still high (61%), is not as strong as that for DANCE IN AMERICA. The audience is still predominantly elderly. Again, the San Francisco audience is somewhat exceptional in that its distribution of adult viewers was fairly flat by age and sex. This is true in Seattle as well but note that the Seattle figures are based on only two observations. In Washington, DC, the shares of younger adults are higher than those for the elderly viewers.

The fractions of viewers that are female and 50+ for LIVE FROM LINCOLN CENTER were similar to those for LIVE FROM THE MET -- about 60% in both cases. The shares for LINCOLN CENTER among both women and men over the age of fifty are more than twice the shares for younger viewers of the same sex. These trends are found, for example, in Boston, Chicago, New York, and Washington, DC.

The television audience for these performance series is quite different in some respects from the audiences for live performances. A recent study by the Theatre Group Fund which surveyed audiences for dance performances by

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

TABLE 3.3

DANCE IN AMERICA LOCAL RATINGS

	Measure-ments	Households			Adults		Women 18-49		Men 18-49		Women 50+		Men 50+	
		Rating	Share	000's	Share	000's	Share	Adults (%)	Share	Adults (%)	Share	Adults (%)	Share	Adults (%)
ATLANTA	3	0.5	0.8	6	0.8	8	0.3	12	0.3	12	2.8	63	0.5	13
BOSTON	3	1.7	2.8	35	2.6	46	1.9	22	1.1	11	5.3	50	2.4	17
CHICAGO	6	2.1	3.3	63	2.5	66	2.1	31	0.4	2	5.1	47	3.4	20
CLEVELAND	4	1.0	1.6	14	1.4	16	1.4	34	0.5	14	1.4	17	2.5	35
COLUMBIA S.C.	3	2.1	3.5	4	4.2	7	6.8	57	4.1	29	3.0	14	0.0	0
KANSAS CITY	3	0.4	0.8	3	0.9	4	0.0	0	0.0	0	3.1	100	0.0	0
LOS ANGELES	6	1.1	1.7	47	1.8	65	1.6	31	1.3	19	2.8	37	2.0	12
MINNEAPOLIS	3	2.0	3.6	21	3.8	28	0.8	7	1.4	11	11.4	57	6.0	25
NEW YORK	4	1.5	2.3	104	2.3	144	2.5	33	1.7	17	3.6	39	1.3	11
SAN FRANCISCO	3	2.2	3.6	41	3.4	52	3.1	27	1.7	13	3.9	29	5.5	31
SEATTLE	3	1.8	3.3	16	3.7	25	3.8	36	3.0	24	5.4	28	2.6	12
WASHINGTON	3	1.1	1.9	16	2.1	25	1.1	20	2.4	36	2.6	24	3.1	20
AVERAGE	44	1.4	2.4		2.3		2.0	26	1.3	15	4.0	42	2.4	17

TABLE 3.4

LIVE FROM THE MET LOCAL RATINGS

	Measure-ments	Households			Adults		Women 18-49		Men 18-49		Women 50+		Men 50+	
		Rating	Share	000's	Share	000's	Share	Adults (%)	Share	Adults (%)	Share	Adults (%)	Share	Adults (%)
ATLANTA	4	1.2	1.9	17	1.9	21	1.4	30	1.0	16	2.8	43	1.3	10
BOSTON	5	4.1	6.6	78	7.3	116	5.0	17	5.5	20	11.8	42	7.2	20
CHICAGO	6	1.9	2.8	57	2.5	73	1.6	21	2.3	23	4.0	36	3.1	21
CLEVELAND	4	1..	2.7	26	2.5	36	1.3	17	1.2	11	6.6	60	1.6	11
COLUMBIA S.C.	2			8ELOW	MINIMUM	AUDIENCE	STANDARDS							
KANSAS CITY	4	0.3	0.4	2	0.2	1	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.7	67	0.5	33
LOS ANGELES	5	1.2	1.9	51	1.6	60	0.7	13	1.0	18	3.0	43	2.5	25
MINNEAPOLIS	4	1.4	2.3	16	2.5	25	1.2	13	1.5	15	4.6	43	4.2	29
NEW YORK	5	4.7	7.0	256	7.5	373	5.0	18	3.2	10	14.3	46	9.7	26
SAN FRANCISCO	5	3.5	6.0	65	5.9	94	4.7	23	6.0	26	7.6	30	6.9	21
SEATTLE	2	2.9	4.7	26	3.7	29	3.3	20	5.1	44	4.1	24	1.9	12
WASHINGTON	3	1.8	3.0	27	2.9	35	5.5	23	3.2	26	4.1	44	1.9	8
AVERAGE	49	2.2	3.5		3.4		2.5	18	2.8	20	5.8	43	3.8	19

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

TABLE 3.5

LIVE FROM LINCOLN CENTER LOCAL RATINGS

	Measure-ments	Households			Adults		Women 18-49		Men 18-49		Women 50+		Men 50+	
		Rating	Share	000's	Share	000's	Share	Adults (%)	Share	Adults (%)	Share	Adults (%)	Share	Adults (%)
ATLANTA	3	0.3	0.6	2	0.4	2	0.9	62	0.4	38	0.0	0	0.0	0
BOSTON	8	4.2	6.7	82	6.5	111	3.0	12	2.7	10	13.9	55	7.8	23
CHICAGO	7	2.2	3.1	67	2.7	81	0.7	10	0.9	15	7.0	51	4.3	24
CLEVELAND	2	2.0	3.0	27	3.1	38	1.5	16	0.8	5	5.4	43	6.1	36
COLUMBIA S.C.	0			NO	MEASUREMENTS		AVAILABLE							
KANSAS CITY	3	1.5	2.3	11	2.1	15	1.5	25	1.0	18	4.7	45	2.4	12
LOS ANGELES	5	1.7	2.5	74	2.8	113	2.3	26	2.7	28	4.0	33	2.4	13
MINNEAPOLIS	4	1.5	2.7	16	2.5	19	0.9	12	3.8	34	3.5	37	2.6	17
NEW YORK	8	3.4	5.0	240	6.1	399	4.6	20	3.4	15	9.9	42	7.1	23
SAN FRANCISCO	7	3.6	6.0	67	5.1	79	4.0	23	3.0	19	9.6	40	5.1	18
SEATTLE	2	1.5	2.6	14	2.8	22	1.5	15	3.7	40	5.0	37	1.4	8
WASHINGTON	3	2.1	3.4	31	3.2	37	2.1	17	0.8	5	7.2	54	5.7	25
AVERAGE	48	2.4	3.8		3.7		2.4	20	2.2	20	7.1	41	4.4	19

TABLE 3.6

VISIONS LOCAL RATINGS

	Measure-ments	Households			Adults		Women 18-49		Men 18-49		Women 50+		Men 50+	
		Rating	Share	000's	Share	000's	Share	Adults (%)	Share	Adults (%)	Share	Adults (%)	Share	Adults (%)
ATLANTA	16	0.1	0.2	1	0.3	2	0.2	35	0.2	35	0.2	10	0.6	20
BOSTON	8	1.2	2.2	22	2.1	34	2.3	35	2.2	26	2.2	23	1.6	15
CHICAGO	0		NO	MEASUREMENTS		AVAILABLE								
CLEVELAND	16	0.5	0.7	6	0.7	9	0.8	37	0.6	22	0.9	30	0.6	11
COLUMBIA S.C.	0		NO	MEASUREMENTS		AVAILABLE								
KANSAS CITY	12	0.3	0.5	2	0.5	3	0.7	45	0.8	36	0.3	9	0.2	9
LOS ANGELES	35	0.7	1.3	32	1.3	44	1.1	27	1.1	24	1.6	29	1.5	20
MINNEAPOLIS	10	0.9	1.6	9	1.8	14	1.0	17	2.3	38	2.3	29	1.9	17
NEW YORK	35	1.4	2.4	101	2.0	126	1.8	28	2.1	28	2.5	29	1.7	14
SAN FRANCISCO	12	1.7	3.9	29	3.6	41	4.5	39	3.2	28	4.4	26	1.3	6
SEATTLE	8	0.6	1.1	5	0.9	6	1.2	48	0.9	30	0.8	15	0.4	7
WASHINGTON	25	0.8	1.3	11	1.3	16	1.4	39	1.0	26	1.5	22	1.3	13
AVERAGE	177	0.8	1.5		1.4		1.4	32	1.3	28	1.7	24	1.0	15

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

TABLE 3.7

WOMEN IN ART LOCAL RATINGS

	Measure-ments	Households			Adults		Women 18-49		Men 18-49		Women 50+		Men 50+	
		Rating	Share	000's	Share	000's	Share	Adults (%)	Share	Adults (%)	Share	Adults (%)	Share	Adults (%)
ATLANTA	1	1.0	1.7	10	1.7	14	1.9	43	0.0	0	3.2	36	2.5	21
BOSTON	4	1.5	2.5	29	2.1	34	2.1	29	1.5	18	2.6	32	2.3	21
CHICAGO	1	0.7	1.1	22	0.8	25	1.2	52	0.0	0	1.0	28	1.0	20
CLEVELAND	5	0.4	0.7	5	0.5	6	0.7	84	0.0	0	1.0	12	0.4	4
COLUMBIA S.C.	1	BELOW MINIMUM AUDIENCE STANDARDS												
KANSAS CITY	9	0.4	0.7	2	0.8	4	0.2	6	0.8	19	2.0	70	0.4	4
LOS ANGELES	5	1.0	1.5	43	1.6	59	1.3	45	2.0	21	1.6	25	1.4	10
MINNEAPOLIS	4	0.1	0.2	1	0.1	1	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.8	100
NEW YORK	9	1.3	2.0	90	1.6	103	1.1	21	0.8	12	2.5	39	2.3	28
SAN FRANCISCO	1	3.4	5.6	60	5.7	84	8.1	48	4.4	23	4.6	18	4.3	12
SEATTLE	1	BELOW MINIMUM AUDIENCE STANDARDS												
WASHINGTON	9	0.9	1.5	13	1.4	17	1.1	33	0.7	17	3.2	39	1.3	11
AVERAGE	50	0.8	1.3		1.2		1.0	29	0.8	14	2.0	36	1.3	21

several of the companies featured on DANCE IN AMERICA found that only 19% of the 4,614 people attending the events were over 50 years of age. This figure stands in sharp contrast to the home viewers, 68% of whom were over fifty. The demographics on the audiences for live performing arts events are corroborated in a report which compiles the results of 270 audience studies.*

The public television audiences described in Tables 3.3 to 3.7 , however, are not atypical for general public television prime time programming. For example, in Boston in November, 1978, the average 8-11 pm shares among adult viewers were 6.0 and 4.4 for women over fifty and men over fifty, respectively, while they were 2.3 and 2.4 for women and men under that age, according to the A.C. Nielsen local book. In most other markets there are similar demographic viewer profiles. The audience for VISIONS, Table 3.6, does not follow the television viewing patterns found for the three preceding series. The majority of the audience for VISIONS is also female, with women comprising 57% of the adult viewers in these markets but 61% of the viewers were under the age of fifty. This finding is more consistent with the results of audience studies for live performances (see footnote below). In that report, the greatest range in median age for audiences was found in the studies concerned with theatrical performances. It appears that the content of the performance is a significant factor in the age of an audience that will be attracted to drama, whether on television or in the theatre.

The WOMEN IN ART series also attracts a higher proportion of female viewers than male, with 65% of the adult audience consisting of women. Persons over fifty are more likely to watch than those under that age (note the ratio of shares of the two age groups) with elderly viewers comprising 57% of the total. It should be noted that several of the local market results are based on only a single program in the series and must consequently be used with caution. The average figures are probably fairly reliable nonetheless.

---

*DiMaggio, P. and others, "Audience Studies of the Performing Arts and Museums: A Critical Review." National Endowment for the Arts, 1978.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

National Television Audience Data:

Prior to October of 1977, A.C. Nielsen only supplied national audience data to PBS concerning its programs in the months of March and October. Since that time there has been information available on a regular basis regarding ten weeks during each year. Thus it is only if a program was aired on PBS stations during those limited periods of time that truly national audience data will be available. The table below lists the programs funded by PITA for which national audience data exists. The table also indicates those programs for which demographic information was obtained.

TABLE 3.8

AVAILABILITY OF NATIONAL NIELSEN DATA

Title	Date	Availability of Demographics
DANCE IN AMERICA		
"Twyla Tharp"	3/24/76	yes
"Dance Theater of Harlem"	3/23/77	no
LIVE FROM THE MET		
"Don Giovanni"	3/16/78	yes
"Louisa Miller"	1/20/79	yes
"Otello" (Repeat)	9/24/79	no
LIVE FROM LINCOLN CENTER		
"N.Y. Philharmonic" (Mehta/Verrett)	9/24/77	no
"N.Y. Philharmonic" (Leinsdorff/Watts)	10/29/77	no
"Pavarotti"	2/15/78	yes
"N.Y.C. Opera"--Turk In Italy	10/ 4/78	yes
"N.Y. Philharmonic" (Mehta/Perlman)	1/17/79	yes
"American Ballet Theater"--Sleeping Beauty	5/ 2/79	yes
VISIONS		
"Two Brothers"	10/21/76	no
"War Widow"	10/28/76	no
"Over Under Sideways Down"	10/30/77	no
"Gardener's Son"	1/15/78	no
"Liza's Diary" (Repeat)	11/ 6/78	yes
"Two Brothers" (Repeat)	12/11/78	no
WOMEN IN ART		
"Frankenthaler-Graves"	6/ 4/79	no
SPECIAL		
"Amazing Grace" (Great Performances)	10/27/76	no

These data are based upon the Nielsen Television Index (NTI) sample of approximately 1200 homes in the U.S. In each sample home a device has been affixed to the television set (or sets) so that the Nielsen Company can determine on a minute by minute basis whether the set is in use and, if so, to which channel it is tuned. It is not possible to determine which members, if any, of the household are viewing the program on the selected channel.

PBS and its stations have provided Nielsen with information concerning the carriage of particular programs by the stations. Nielsen then computes the number of stations which carried a particular program and the percentage of all U.S. television households (those households having at least one TV set) which should have been able to receive the program from a local station.

The national audience data include the following: (1) the total number of households estimated to have viewed at least six minutes of a given program; (2) the percentage of all U.S. television households that this represents; (3) the average number of households watching a given program during any minute of its presentation; and (4) the percentage of all U.S. television households that this represented. The percentages of all U.S. television households are referred to as national household ratings. These ratings may be either total household ratings (2 above) or average household ratings (4 above).

In addition to the household ratings for PBS programs that have been provided, some demographic information has also occasionally been available. Data on the head of household indicates whether that person has attended some college or university and whether that person's occupation is categorized as blue collar or white collar. There is also information on the total income for the household. This technique does not provide demographic information on these viewers unless the viewer is also the head of the household. The available data has been analyzed to provide ratings (percentage of television households) broken out by: "some college" vs. "no college" households; "blue collar" vs. "white collar" households;

and households with incomes less than $20,000 vs. those with incomes above $20,000. The relative sizes of the ratings in the different categories indicate the relative propensities of those types of households to have watched a given program. As was discussed in the previous section, PBS only has data for certain limited periods during the year. Thus, the number of measurements of truly national audiences for PITA programs is rather small. Those for which breakdowns by socio-economic status are available is limited still further as indicated in Table 3.8.

Table 3.9 presents the available audience ratings. Due to the small number of measurements, it should be interpreted cautiously. The first column of Table 3.9 shows the number of programs in each series upon which the household data is based. The next two columns indicate the number of public stations which broadcast (on average) the programs in question and the percentage of television homes in the U.S. which should have been able to receive the programs from a local public television station.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

TABLE 3.9

NATIONAL AUDIENCE FIGURES

	Number of Measurements	Number of Stations	Coverage of U.S.	Total Audience Households 000's	Total Audience Households Rating	Average Audience Households 000's	Average Audience Households Rating	Number of Measurements	Total Audience Household Rating by Status: College None	College Some	Occupation Blue Collar	Occupation White Collar	Income Under $20k	Income Over $20k
DANCE IN AMERICA	2	212	77%	2255	3.2	1550	2.2	[illegible]	2.7	4.1	1.3	4.1	2.8	3.9
LIVE FROM THE MET	3	247	88%	3397	4.6	1187	1.6	2	3.6	6.9	2.6	5.0	4.3	5.5
LIVE/LINCOLN CENTER	6	227	83%	2213	3.0	1032	1.4	4	2.3	4.9	1.6	4.5	2.6	4.9
VISIONS	6	192	75%	978	1.4	555	0.8	1	2.0	2.9	1.7	3.0	2.5	1.8
WOMEN IN ART	1	148	48%	BELOW MINIMUM AUDIENCE STANDARDS										

The columns labeled "Total Audience" refer to the total number of homes in the U.S. which viewed a program for at least six minutes in the week sampled -- each home being counted only once. The columns labeled "Average Households" refer to the average audience for any given minute of a program's airing during the week sampled. The whole numbers presented indicate the absolute number of television households (in thousands) while the numbers under the headings "Ratings" indicate the percentage of all U.S. television homes that those whole numbers represent. Thus, of the six LIVE FROM LINCOLN CENTERs for

which data is available, the average audience at any moment was 1,032,000 households, or 1.4% of the television households in the U.S. However, there were 2,213,000 households that watched at least six minutes of LINCOLN CENTER (or 3.0% of U.S. TV homes) in the sample weeks* It should be empnasized that these total audiences are for a single week only. If any of the programs were repeated in later seasons, they would presumably have attracted more viewing households which had not seen any part of the previous broadcasts.

The next section of the table presents the demographic information available concerning the limited number of programs in the series. The first column gives the number of programs upon which the averages are based. Since these numbers are so small, it is best to consider the series together and draw only general conclusions. It should also be kept in mind that the categories of occupation and amount of college refer only to the head of the viewing household, since it is not known from the metered households which make up the national sample exactly who in the household was watching.

Despite these caveats, the relative ratings for the pairs of demographic groupings yield rather unequivocal results. The audiences for all of the series are strongly upscale for education, occupation, and income. Of these three variables, the strongest determinant is occupation, followed by the crude measure of education (some college vs. no college) and family income. While these trends are generally in accord with those found in "Audience Studies of the Performing Arts and Museums" (DiMaggio et al, 1978), there are one or two points worth noting. DiMaggio indicated that among audiences for live performing arts, the proportion of the audience that had attended at least some college was almost invariably over 80%. Because only 26% of the U.S. population over the age of 24 has attended college (DiMaggio et al, 1978), the college-educated group in the TV audience would have to be twelve times as great as

*Note that this ratio of about two to one for total audience to average audience holds for most of the series examined. Such a ratio is strongly dependent on two key items, namely the length of the program and the size of the average audience. A long program allows more viewers the opportunity to tune in for a "sample," which increases the ratio. Programs with smaller average audiences also tend to have a higher proportion of "samplers" among the viewers and thus have relatively higher total audiences.

among non-college attendees for their proportions in the television audience to be in the same 4 to 1 ratio as for the live performances. The ratio for the television series examined here (see Table 3.9) is nowhere nearly that high, indicating that PITA-supported programs are reaching a much higher proportion of the non-college-educated population than do live performing arts events.

For occupation there is a somewhat similar situation. The DiMaggio study (1978) of live audiences shows that professional and managerial persons also made up over 80% of the live audiences, but closer to 40% of the population as a whole. Thus, the ratings for the two groups would have to be in about a 5 to 1 ratio for the same proportions to hold among television audiences. An upper limit for the programs examined here (see Table 3.9) would seem to be more like 3 to 1, again indicating that PITA-supported TV series draw a demographically wider audience than does the concert hall.

In the DiMaggio study, the median income fo the audiences for live performing arts was nearly $19,000--quite close to the breakpoint used in the television audience analysis. Thus, the fact that income level shows the least impact on viewing of these programs among the three indicators available is not too surprising. To sum up, while the average audiences for the programs under scrutiny are all sharply upscale, they are apparently less so than tne audiences for similar live production. Televising the arts does, in fact, extend the arts to a broader audience.

STUDIO SEE and Specials

Information on audience exposure to STUDIO SEE was taken from the "Report on PBS Programs" produced by the A.C. Nielsen Company.* The report indicates that during the month of May 1979, the program was carried by 92 public television

*The Public Broadcasting Service contracted with the A.C. Nielsen company to collect the NSI data that it had concerning 30 PBS programs in all markets during the May, 1979 ratings period (all U.S. markets are measured every November, February, and May). The resulting publication contained information about audiences for the programs in an average week in May on a national basis.

stations which enabled 64% of the U.S. television homes to receive it from a local channel. As can be seen from the table below, most of its audience was gathered on the weekend during daytime (defined as 7:00 am to 5:00 pm in Eastern and Pacific time zones and 7:00 am to 4:00 pm for Mountain and Central time zones). The remainder of the audience was captured primarily in weekday early fringe showings (defined as Monday-Friday from 4:30 to 7:30 pm in Eastern and Pacific time and one hour earlier in Central and Mountain time zones). The figures listed indicate the total number of viewers (or households) that watched at least one quarter hour of the program during the specified time period in an average week in the month of May, 1979.

TABLE 3.10

STUDIO SEE VIEWERSHIP

Time Period	Households (000's)	Teens (12-17) (000's)	Children (2-11) (000's)
Early fringe (Mon-Fri)	87	13	66
Weekend daytime	253	35	219
All telecasts	354	52	300

Very little audience size information is available about the television specials funded by PITA. On October 27, 1976, AMAZING GRACE was presented as part of the Great Performances series. National audience data indicate that it was carried by 217 public television stations covering 78% of all U.S. television homes. It had a total audience of 3,420,000 households (4.8 rating) and an average audience of 1,500,000 households for a 2.1 rating.

A GOOD DISSONANCE LIKE A MAN, a special on Charles Ives, was aired on October 11, 1977. In Chicago the program had a 1.3 estimated rating with 46,000 adults in 48,000 households making up the average audience. Local ratings information from Kansas City and Cleveland indicate that it was below minimum standards (i.e., the audience was too small to be reliably measured with Nielsen's methods) in both cities.

Two specials which aired in January of 1980 were MEMORIES OF EUBIE and CONVERSATIONS ABOUT THE DANCE. The overnight household ratings* for the two programs in the four metered markets were as follows:

	New York	Los Angeles	Chicago	San Francisco
MEMORIES OF EUBIE	2.3	0.9	2.7	3.3
CONVERSATIONS ABOUT THE DANCE	1.0	1.3	1.3	2.2

Cost of PITA Programs Per Viewer

On the basis of estimates of national audience ratings for these series and estimates of costs to produce these programs, it is possible to compute rough estimates of the cost of reaching individual viewers of these programs. These estimates should be viewed as approximations. They do not include the costs of promotion and, as has been suggested above, promotion plays a significant role in attracting audiences. These estimates also do not include the numbers of viewers who saw these programs when they were rebroadcast. By computing these figures from various indications of audience exposures, for some of the programs in a series, a range of costs per viewer has been estimated.

Table 3.11 presents a breakdown of audience and cost figures of the 1976 LIVE FROM LINCOLN CENTER programs. The audience size and budget figures were provided by Lincoln Center.

The total number of viewers for the six 1976 programs was 13,055,000. PITA awarded LIVE FROM LINCOLN CENTER $240,000 in 1976. Therefore, the cost per viewer to the Endowment for the 1976 season of this series was 2¢.

*In four markets (New York, Los Angeles, Chicago, and San Francisco), Nielsen maintains a year-round sample of about 400 households (in each of the cities) in which it has placed television audimeters (i.e., meters like those used with the national NTI sample discussed above). Thus, in these four markets household ratings information is available "overnight" to Nielsen clients. Since October, 1978, PBS has acquired the audience information for the public stations in the four "metered" markets.

TABLE 3.11

Cost Per Viewer of LIVE FROM LINCOLN CENTER

PROGRAM TITLE	NUMBER OF VIEWERS	NUMBER OF HOUSEHOLDS	COST OF PROGRAM	TOTAL COST PER VIEWER
American Ballet Theatre "Swan Lake"	4,799,000	3,620,000	$202,092	$ .04
Great Performers Series Andre Watts	559,000 (not broadcast in prime time)	430,000	$132,437	$ .24
New York Philharmonic Previn/Van Cliburn	1,846,000	1,420,000	$153,160	$ .08
New York Philharmonic Kubelik/Arrau	1,661,000	1,278,000	$163,050	$ .10
New York City Opera "Baby Doe"	1,421,000	1,093,800	$195,662	$ .14
New York City Opera "Barber of Seville"	2,769,000	2,130,000	$219,480	$ .08

An estimate of the cost for LIVE FROM THE MET can be computed on the basis of the average national ratings for the series presented on page 87. According to Table 3.9, an average broadcast reached 3,397,000 households; according to the Met, each broadcast cost about $375,000. Estimating the persons viewing per household as 1.3, the average number of viewers was 4,416,000 and the cost per viewer equals 8¢. Programming in the Arts' contribution to the series in 1979 was $150,000 making their cost per viewer equal to less than one cent. Similarly computed, the cost per viewer for DANCE IN AMERICA equals approximately 13¢, with the cost to PITA equal to 4¢. VISIONS programs cost 16¢ per viewer.

Such estimates should only be used with caution. While they might be used to compare the cost of one series to another, these figures do not reflect significant differences between series. By comparison with the cost for a ticket to live performances, the American public is clearly benefitting.

Indications of Audience Response

Though the Nielsen ratings have become a standard indicator of audience exposure to broadcast programming, they do little to illuminate the reaction of viewers to the content and quality of the programs. This information can be gathered from viewers in several ways: (1) Viewers may be asked directly to supply judgments and reactions to the program material; (2) Viewers may volunteer their opinions to the stations or producers or programs; and (3) Producers can invite a response from the viewers. Each of these methods have been used to elicit a reaction from viewers of programs supported by Programming in the Arts and the results are presented below.

In 1978 and again in 1979, the Corporation for Public Broadcasting commissioned surveys of known viewers of public television to learn what viewers thought of the national programming. These viewers were asked whether they were familiar with approximately 100 programs, and if so, how good they thought they were. The Public TV Qualitative ratings (PTVQ) for the programs funded by Programming in the Arts that were included in the CPB questionnaire are presented in Table 3.12. In general, the percent of people familiar with the programs was low, ranging from 7% to 21%, but the quality judgments by viewers were quite high. Programs receiving above-average quality ratings are noted on the Table. Of the ten programs included in the study, six were rated above average.

Occasionally a program will be tested before a sample of viewers to assess their response. The Corporation for Public Broadcasting commissioned such a study for the pilot program in MUSICAL COMEDY TONIGHT. The program was broadcast over KCTS, the public television station in Seattle, and received enough promotion to attract an audience. Two hundred households in Seattle were wired with tuners that allowed them to register their responses. The program surpassed the competition, "The Tony Awards" on commercial TV in quality ratings and showed a steady increase in positive responses as the program continued. The show was rated extremely favorably; 95% of the viewers reported that they would watch a series and 90% said that they were very interested in the show.

TABLE 3.12

Public Television Qualitative (PTVQ) Ratings

PROGRAM	TOTAL FAMILIAR		"ONE OF MY FAVORITES"		"VERY GOOD"		"Good"		"FAIR"		"POOR"	
	n	(%)	n	(%)	n	(%)	n	(%)	n	(%)	n	(%)
FIRST WAVE PTVQ RATINGS - November 1978 - 1208 viewers were interviewed												
VISIONS*	133	(11%)	23	(2%)	32	(3%)	53	(4%)	20	(2%)	3	(0)
LINCOLN CENTER "The Turk in Italy"	89	(7)	27	(2)	19	(2)	19	(2)	11	(1)	5	(0)
THE MET** "Bartered Bride"	128	(11)	50	(4)	46	(4)	22	(2)	8	(1)	1	(0)
SECOND WAVE PTVQ RATINGS - August, 1979 - 1075 viewers were interviewed												
LINCOLN CENTER "Sleeping** Beauty"	225	(21%)	95	(9)	73	(7)	35	(3)	20	(2)	4	(0)
DANCE IN AMERICA "Balanchine"**	210	(20)	66	(6)	68	(6)	62	(6)	14	(1)	0	(0)
LINCOLN CENTER "Pavarotti** and Sutherland"	129	(12)	51	(5)	43	(4)	19	(2)	13	(1)	4	(0)
VANESSA**	77	(7)	28	(3)	17	(2)	22	(2)	10	(1)	-	
LINCOLN CENTER "Mehta &** Perlman"	135	(13)	73	(7)	34	(3)	14	(1)	14	(1)	-	
STUDIO SEE	120	(11)	25	(2)	30	(3)	32	(3)	29	(3)	3	(0)
VISIONS*	97	(9)	11	(1)	21	(2)	51	(5)	10	(1)	3	(0)

*The study did not differentiate individual programs within VISIONS.

**These programs received above average qualitative ratings. The PTVQ is computed by dividing the number of people who say "One of my favorites" by the number of people familiar with the program.

There have been relatively few attempts on the part of individual public television stations or the Public Broadcasting Service (PBS) to keep track of the audience's response to programs. When viewers write or call their local stations an effort is made to respond for information, to answer complaints and to acknowledge praise but the distribution of responses is rarely tabulated. For a few years PBS did send a monthly summary of the mail they received to approximately twenty PBS stations but that service was suspended in late 1977. Letters concerning specific programs are forwarded to the producers; rarely are there very many.

The letter response received by PBS during one year, between November, 1976 and November, 1977 for three series, DANCE IN AMERICA, VISIONS, and LIVE FROM LINCOLN CENTER, was reviewed. Of the 17 letters concerning LINCOLN CENTER, 100% were positive; of the 50 letters concerning VISIONS, 92% were positive; and all of the 6 letters received at PBS concerning DANCE IN AMERICA were positive.

In June, 1979, WNET started an in-house information service which keeps track of the phone calls received from viewers. The Information Services department at WNET prepared the following summary of phone calls received from viewers concerning the programs that were supported by "Programming in the Arts" as of January 20, 1980 (see Table 3.13). The majority of callers were requesting scheduling information. Members of the audience who expressed an opinion of the programs were all positively disposed.

TABLE 3.13

Phone Calls Concerning PITA Programs

	Calls	Type of Calls
DANCE IN AMERICA		
Choreography By Balanchine	55	Positive comment, Questions about Airtime, Questions requiring research
General	13	Airtime & Research
	68	
LIVE FROM LINCOLN CENTER		
General	55	Airtime
Giselle	1	Requests that program be repeated
Mehta-Gilels	27	Airtime & Requests for repeat
Pavarotti	339	" "
Sutherland-Horne	184	
	606	
LIVE FROM THE MET		
Un Ballo in Maschera	13	Airtime & Requests for repeat
General	27	" "
Mahogonny	10	Positive comments, Airtime & Requests for repeat
Otello	197	Positive comments, Airtime & Requests for repeat
Tosca	1	Request for repeat
	248	
MEDIA PROBES	16	Airtime
MEMORIES OF EUBIE	128	Positive comments, Requests for repeat & Opposed to pre-emption
MUSICAL COMEDY TONIGHT	44	Airtime & Requests for repeat
CONVERSATIONS ABOUT DANCE	2	Airtime
VISIONS	41	Repeat: wrong episode shown
WOMEN IN ART	10	Airtime & Requests for repeat

A third method for assessing audience reaction to the programs has been employed by the Metropolitan Opera Guild for LIVE FROM THE MET. Companies appearing on LIVE FROM LINCOLN CENTER now make use of the same technique. The broadcast program contains an offering to the viewing public of a playbill or magazine about the program they have watched on television. When audience members write in for the program, the arts organizations have an indication of the intensity of the response of audience members. The number of cards from viewers in response to a concert or performance has ranged from a low of 1584 for the Chamber Music Concert to 73,000 for the American Ballet Theatre. The names of people who write in are added to the organization's mailing list. The intensity of appreciation is further tested when the organization later solicits donations, memberships and other outlays of money from this expanded mailing list. Thus far, the response rate for new memberships has ranged between 1% and 4% per program, a respectable showing for a direct mail solicitation.

The response of viewers to the original offering does not correlate with the ratings for the different programs and therefore should not be taken as a precise measure of audience preferences. The design of the stagebill or magazine being offered and the placement of the offer within the broadcast seems to predict viewer requests more accurately than do audience ratings.

Alternative Distribution Channels

Rights

Media projects that have been recorded for broadcasting can theoretically be distributed through several non-broadcast channels. In practice, however, contractual agreements concerning ancilliary rights have complicated, and thus far inhibited, much secondary distribution of programs supported by PITA.

When contracts for media projects are drawn up, the producers must negotiate with all involved parties for the right to distribute the program or film. Many of the programs funded under Programming in the Arts have drawn on the craft

and talents of a wide range of participants, all of whom deserve some payment whenever the program is distributed. Salaries and fees are usually set by the relevant unions but so many of the PITA-funded projects have broken new ground that remuneration standards are yet to be established. Negotiations with unions such as the American Federation of Musicians, the Writer's Guild of America, the Director's Guild of America, the American Federation of Television and Radio Actors (AFTRA), the Screen Actors Guild (SAG), the International Alliance of Theatrical Stage Employees (IATSE), the National Association of Broadcast Employees and Technicians (NABET) and the International Bureau of Electrical Workers are typically required before any of the projects can be distributed. Union affiliation varies by producing station as well as by project. Agreements for secondary distribution are further impeded when several funders demand some payback for their initial grant support.*

When funds are granted to a media project by PITA, no rights are retained by the National Endowment for the Arts. Grant recipients are not asked to reimburse the Endowment for the Arts, even if a large profit is subsequently generated by the work. Few of the participants interviewed in this study had cleared profits from their work. As new markets for media products open up, however, these ventures may prove more profitable and the conflict over ownership, rights and remuneration for initial funding threatens to increase.

Corporate funders and most foundations do not now make claims on the future earnings of projects they have supported and will probably not do so in the near future. The Corporation for Public Broadcasting and the public television stations generally hold a different position. Until most recently, when CPB participated in the funding of a program or series, it expected to receive 50% of the earnings regardless of the proportion of funds it had provided. This policy, according to several independent producers and representatives of media organizations, has made co-production extremely difficult. When several funders each demand 50% of the earnings, there are not enough monies to reimburse all parties. Although CPB has become more flexible of late, it will continue to demand a portion of the added income derived from non-broadcast and international broadcast distribution of projects it has funded.

*In the past, the National Endowment for the Humanities and the Corporation for Public Broadcasting have expected repayment after a project became profitable.

CPB is in the midst of a re-organization which will result in a two-fold relationship with television. A Program Fund will finance programming for television and an Office of TV Activities will, among other things, coordinate and consolidate efforts to sell programs to other countries on behalf of the public television stations. In return for this service, and in return for the initial funding of programs, CPB expects to receive a share of the profits.

Public television stations are also asking for some repayment of their investments. When stations produce programs, they generally hold all of the rights and rewards that are not shared with other funders. When the programs are produced by independent sources and are purchased by the public broadcasting system, broadcast rights are negotiated for a limited period of time. Currently, when the stations fund a program or series through the Station Program Cooperative (SPC), they receive certain broadcast rights to the program and no other rights. A few media respondents suggested that stations funding programs through the SPC are apt to grow more contentious. They too will begin to demand a share of the earnings generated by the additional distribution of programs through cable, cassette and video disk that were produced with their support.

When stations are funded to produce programs, they negotiate with the talent and crafts for as many distribution rights as they can foresee using. In addition to domestic broadcast rights, they often negotiate for audio-visual rights, foreign distribution, and all others.

Audio-visual rights generally apply to the distribution of films or tapes to schools, libraries, and other places of exhibition. As the financial resources of these institutions are diminishing, so are the returns to producers from these sources. DANCE IN AMERICA and WOMEN IN ART are both available to schools and libraries, with much of the profit returning to the station. WNET holds the rights for audio-visual distribution of WOMEN IN ART whereas the rights to programs produced for DANCE IN AMERICA were negotiated individually with each of the dance companies.

LIVE FROM THE MET and LIVE FROM LINCOLN CENTER have not been available to the public except through broadcast distribution. Plans are underway to release LIVE FROM THE MET for archival purposes.

The New Technologies

New, lucrative, non-broadcast markets are expected to develop around the home video consumer. Many plans and projects are in development concerning video cassette, video disk, and cable distribution of media arts projects but all of the pieces are not yet in place.

There are still very few video cassette recorders or playback machines in the hands of the consumer, even though a home machine has been available since 1966. The high price of these machines and the incompatibility of different machines and cassettes have inhibited the growth of this market thus far. The video disk is only now being test-marketed in three geographic markets at present. The high quality sound and low price of the disk hold much promise for the future of media arts programming.

Numerous communication companies are in the process of accumulating inventories of video programming. These companies have expressed an interest in acquiring several of the programs produced with support from PITA, but negotiations are still under way. The cost of repayment of artists and craftsmen is high and an equitable price for the rights to additional distribution has not been standardized.

In the 1980's, a system for the production and distribution of video programs will undoubtedly emerge. At this time, no one is certain of the shape it will take and who will be playing which roles. The public television stations with production facilities are considering the possibility of moving in to distribution to non-broadcast markets themselves, but the costs of mounting a sales operation have yet to be reckoned with. RCA (SelectaVision), Time-Life, Warner's Communications (Home Video Inc.), MCA (DiscoVision), and ABC Video Enterprises Cassettes are all positioning themselves in the market and express an interest in arts programming in the future. The first cultural entries will probably be theatrical ones as ABC has negotiated an arrangement with the Shuberts for cassettes of Broadway shows and discussions have been underway between cable companies and producers of dramatic programming.*

*Home Box Office, for example, has been talking to Joseph Papp of the NY Public Theatre.

The cable market is another potential distribution channel and source of income for the producers and talent of arts programming. Commercial cable systems and pay-TV services now reach approximately 20% of the potential television households. This amounts to approximately 15 million homes. Market studies conducted by pay-TV companies indicate that the audience for "cultural" programming is not yet as high as it is for sports or first-run movies, but the concept of an arts or cultural channel is quite active and many "discussions" are on-going between producers of programming and the media companies.

In Canada, for example, a Toronto-based company called Lively Arts Market Builders (LAMB) hopes to start a limited cable service in the spring, 1981, to cablecast international ballet, opera and music to subscribers in Canada and possibly the United States. If LAMB receives approval from the Canadian Radio and Television and Telecommunications Commission, $5.5 million will be spent on programming in the first year with 75% earmarked for Canadian productions.

In May, 1980, the Carnegie Commission in New York unveiled a plan for PACE: Performing Arts Culture and Entertainment,* a full-scale cultural cable channel to be operated by a non-profit organization independently of both PBS and cable system operators. With a total first-year budget of $23.3 million, PACE would offer 210 hours per month of arts-oriented programming. According to Carnegie projections, PACE could break even with 750,000 subscribers at $9 per month each, an audience size expected to be achieved within four years.

For the time being, cable companies and pay-TV are still trying to attract new consumers. Therefore, although they will eventually be able to offer programming with a narrower appeal than commercial broadcast television and still make a profit, currently they are still in the business of attracting large audiences. When cable companies do show cultural programs, generally about 45-55% of the possible audience watches. According to one spokesman for Home Box Office, the audience that is interested in cultural programming is willing to pay a high price for it.

*See Keeping PACE with the New Television, by Sheila Mahoney, Nick De Martino and Robert Stengel, VNU Books International, New York, 1980.

Program producers and cable program distributors are now discussing the possibilities of co-production. In return for money up-front which would support the actual production of programs, the cable service would get the rights to run the programs exclusively for a few months before they were broadcast over public television. Such arrangements have been proposed by KCET to Home Box Office for the production and distribution of MUSICAL COMEDY TONIGHT.

Representatives of many of the arts organizations that were interviewed for this study expressed a willingness to become involved in media projects that would be distributed through alternative channels. In most cases they were not actively pursuing the possibilities. Those who expressed interest had the expectation that the media organizations would initiate such projects. A few exceptions were found among the largest arts organizations such as the Met and Lincoln Center. These organizations have not only been featured on the series, but have produced them and retained control of the secondary distribution rights. Tapes of the programs that have been broadcast remain in their possession and will eventually comprise an impressive library of performing arts programming. These organizations are actively pursuing the opportunities for cable, video cassette, and video disk distribution. As one representative said:

> We're putting ourselves out in the marketplace to see who is going to come up with the most money, and probably will end up in all forms because it's going to be a while before anybody knows which will succeed.

Several people mentioned the prospect of an arts service in which satellite time would be used to transmit arts programming to various cable companies around the country. Although none of the arrangements have been formalized, informed parties suggested that such a service might begin operations within the next year. The service would pay suppliers for the exclusive cable rights for programs. Individual producers, arts organizations, television stations, and the Endowments are being approached as potential suppliers of arts programming for the service.

Foreign Markets: An International Audience

Over the past few years, independently-produced American films have begun to find a market in foreign broadcasting. Programs produced with PITA support are no exception. Rights to the films produced by independents as part of VISIONS have been re-negotiated to allow the filmmakers to distribute them here and abroad. Several of these films ran over budget and the individual filmmakers were forced into debt to complete their projects. By granting them the rights to distribute these films themselves, KCET, NEA and CPB are enabling the filmmakers to re-coup some of their losses. As of September, 1979, three of these films had earned the following amounts from theatrical and broadcast distribution in foreign countries:

"Over Under Sideways Down"	$ 26,600
"Gardener's Son"	17,000
"Alambrista"	203,000

Individual programs within the DANCE IN AMERICA series have also been sold to foreign broadcasters and the British Broadcasting Corporation (BBC) has acquired some programs from the EARPLAY series. Most recently, the Metropolitan Opera Association has arranged to broadcast operas internationally via satellite. The broadcast of "Manon Lescaut" occurred on March 29, 1980. Originating from the Metropolitan Opera House in New York City, it was received live by audiences in six countries and arrangements for broadcast have been made with 12 other nations. A tape of the performance will be shown as part of LIVE FROM THE MET in the fall of 1980.

Now that the foreign markets have been explored for films and programs produced in the United States, several public television stations and independent filmmakers have begun to look abroad for production funds. Co-production with foreign investors will ideally increase the pool of resources for the start-up of projects while also expanding the potential audience for these media arts projects to an international scope.

Chapter 4

IMPACT ON THE MEDIA

Broadcasters represent the largest single category of recipients of Programming in the Arts funds (See Table 1.3, page 12), accounting for approximately 63% of the monies granted under this funding category. In this chapter, the impact of Programming in the Arts (PITA) support on the media is discussed. The media here include the public television and radio stations receiving funds from PITA, as well as broadcasting stations affiliated with the Public Broadcasting Service (PBS) or National Public Radio (NPR) who have received no funds from PITA. The impacts on PBS, CPB, NPR and the commercial media are also presented. The impact of support on independent filmmakers and video artists are included in Chapter 5 which examines the impact on participants. Four types of impacts on the media have been found to result from PITA support. These are 1) financial impacts; 2) technological impacts; 3) production impacts; and 4) programming impacts.

The major findings discussed in Chapter 4 are:

- The majority of PITA funds (63%) directly support public broadcasters.
- PITA funding attracts additional funds to projects by lending credibility and by requiring matching funds.
- PITA projects have been used effectively during fundraising drives for public broadcasting.
- Arts programming supported by PITA has attracted audiences for public broadcasting.
- Producing stations have increased their revenues through the sale and rental of PITA programs.
- Technical innovations which were developed for LIVE FROM LINCOLN CENTER have been adopted for the presentation of live performances by public broadcasters and commercial broadcasters.
- Additional arts programming is currently being developed by public broadcasters for local audiences and by commercial television for national broadcast and cable audiences.
- Public broadcasters outside New York City note a shortage of trained and experienced media arts production personnel.

Financial Impacts on the Media

The most obvious financial impact has been felt by public broadcasting stations. Support of media projects by PITA represents a significant influx of funds for the public broadcasting system. Since 1972, one station, WNET in New York has received a total of $3.6 million while KCET in Los Angeles has received $2.8 million. Numerous other public television stations have also received funding. Public radio producers of EARPLAY have received a total of $877,500 during this period. Since these funds must be matched, the actual amount of dollars drawn into the system as a result of PITA grants is, in fact, much higher.

Public broadcasting stations are continually searching for funds. Production and operating costs are covered by support from four sources: Memberships and subscriptions from the public; corporate underwriting; foundations; and the government through the Endowment, CPB, and other agencies. Although other programs within the Endowment award funds to arts institutions for their operations, PITA has not given grants to media organizations that apply directly to operating costs. However, when a station receives a grant for production, some portion of those monies will cover the station overhead. In addition to salaries for the talent and producers for the program, these funds provide for the administrative and technical staff needed to run a broadcast operation.

These grants also have an economic impact on the media organizations that are not the direct recipients of the funds. Programs produced with support from PITA are considered to be of extremely high quality by the majority of people interviewed for this study. Several station managers reported that they would not be able to afford programs of comparable quality without the support that the Endowment provides. Each fully-funded program introduced through PBS is theoretically available to member stations at no additional cost. Though the Endowment has only partially supported these programs, its involvement has attracted other funders and many of these series are fully-funded. Each hour of programming supplied to the

system in this way is one less hour the stations have to produce or buy. Between DANCE IN AMERICA, LIVE FROM LINCOLN CENTER, LIVE FROM THE MET, and VISIONS, 107 hours of television programming have been made available to public television since January, 1976.*

Fundraising

A significant amount of income for public broadcasting is raised during pledge periods. Most stations make major fundraising appeals three times each year (in March, August and December). The largest of these is a nationally coordinated pledge festival held in March. PBS, in conjunction with station programmers, offers a schedule of programs to the stations which is deemed to be highly popular and potentially profitable. After the March Festival, PBS collects reports from the stations detailing the amount of funds raised around and during each program. PBS then makes the national figures for each program available. Several programs funded by PITA have been scheduled during these fundraising drives in the past and have done quite well. Below are figures provided by PBS on these programs.

LIVE FROM THE MET: "Don Giovanni" was part of Festival '78. The total raised around and during the broadcast was $411,000, with 89 out of 108 stations reporting. PBS reports that the average individual gifts were above the median for the Festival; the money raised per break was also above the median for the Festival.

DANCE IN AMERICA: "Balanchine Part IV" was broadcast during Festival '79. It raised $213,000, with 102 stations out of 118 reporting. The average pledge was $34.24, whereas the average pledge for the whole Festival was $31.69. Balanchine IV also generated above-average dollars per minute.

"Georgia O'Keeffe", one film from the WOMEN IN ART series, was rerun as a special during Festival '78. It raised $28,707 which was higher than the Festival median in terms of both dollars per pledge and dollars per break, but lower than the median in dollars per minute.

*This number does not include repeats of the programs. Stations have the right to rebroadcast DANCE IN AMERICA and VISIONS at their own discretion until they have used up their four releases in three years. No estimate of the number of hours these programs have been aired is available.

Station managers generally appreciate the performing arts programs for fundraising purposes:

> The opera did very, very well for our station. They are always good money raisers. LIVE FROM THE MET, LIVE FROM LINCOLN CENTER; they all do real well.

Radio broadcasters expressed enthusiasm for the fundraising opportunities of simulcasts.

> Most of these shows have been, if they've run during fundraising periods, very good fundraisers.

However, there are some qualifications. One programmer said:

> The ones that have the most fundraising potential, you don't have control of, and those are the LIVE FROM LINCOLN CENTER, and the LIVE FROM THE MET. We would like to have those as fundraisers, but only with the hot talent. It's one thing to have 'Don Giovanni' or 'Tosca' and it's quite another to have "The Rise and Fall of Mahagonny," which we wouldn't fundraise around.

There has also been some conflict between the arts institutions and the media organizations concerning fundraising around these programs. The media and the arts both regard the broadcast as an opportunity to appeal to the public for financial contributions. Each sees the other as competition for the same dollars. As a representative from one arts organization stated:

> I object mightily to PBS having all their stations in such a tight spot that they'll do all these things about the arts, but then all they'll do is raise funds for themselves. There is a big program about the Met, and instead of saying support your local opera company, or even support the Met at this point, they come on and say, help your local Channel 13. I don't blame the local man, cause survival is important and maybe he is out there to get the biggest pot of money in the world, and get the best paid staff and the best equipment. I don't know what his reasons are, all I'm saying is that it's unfair to exploit us and not support us.
> (Seattle WA)

Building Audiences

The use of performing arts programs to raise funds during pledge weeks underscores yet another indirect financial impact on the media: building audiences.

A PBS official observed about the beginnings of DANCE IN AMERICA,

> The fact is that both ABT and the ALVIN AILEY programs were highly successful in terms of production and in terms of the audience that we got back in public television from it. They were really major size audiences for us at a time when we were just beginning to find a presence in the public's consciousness.

The buildng of audiences through recurrent program series is financially important for local stations since regular viewers often become station contributors.

A recent survey of attitudes toward public television, conducted for the Public Broadcasting Service (Peter D. Hart Research Associates, 1979) gives some indication of the contribution made by performing arts programming, much of it supported in part by PITA. When asked to describe public television, 17% of a random sample of respondents volunteered that it offered performing arts and cultural programming such as opera, dance, plays, classics and concerts. The most frequent response (34%), when asked the best reason for having a public television system at all, was:

> Public television makes cultural programming like concerts and plays available to people who might not be able to see them in person.

Public television shows are considered "in good taste" by 78% of the respondents whereas only 13% could say the same of commercial television. The study found that Great Performances (which includes LIVE FROM LINCOLN CENTER and DANCE IN AMERICA) was the most popular cultural programming with 11% of the respondents claiming to be regular viewers and 14% occasional viewers.

Income from Secondary Sales

Another direct financial impact of PITA funds on producing stations is the possibility of secondary sales of films and/or video-cassettes of programs to schools and libraries, theatres and foreign broadcasters. As noted in Chapter 3, secondary distribution is constrained by the types of rights negotiated in original contracts and each project is unique. In the past, projects which had received funding from the Corporation for Public Broadcasting were required to "re-pay" CPB the original grant if revenues accrued through secondary distribution. As a funder, the Endowment has made no such restrictions.

To date, four of the six major PBS series funded by the Endowment have seen some kind of secondary distribution.* WNET's WOMEN IN ART is in audio-visual distribution and some of the VISIONS made outside KCET are in theatrical distribution here and abroad. Individual programs in the DANCE IN AMERICA series and in EARPLAY have also been purchased for broadcast in Europe.

The contractual arrangements for the WOMEN IN ART series made WNET sole owner of the films; the filmmakers receive no additional remuneration for distribution contracted by WNET since completion of the television series. WNET has made an arrangement with Films, Inc. for handling film and video-cassette rentals and sales. Below are the total funds received from the sale of films and videocassettes of WOMEN IN ART as of January, 1980. (The programs are sold individually.)

Videocassettes:		16 mm films:	
Duplication fees:	$ 2,154	O'Keeffe	$ 134,000
O'Keeffe	10,200	Cassatt	42,750
Cassatt	3,000	Anonymous	23,000
Anonymous	2,000	Nevelson	26,000
Nevelson	2,500	Frankenthaler	23,700
Frankenthaler	2,500	Saar	19,600
Spirit	2,700		$ 269,050
Whole series	2,500		
	$ 27,554		

*The ancilliary rights for LIVE FROM LINCOLN CENTER and LIVE FROM THE MET have not yet been negotiated.

The total for all sales is $296, 604. WNET's share of this is $67,262.50 for film sales and $6,888.50 for videocassette sales, a total of $74,151.

The income derived by independent filmmakers for foreign distribution of some films produced for VISIONS may be found in Chapter 3, page 103.

Corporate and Foundation Support

Another impact of the support granted by PITA is felt as the station attempts t' raise additional funds for the production. Most public broadcasters agree that a grant from the Endowment has made it easier to attract funds from other sources. For projects PITA has supported, fundraising is enhanced in at least two ways. The fact that PITA has funded a portion of the program's budget makes the project a "bargain" for other funders who can underwrite a program for less money. Funding by the Endowment also provides credibility for funders with less expertise in the arts.

> I think if NEA were involved in it, even on a matching funds basis, we'd have a greater likelihood of success of getting the other match.
> (San Francisco CA)

> It's importance is that it's more of an endorsement for other funders than it is the money ... In many cases, simply the NEA name being associated with this is enough. (New York NY)

> There have been times when the endorsement of the NEA has acted as a kind of stepping wedge into getting other funding because it was a seal of approval ... it probably gets a more serious evaluation by other funders.
> (Boston MA)

> For one series that we just got money from Exxon ... they refused to do it without an endorsement from NEA.
> (Columbia SC)

> It's a credit, it's of definitely big value. Three reasons. One is that I think that people believe that NEA to some degree ... is essentially interested in a non-political way in supporting the arts. And secondly, it helps somebody in a corporate level who's not really an expert in the area feel that NEA has people a little more expert. Thirdly, it's a bargain. I'm putting up three hundred to get six hundred thousand and NEA doesn't take away any of my credit. They add to it. (Los Angeles CA)

Drama series and independently produced films have proved exceptions to this pattern. EARPLAY has been unsuccessful in attracting funders other than the Endowment and CPB; VISIONS was never successful in attracting new funders to the project and CPB withdrew its support before the series was completed. Since drama frequently deals with controversial subjects, it is generally regarded as a more risky proposition by corporate funders.

Technological Impacts

PITA provided part of the funding for Lincoln Center to develop the technology required to broadcast high quality live performances. By using cameras and lenses which require only low-level lights, neither the performers nor the audience is disturbed during the broadcast at a live event. Another technological innovation which Lincoln Center pioneered was the use of radio simulcasts. Both of these techniques have had an impact on public broadcasting through the programs they have made possible as well as through the technological capability now available to others. LIVE FROM THE MET uses both as did KCET's 1980 production of "La Giaconda" with the San Francisco Opera. Many stations have plans for similar live productions locally and potentially for national broadcasting. NBC's use of simulcast with Live from Studio 8H is an example from the commercial media.

Production Impacts

The continuous funding of the performing arts programs provided by PITA enables production personnel to work with one form of programming over several years rather than on a one-time basis. It has allowed for experimentation with new production techniques which have influenced the production approach to the performing arts used by others. For example, the use of English language subtitles on LIVE FROM THE MET have been used for "La Giaconda" from San Francisco and "Faust" from Chicago.

Programming Impacts

Scheduling

Public broadcasters like arts programming. "Cultural and arts programming is the backbone of public broadcasting," commented one. Quarterly surveys of public television station managers conducted by the Communication Research Department of PBS indicate that LIVE FROM THE MET, LIVE FROM LINCOLN CENTER and DANCE IN AMERICA are rated well above the median of public television programs for their importance to local schedules. AMAZING GRACE was also rated above the median. VISIONS and WOMEN IN ART were rated on the median for this item. Only two of the PITA-funded programs rated during the seven quarters fell below the median in terms of their importance to local schedules. These were A GOOD DISSONANCE LIKE A MAN and STUDIO SEE.

The PBS quarterly reports note that of all programs considered, those that were part of a series fared best. These were usually public affairs and science series. PBS considers Great Performances a series, but interviews with broadcasters suggest that it is too diverse a potpourri to attract a regular, recurring audience.

Many of the program schedulers interviewed in this study felt there was currently more programming available than they could use. This affects the selection and placement of programs currently funded through PITA and future programming. Public television's need to attract and build audiences is a continuing theme in programming discussions:

> We have more programming than we know what to do with, good programming, too. And then we get three hours from Lincoln Center and it tears you apart, and your audience leaves you. And then again some nights, the Vienna Opera or something, is just stunning. I think, sometimes, well, LIVE FROM LINCOLN CENTER has a kind of undisciplined length that has hurt.
> (Chicago, IL)

LIVE FROM LINCOLN CENTER. I really am biased against that program and I haven't gone into it enough. I think LIVE FROM LINCOLN CENTER gets a fairly good audience, but when you look at the cumulative audience it gets against the cumulative audience you get with programs that are repeated, and the costs that have been paid, it is far less. I think it's a luxury that we really haven't analyzed very well ... MUSICAL COMEDY TONIGHT gets bigger ratings than LIVE FROM LINCOLN CENTER, and we have three more releases for that that don't cost any money.
(Los Angeles, CA)

There is a glut of programming at this point. There really isn't need for quantity any more. We have a lot of first run material and a sense of programming, both in the arts and all other areas. Our needs are for an upgrade of quality and so when we get something of quality from something of less quality, whatever quality means... we decide if and how to run it.
(San Francisco, CA)

There's too much programming right now. For example, I would love to buy Dr. Who, but where the blazes am I going to put it? If somebody is going to produce something that fits into a nicely created slot called Great Performances, even if its symphony, that's fine. But other than that, when you're talking about something like a half hour arts magazine, it's very difficult to see where PBS is going to slot that.
(Cleveland, OH)

Generating New Programming

Since the 1976 premieres of LIVE FROM LINCOLN CENTER and DANCE IN AMERICA, there has been an increasing interest and activity in performing arts programming among broadcasters. Performance from Wolftrap, Soundstage, Kaleidoscope and others have all found an audience on public television. On radio, Masterpiece Radio Theatre premiered in 1979. As noted above, some public broadcasters are beginning to feel a surfeit of programming in the arts.

It is difficult to ascertain precisely the desgree to which PITA-funded media projects have acted as a catalyst for these new projects. It is clear that many of the programs use technological and production techniques first displayed on LIVE FROM ... and DANCE IN AMERICA series.

Local Arts Programming

Public broadcasters in most of the twelve cities included in the present study are doing some local arts programming. Table 4.1 presents a sample of public radio and television programming in the arts produced locally.

There is some concern among both broadcasters and arts organizations that local public television stations lack personnel and expertise to produce professional and polished television programs. As one arts representative complained, "They have this local TV look." Many stations import experienced performing arts producers from New York or Los Angeles when they plan a major arts project. A need exists for more training in the producing of performing arts in the media. One mid-Western producer suggested:

> We need to get people from WNET and the Media Development Program at Lincoln Center to share that stuff ... we need to get people from the Center out training. They don't know anything except in New York City ... but by virtue of the fact they are as big as they are, I sure hope they'll come and help the rest of us develop it.

An executive at a major producing station suggested:

> ... I think there is a great deal of material out there that could be put on television but most of the small stations and independent producers and filmmakers are not capable of doing it by themselves. I think that one of the things that NEA could help organize would be essentially a kind of team or task force from WNET or KCET that could go in and assist those stations in helping to raise the quality of the production. The effect of that would be that you have left behind a whole group of people who have been better trained, better able to do it for themselves next time.
> (Los Angeles CA)

Even when the quality of local productions is top-notch and the program of national significance, programs often cannot be seen in other markets or over PBS because the producing station cannot raise the funds required to upgrade the writing, music and other rights from local to national levels. The Corporation for Public Broadcasting has had about $100,000 per year

Table 4.1

Local Public Broadcasts in the Arts*

City	Local Programs
Seattle	Stepping Out, weekly arts magazine (television) "Cellar George," black drama (television) "The Story of Cinderella," Vancouver opera (television)
Los Angeles	Aman Folk Dance Company, (television, 1977)
San Francisco	Joan Baez concert (television, 1978) "Sing It Yourself Messiah," live from Opera House Open Studio (access for minority performing arts) Radio drama with Bay area writers (radio)
Columbia	Drama by southern writers (television) Debut about young artists (television) Musiacs (radio)
Minneapolis	Prairie Home Companion (radio, 1977) Artists Showcase (radio) Wild Rice, weekly TV arts magazine "Gilbert Sullivan, Strauss and Friends" (Minnesota Opera Co.) (television) "Encounter with Artists" (television) "Good-by, Stanislaus Kobicheski" (television) University of Chicago Folk Festivals (radio) Chamber Music performances (radio) In Concert (radio) Music in Chicago (radio)
Boston	Mostly national productions Artists Showcase (television)
Atlanta	"Anywhat," weekly arts magazine (television, 1977) Atlanta Symphony Orchestra (radio) Atlanta Music Scene (radio)
Kansas City	Kansas City Opera (radio) Jazz Festival (radio)
Cleveland	Cleveland Orchestra Concert (radio) Cleveland Orchestra Pops (radio)

*Date of origination is included where available.

available to PBS stations for this purpose. This is an insufficient amount to upgrade the rights to more than a very few programs each year..

The New York-Washington Connection

There is strong resentment among public broadcasters located at some of the larger public broadcasting stations outside New York City. They feel they do not have an "inside track" at the Endowment. They use this factor to explain why a more national picture of the performing arts does not appear on the public television screen.

> In general, the West has not gotten its proportionate share of any of the Endowment's monies...Public television stations on the East Coast find it easier to get to Washington and talk over projects -- lay the groundwork -- than it is for us.
>
> (Los Angeles, CA)

> From the perspective of a station producer, other than WNET, it's kind of disturbing that we don't have the same cachet to bring in the kind of money that's needed to produce this sort of thing...It's not even different people, it's just our city and our ballet company...The Met and Lincoln Center are not the only places where American culture at its highest levels exists.
>
> (San Francisco, CA)

Future Public Broadcast Plans in the Arts

Recent changes in the leadership and organization of national public broadcasting agencies have consequences for the future of arts programming. Although the plans and options developed by these agencies are modified with some frequency; their leaders recognize that coordination of activities and funding priorities across organizations will most likely be required if the accomplishments of arts programming in the past are to be rivaled in the future.

In March, 1980, Lewis Freedman, as the new head of the Program Fund at the Corporation for Public Broadcasting, presented a statement of "Program

Fund Priorities and Procedures." The priorities neither limit nor specify plans for arts programming, but two arts-related projects are currently under development. First, CPB is preparing to make a major commitment to support a new drama series for public television. In cooperation with other funding agencies, such as the National Endowment for the Arts, CPB plans to initiate a series of new and/or established dramatic programs. Funding for individual productions will be available to producers and writers. The second initiative under consideration by the Cultural Programs area of the Program Fund is a series of feature-length films. Design of this project is still in the earliest stages but the films are expected to be predominantly dramatic rather than documentary.

In addition to these projects which are specifically culture-oriented, the Program Fund has issued two invitations for program proposals. Proposals for programs on "Matters of Life or Death" and "Crisis to Crisis -- Issue-Oriented Programs" might also result in arts programming.

The Public Broadcasting Service inaugurated its common carriage schedule in the fall of 1979 and is presently developing three streams of programming. These are:

PTV I: universally carried material including common carriage and high impact children's programs for prime time broadcasts;

PTV II: regional ad hoc station groups, including targetted programs; low purchase Station Program Cooperative programs; live events, avant-garde programs, and re-runs of PTV1; and

PTV III: educational and children's programs except those of high impact.

Arts and culture programs will be included in each of these categories but arts programs produced for PTV1 and aired in prime time are likely to receive the broadest exposure.

At local stations, there is a great deal of discussion about future arts projects. Most of the stations are considering arts projects and many plan to approach the Endowment in the near future with their proposals. Most of these are therefore confidential at the present time. Generally, the ideas apply the live performance concept to major companies outside New York City. Arts magazines are produced locally with some success and there is considerable

interest among some stations in a national arts magazine for broadcast on either public television or public radio.

WNET and Exxon are planning an alternate format for performing arts on television. DANCE IN AMERICA has, to a large degree, fulfilled its early promises and the production staff is looking toward new challenges.

Spill-Over: Affecting the Commercial Media

Representatives of the commercial networks were somewhat reluctant to speak openly about their future plans. NBC has the most ambitious plans in this area, having inaugurated Live from Studio 8H in January, 1980, with plans for intermittent live, studio specials in the various arts. NBC has also begun a series of live repertory theatre performances; the first production is "The Oldest Living Graduate." NBC officials deny that their concept and planning has been influenced by public broadcasting's success with the arts. "Not at all...minimal influence, if any," is their response. Others outside the commercial media disagree: "8H...wouldn't have happened if there hadn't been LIVE FROM LINCOLN CENTER." Live from Studio 8H does use the "live" concept, the simulcast approach and the superstar performers who were first telecast on public broadcasting.

The plans of the other commercial networks are unclear. Intermittent specials appear to be the approach; the relatively low ratings of Live from Studio 8H (5.5 rating, 9 share) by commercial standards may have re-confirmed their suspicions that arts on television are not economically viable unless altered for the mass audience. ABC presented "Baryshnikov on Broadway" in the spring, 1980, but as one performing arts producer noted: "Here's the difference between public television and commercial...ABC is going to do snippets of shows, 'Baryshnikov on Broadway.' They're not going to take him and put him in one long performance which is what he does. I think he's worth three hours." (New York, NY) ABC has also recently revived Omnibus.

In the field of radio drama, CBS has attempted to revive regular weekday evening dramas with Sears Radio Theatre. CBS Mystery Theatre is another entry into the commercial radio drama field which has been scheduled less frequently. One radio expert in Washington, DC, says:

> Radio drama has in the past few years had a "rebirth" although in total, it has been very minimal. It's tapering off now. Sears got into it, and has gotten out of it after a quick experiment. WTOP dropped the CBS Mystery Theatre here in DC. Nobody's carrying the Mutual series. There was an audience there, but it was relatively small.

Chapter 5

Impact on Participating Artists and Arts Organizations

This chapter summarizes the consequences of participating in PITA-supported projects as reported by artists and the representatives of arts organizations. The impacts they have experienced fall into two main categories: financial impacts and impacts on creativity.

The major findings discussed in Chapter 5 are:

- Financial support by PITA to independent arts was substantial and in no way hampered artistic freedom.
- High standards of production and remuneration for artists that were established by DANCE IN AMERICA are rarely equalled by other producers.
- Arts telecasts have raised audience awareness and acceptance of participating artists and arts organizations.
- New audiences were attracted to live performances after watching a television performance.
- A PITA grant is considered a valuable endorsement by recipients and other funders.
- Participating arts organizations report an increase in live audiences when they are on tour.
- Some artists and arts organizations have generated additional income from their television appearances through the sale of international broadcast rights and non-broadcast rights.
- Arts organizations have increased their mailing lists and membership as a result of televised performances.
- Products associated with the televised productions, such as records and books, have earned additional income for participants.
- Many of the performances and productions supported by PITA would not have occurred without this support.
- Participating in PITA projects has significantly affected the subsequent opportunities for artists and the direction of their careers.

While approximately 60% of Programming in the Arts (PITA) funds have been awarded to broadcasters, support has also been granted to individual artists and arts organizations for the development and/or production of media projects related to the arts. LIVE FROM LINCOLN CENTER, for example, is produced by Lincoln Center and presented to PBS by WNET, the public television station in New York. The funds in that case are granted directly to the arts institution. Projects developed by artists, arts organizations and broadcasters have involved artists from a variety of disciplines. Musicians, vocalists, and dancers have appeared on LIVE FROM LINCOLN CENTER, DANCE IN AMERICA, and LIVE FROM THE MET. Writers have been commissioned to produce original plays for VISIONS and EARPLAY; actors have appeared in these dramatic productions. Performing and visual artists have been the subject matter for many specials, films, and short series such as WOMEN IN ART. Throughout these projects, the participation of media artists -- producers, directors, and filmmakers -- has been critical for their success.

In this chapter, the impacts of support from PITA on participating artists and arts organizations are reported. Participants in this chapter include performing artists who have appeared on television programs supported by PITA, administrators and managers of arts organizations who have received grants or whose companies have been involved in these projects, and independent filmmakers, writers, directors and producers. In some cases, the participating artists and arts organizations have been the direct recipients of the funds with complete control over their own budgets. In other cases, participants worked on projects funded through a broadcasting organization and were paid a salary or fee for their contribution. VISIONS was an exceptional project in that the grant was awarded to public television station KCET in Los Angeles, but the participating artists in some programs -- writers, directors and producers -- were given their own budgets to manage.

To a large extent, the level of satisfaction and the impacts reported by participating artists and arts organizations varied according to these funding arrangements. Whereas none of the participating artists or individuals at arts organizations who had been funded directly suggested that their artistic freedom had in any way been hampered by the Endowment, participants who had been funded hrough a broadcaster occasionally ran into problems with station personnel concerning the administration of projects, both artistically and financially.

The vast majority of participants could think of no negative effects whatsoever as a result of their participation. Beyond the fact that the funding was not sufficient to do all that they wanted or set out to do, the participants were quite satisfied with the program and eager to be involved in future media projects. There were, however, a few artists who felt that they had been unfairly treated by the public broadcasting system. Though most of them admitted to having little knowledge of the imperatives of the Corporation for Public Broadcasting, the Public Broadcasting Service, or of the individual broadcast stations, they were left feeling exploited. As they saw it, the artistry was theirs, the economic benefits were not. For these participants, the experience had been painful and would not soon be repeated. Much more typical were the participants who felt they had learned a great deal from the experience which would continue to nourish their creative efforts.

> 'I don't think there are any negatives. Maybe one of the negatives is that you realize that there's so much you can't do. Much of the repertory is not adaptable. That, of course, is an opinion. I don't think that's much of a negative.'

> 'Personally, it has been an extraordinary experience collaborating with these people because they are very giving and you learn a lot by looking and working with these people.

> In her mind, it was not that successful at first but in retrospect she feels more positive. Everything for her is a learning experience.'

I can t think of any negative effects. In terms of our own personal experiences, the trip to Nashville was great, the Grand Ole Opry was wonderful, the facilities were super, we got paid, we were on television, what more can you ask for? And, it was a good show.

Financial Impacts

Support for Artists

The most immediate impact felt by most participating artists is the financial support granted for their work. Independent filmmakers and video artists usually have an extremely difficult time raising funds to finance their projects. Few private sources have been willing to invest in these sometimes controversial and often high risk ventures. In contrast to the arduous process they must usually resort to in applying to and appeasing various funders, most of the individual recipients of PITA grants found the demands made on them reasonable and their artistic control complete. The expressions of gratitude and praise for the Media Arts program at the Endowment were profuse and enthusiastic.

I think one of the best things about the NEA projects that we have gotten funded is that there is no interference at all of any kind, and I think of course, it leaves a lot to the discretion of the grantee in terms of that, and to their ability to follow through, but if you can deliver, it seems to me an ideal situation.

It's all on the positive side having applied to NEA for that project and getting the money. They didn't interfere and they sent the money so I could use it when I needed it.

It was entirely successful. I made the exact film that I set out to make.

It's a question of control for the artist. And it's difficult when you're talking about large budget projects, like movies, because money says control comes from other areas

most of the time. The real benefit that I see in the Endowment is, it doesn't put control on the whole thing.

Well, the positive effects are that I got the tapes made, and I got them made with the kind of quality that I wanted to make them. I couldn't have done that any other way but through their funding.

I think the National Endowment for the Arts is the most enlightened institution, with the exception of an officer from the Ford Foundation who said, I love the project, here's the money. The Endowment is very supportive, they are very nice to you. Some of the other funders are just rude. It's gone to their head -- the idea that everyone is coming to them in a mendicant position makes them arrogant. That was never our experience at the NEA.

The funding provided by PITA was rarely sufficient in the eyes of recipients. Due to the fact that grants almost always require matching funds from private sources, independent filmmakers and videomakers expend tremendous amounts of time and energy raising funds. Frequently, they still find themselves in debt as they attempt to complete their projects. If they have had complete control of the project and retain all rights to its future distribution, they generally have few complaints about the arrangement. In some instances, however, the amount of the grants was so low compared to the cost of the project, they were not worth the time and cost of administration.

The problem is the funding. It amounted to us having to work under worse conditions than commercial television. If you are trying to do something different, you really have to fund it with enough money to really do something different.

We were only able to finish the film because my brother believed in it and supported it. He has a film lab and postponed the bills. He blew it up to 35mm so that we could enter it in competitions.

Let me say that I was one of the pioneers in getting artists money. When I was first approached in 1973 to make a video tape, I said yes. How much will I get out of this? He said we'll give you what we pay Julia Child which amounts to $100, because we were going to shoot it in one day. I said no, I won't do that. We went back and forth over this contract. I think I got $1000, and I always insisted on getting $1000 out of these budgets, but given the economics of making video art, even $1000 is not really fair. There is no way an artist working in video can make a living.

Making pictures costs so much money that it has to be dealt with as a business. So fortunately, the Arts Endowment at least, even though they can't give you enough to do the whole picture, they have the foresight and the intelligence to say once you create a work of art, it belongs to you, as much as anybody.

I got $10,000 from NEA in 1976. I spent about $40,000 of my own money too. I got another $10,000 from NEA in 1977. They seemed to like the revised film idea. They have never tried to control what I've done. They have been wonderful but I feel so guilty that the movie isn't done and I haven't wanted to go back and ask for more money, so I have been trying to get money out of PBS. I have probably spent $3000 on trips to Washington. I gave up... In a sense I wish I hadn't started the film. It's an albatross.

When dance companies appear on DANCE IN AMERICA, the performers and the choreographers are paid a fee for their services. Because the television contract is based on AFTRA rates, the fee is higher than what dancers are paid for a live performance. According to several performers and company managers, the fee is not terribly high, but the production is handled so well that the time required of the performers is well spent. In most cases, the dance company does not receive money from the production budget but Exxon, as corporate underwriter of the series, has made a separate contribution to the companies that have appeared. The performers also receive residuals each time their program is rebroadcast. Standard public television broadcast rights -- four plays in three years -- were negotiated for these programs. International distribution and audio-visual rights have been negotiated separately with each company, and several of the pro-

grams have been shown in Denmark, Norway, Switzerland, all of Continental Europe, the United Kingdom, Australia, and New Zealand.

The standards set by DANCE IN AMERICA represented a large advance over most television arrangements for dance companies. Prior to this series, most dancers were underpaid and poorly handled when hired for television. Some companies now find that these standards established by DANCE IN AMERICA cannot be met in other productions. The amount of payment that dancers now expect, on the basis of their DANCE IN AMERICA experience, is higher than what other producers are able to pay. One consequence of this is that few independent television dance projects have been generated as a result of the television appearance on DANCE IN AMERICA for the participating companies, though the desire certainly exists. Exceptions are found in companies that were involved with media prior to the DANCE IN AMERICA experience, such as Twyla Tharp who went on to produce "Making Television Dance" and Merce Cunningham who most recently has done a film entitled "Locale."

When performers appear on LIVE FROM LINCOLN CENTER or LIVE FROM THE MET they receive a special fee in addition to their normal live performance fee. One person associated with the series suggested that performing artists were willing to do the broadcast for less than they might otherwise demand because the national television exposure proved so valuable to their careers, allowing them to command higher concert fees subsequently. Lincoln Center also gives a grant to the company appearing in a program, in return for the rights to the programs.

The economics of the VISIONS series were somewhat different. The producers were given a budget for the film productions or the studio productions. Each filmmaker was given $200,000 approximately to budget themselves; the in-studio dramas were budgeted at $190,000. Most of the films required additional money and the filmmakers were left on their own to raise the funds. Most of the actors in the VISIONS series were paid at AFTRA rates. Their remuneration for the television appearance was higher than a standard theatre rate.

Building Awareness

The most frequently cited impact of participation in a PITA project which is broadcast nationally has been that it increases the awareness on the part of audiences, sponsors and other funders, of the participating arts organization. Arts organizations have found that the broad exposure they received on national television has served as a most effective promotional tool. A television appearance on DANCE IN AMERICA, for example, becomes an advertisement for the performing artists. Though many of the artists and companies that have appeared on these major series were already well known among the theatre-going devotees of an art form, televising the arts has spread their fame to new audiences and increased the acceptance they feel.

> I think it (television) has in many instances initiated audiences to come. It has built up enough curiosity that they want to see it live. I think it has prepared audiences for the kind of work we do so that if you've seen us on television, hopefully you know you're not going to see classical ballet. I have heard many comments--in Boston--from people who first became aware of the company through television and that brought them to the theatre.

> It seems to me that it's just the exposure. If they (the audience) had found that they were interested, about even one little thing, that's going to get them interested in going. And when they do, and find out that it's better in real life, they are going to keep going and they are still going to watch it on television because they still get something. I really don't think it hurts.

> There's the fact that it expands our audience. It acquaints more people and gives them a taste of what that experience on the stage can be.

> My guess is that television serves a function. Television can bring the people into the theatre for the first time, or maybe for a second or third time, if they're not regular goers. That increases the likelihood that from that group or small number will come the regular people who do develop sophistication.

A study conducted in 1976, shortly after the premiere of DANCE IN AMERICA supports this point.* The first program in the series featured the Joffrey Ballet. When the live audience for a Joffrey performance was asked whether they had seen the program and if it had influenced their decision to attend, 59% of the people who had never been to a Joffrey performance before reported that they had made their decision after seeing the program on television.

Fundraising

In addition to the financial contribution made by the Endowment to a project, great significance is attached to its endorsement. The Endowment has maintained high quality standards and its credibility generalizes to the projects it supports. This endorsement appears to have as much of an impact on the psychology of the participant as on his or her actual ability to raise additional funds as many of the projects are still incomplete due to a lack of funds from other sources. The other funders to whom we spoke declared that the Endowment's association with a project was definitely positive in their minds. The problem is simply the inadequacy of resources dedicated to non-commercial media arts projects from both private and public sources.

> NEA funding makes a huge difference...in terms of raising matching funds, in terms of the whole prestige, the way people talk to you, the way they are willing to look at the film, the way distributors are willing to consider the film and television stations...
>
> Other sources--private organizations--like to see that other people have approved you. Every time you get a grant you're more "approved" to get another grant.
>
> Without them I couldn't have--the domino theory--big pieces like this only happen with the domino theory, unless you've got such a name for yourself that you can command that kind of money all by your lonesome. And that might as well be commercial. But I think the Endowment gave a lot of

*National Research Center of the Arts, Inc. "The Joffrey Ballet Audience." Mimeographed. June, 1976.

credibility to my work...It gave me credibility for what I wanted to do so that I could raise other money, because they were supporting me.

The film carried a title that gives credit to NEA so it kinds of gives authority to the film itself when it is seen... It gives more authority to anything I do in the future, having had that grant, along with the Guggenheim in 1970 and so forth. It makes it easier for me to work, for one thing and that's pretty important.

I think that an NEA grant to any arts project, including our own, establishes the integrity of the project because of their own promotion and what they have stood for over the years. I think that it does more than just financial support, it gives the project a certain blessing.

Creating New Sources of Revenue

Many of the artists and organizations who participated in the major series supported under PITA were playing to nearly full houses in New York City or other home towns prior to their television appearances. These organizations were unlikely to credit television with having had an effect upon their ticket sales at home nor were they likely to suggest that the length of their performance season had changed. A substantial and positive impact was felt, however, when participating organizations set up tours. Sponsors are more willing to book them, audiences are more willing to come out to see them, and the halls they perform in are larger.

We had no difference in the seats sold because of it in New York. There was some apparent help in some of the tour cities with operas that are not as well known that have been televised and then gone out on tour.

We usually sell about 92% of the house for the ballet. Television didn't alter that but it probably made us a more valuable touring company. In Iowa there is a heavy university community and they probably all watch public television. We had a full house in Iowa.

> Five or six years ago there were a lot of theatres and universities that had a question about whether or not they could bring our company and have it pay off so they wouldn't do it. Now it's less of a question. We usually sell out. In some places the houses we play to are scattered but in the past it was a matter of even getting the bookings.
>
> It's changed over the years. Many of the houses we played have changed over the years. Now we can play a 2,500 seat house and know that we can basically fill it. There's a certain amount of exposure that you get from television and I know a lot of times when sponsors are making arrangements for publicity, they contact PBS about trying to run one of the shows in conjunction with the publicity -- like two or three weeks before we show up. If the local PBS station hasn't used their allotted number of plays, they can run it anytime they want.

The funds granted to participating arts organizations rarely contribute substantially to the operating costs of the performing company. They are absorbed by the production costs, salaries and overhead for administration of the media project, and by broadcast fees. However, the secondary economic benefits that can be derived from a television appearance seem to be limited only by the imagination of an organization's administrators. In the discussion below, the experiences of the Metropolitan Opera Guild and Lincoln Center for the Performing Arts illustrate this potential. Individual artists have also found ways to use the television exposure to their advantage although few have reaped large financial benefits thus far. Participants in PITA-supported projects have generated additional income from each of the following sources:

a) sale of international rights, and rights to non-broadcast distribution;

b) increased corporate and private patronage;

c) expanded mailing list of potential subscribers or members;

d) creation of by-products associated with the broadcasts that can be sold to the public.

Though there has been much talk of the potential of co-production with cable companies, as yet no arrangements have been made.

The Metropolitan Opera Association has recently reached agreement with broadcasters in foreign countries who will carry the broadcast of LIVE FROM THE MET. The additional cost of expanding the audience internationally once the production is readied for broadcast is merely the cost of satellite time and the negotiations. The added income from broadening the reach of the telecast is a direct benefit for the Met. Neither Lincoln Center nor the Metropolitan Opera Association have yet cleared the rights for non-broadcast distribution of some of the programs. For DANCE IN AMERICA and WOMEN IN ART the rights to additional distribution of some of the programs have been negotiated and are held by WNET if they have been negotiated. Remuneration for the participating artists and arts organizations differs for each program, but thus far the earnings for participants have been minimal.

Though it is rarely obvious when the contributions arriving at an institution are a direct result of the television program, participants do get some indications from the comments they hear and the interest people express in the programs.

> The patron giving has increased substantially for a lot of reasons, but I think when you go to almost any fundraising event that we have, after they talk about who is singing, the next question they ask is, "Tell us something about LIVE FROM THE MET."

Individual dance companies who have appeared on DANCE IN AMERICA reported using the tapes of their programs as a sample of their work to enlist the support of corporate sponsors for subsequent projects. They consider the programs a good representation of what they can do when given the resources to do it properly.

The Metropolitan Opera Guild has pioneered in using the broadcasts to increase the size of its mailing list. An offering of a free magazine or stagebill about the opera is made at some point during the telecast. The response to these offers has been overwhelming. Beginning with the broadcast of "La Boheme" in 1977, the Met had received a total of 299,000 requests for these mailings as of December 31, 1979. Approximately 80% of the people requesting the pamphlets had not previously been on the mailing lists for the Opera. These people were later solicited for memberships and 11,250 (5%) new members were enrolled. This expanded mailing list has also been used for selling raffle tickets and merchandise associated with the Opera, and to ask for contributions. A national raffle conducted annually by the Met doubled in growth last year. In large part that growth has been attributed to the expanded mailing list. Added income generated from the expanded mailing list has been computed by the Opera Guild to total $511,540 since the first broadcast.*

Whereas individual programs within the LIVE FROM THE MET series have received between 7,000 to 56,000 requests for the mailings, one program--the American Ballet Theatre--broadcast as part of LIVE FROM LINCOLN CENTER received requests from 73,000 individuals. The development project at Lincoln Center began in 1978 and development has been handled differently by the various companies. For the program presenting the American Ballet Theatre which received enthusiastic response, the audience was offered a copy of "On Point" magazine. When the ABT solicited new members from these 73,000 names, approximately 750 (1%) people subscribed.** Total figures of new membership or income as a result of the entire Lincoln Center series are not available currently.

The Met has again led the way by producing merchandise associated with the series, which can earn additional income for the organization. People on the mailing list are offered a variety of products that have added meaning for the audiences of LIVE FROM THE MET. The Guild has found that records of the operas that have been telecast sell better than records of comparably

*It should be noted that PITA began to support LIVE FROM THE MET after the first telecast.

**Although the 1% response rate is lower than the above mentioned 5% received by the Met, it is considered a good rate for direct mail advertising.

popular operas. The predictable popularity of the opera is being skewed as a result of its expanded exposure via television. The Guild is also about to produce cosmetics bags out of the materials from costumes used in the productions. The costumes will most likely be selected from an opera which has been telecast as those have by far the largest audiences and are expected to generate the most interest among potential consumers.

The Guild has already produced a learning kit for schools based on the telecast operas. The "Opera Box" kits contain a guide for teachers on how to use the box, a sound film strip, a 12-inch LP record from the opera produced for this purpose, a poster for the classroom and an individual take-home poster for each student. These boxes are an outgrowth of the televised operas. Now that the operas are accessible nationally, the educational effort can reach out to students across the country. Eventually, video disks based on the live broadcast might be included in the kits.

Income derived from these products is used to support the activities of the Met. Individual vocalists and musicians have for many years derived additional income from the sales of records. Several of the performing artists who have succeeded on television were stars long before their appearances. There is evidence, however, that television has served to magnify the brilliance of some careers. Pavarotti, whose fame has spread so rapidly over the past few years, first performed on LIVE FROM THE MET in "La Boheme" in 1977 and then on LIVE FROM LINCOLN CENTER in 1978. Though no recordings were made of the live broadcasts, an album entitled "Hits from LINCOLN CENTER: Pavarotti," had been on the Billboard Top Classical Records Chart for 75 weeks as of February 16, 1980. When he once again appeared on LIVE FROM THE MET in "Un Ballo Maschera" on February 16th, the record went from tenth to third place on the charts. Royalties from the recording go directly to Pavarotti.

THE ORIGINALS: WOMEN IN ART has also been exemplary in extending the impact of the series through audio-visual distribution and in stimulating subsequent products. Several programs in the series are currently available in 16mm film and video cassette for rental or purchase by schools, libraries and theatres. Rights to the distribution have been retained by the broad-

casting station, WNET (see Chapter 4, Impact on the Media) so that the producers and artists do not derive any additional income or benefits from the series beyond the increased recognition of their work.* Several other products, however, have been associated with the series. ANONYMOUS WAS A WOMAN, one film in the series, was developed into a book of the same name by Mirra Bank, the producer of the film. Another book, entitled Originals: American Women Artists, written by Eleanor Munro, also grew out of the series. The book was commissioned by PBS and published by Simon and Schuster in 1979. The publication of this book had additional ramifications as it inspired an art exhibit called "Originals" at the Graham Gallery in New York City. The exhibit featured the work of artists included in the series and many other women artists.

Curiously, the series, WOMEN IN ART, may have had an even larger impact on the artists featured in the films than upon the artists paid to make the films. According to several observers, the careers of these artists have picked up as a result of the attention drawn to them in the films and the surrounding publicity.

Income From Secondary Distribution

There has been little evidence that independent filmmakers and videomakers have derived significant income from the projects supported by PITA. To some extent this is a consequence of the research design which did not permit sufficient time to track down the producers of the earliest projects. Projects that were funded in 1978 or 1979 are in most cases still in production. It is premature to assess the economic benefits that might be derived from them. In many cases that is true even for projects funded by the Endowment in 1976 or 1977. A few filmmakers have reported that their projects were completed and are now in distribution

*One exception to this is the film on Alice Neel which existed prior to the series. Revenues earned on it are split 50/50 between WNET and the filmmaker.

internationally or to libraries and schools, but the debts incurred during production are not yet paid off. Other media artists believe that potential income awaits the further distribution of their projects but due to a lack of interest, expertise or time, they have not distributed the films or tapes themselves. A few counter examples suggest that an earning potential exists were the artists to receive guidance or encouragement in this area.

One early project funded by the Media Program at the Endowment was a film produced by Allan Miller with Bill Ferdick, entitled "Bolero." The film was broadcast over PBS and internationally. Rights to the film have been retained by the Corporation for Public Broadcasting (CPB) who co-funded it with PITA and the producers. Distribution of the film has been handled by Pyramid Films, with half of the proceeds going to CPB and half to the producers. As of the close of 1979--after 1 year of distribution--the film had earned the following amounts:

Sales	$394,549.91
Rentals	29,640.00
IBM License Fees	54,926.00
Theatrical	575.00
Television	9,140.00
TOTAL	$488,830.91

In 1971, the budget for the film was $65,000.

Several of the films produced for VISIONS are also being distributed for international broadcast and theatrical exhibition in the United States. Though these films were produced under a grant to KCET, arrangements have been made to allow the independent filmmakers to distribute the films in an attempt to earn back the private money that was invested to complete the films. As yet the monies earned have not covered the costs. As of September, 1979, gross earnings from three of these films were reported as $246,600.

Impacts on Creativity

The creative process is not well understood. Neither artists themselves nor psychologists who study them have been able to predict the conditions under which creation will take place. Even in retrospect, it is difficult to assess which factors were responsible for works that are outstanding. Sometimes the artist can at least account for the relative success or failure of a work; sometimes the artist is the harshest critic. The participants interviewed in this study had mixed feelings about the work they had created with PITA support. In some cases, particularly when the work had been recognized by their peers, artists were quite satisfied with their productions. Rarely was it a simple matter to trace back a career and determine what might have happened had not the Endowment supported a particular project.

Though some of the projects funded by PITA might have occurred without Endowment funds, many participants felt that the specific projects would not have been created without this support. This was particularly true for individuals who had been given an opportunity to write or produce material for VISIONS. For some artists, the control they had over the work, when combined with substantial funds, allowed them to work on projects with more commitment and care than they had been allowed in the past.

There have been some impacts on the actual performances offered at Lincoln Center as well. Although broadcasts of the programs do not alter the live performances, according to administrators of the projects, certain performances, such as the Horn and Sutherland concert and a future Horn, Sutherland and Pavarotti recital, would not have been affordable without the added revenue generated by the television exposure. These events have been created as a direct result of the television series. The television exposure has become so desirable to the performing artists that they are now requesting that their appearance at Lincoln Center be televised.

According to most of the people interviewed, the performances for the live telecasts were excellent. The artists concentrate harder, feel stimulated by the cameras and give better performances than they do when there is no television coverage.

DANCE IN AMERICA has stimulated and captured another type of creation. There are people who suggest that what has been recorded for broadcast in DANCE IN AMERICA is something other than what an audience sees on stage. The original work is ephemeral and cannot be preserved; a translation of the work recorded for television will exist indefinitely. This translation is a creative product that would not have existed otherwise. When great choreographers are asked to adapt their works for the camera, the artistic talent is being applied in a new way. The translation is a new form of the artist's work.

Career Impacts

Several of the writers who were given their first opportunity to develop their own material for television through VISIONS have felt a very positive impact on their careers. Some of the writers have been commissioned by PBS to write or direct programs that will be part of other series. A few of the writers have moved into commercial television and are currently working on material for "Movie of the Week" programs. Among the VISIONS writers have even been a few who have gone on to produce major studio motion pictures. Many of the artists whose careers had prospered since their participation on VISIONS saw little chance for as rewarding an opportunity in the future, however.

> It was something that I felt very committed to and very dedicated to. I believed in what it was supposed to be very very much, more than anything I've ever done and possibly ever will.

> It changed my life! I think I was happiest doing that film. I really cared about it.

It actually took a chance on filmmakers, and I think that hasn't been done directly... I lived in New York then and there was no other place you could go, practically. Out here you can put together a horror movie and probably get it made--cheap money and there are investors around--but if you had a project you believed in and it wasn't really a commercial exploitation vehicle, there was only one place to go--VISIONS.

Producers who have successfully created a type of program or film for television report that they tend to get pigeonholed by their success. Once they have done something in an area that is outstanding, people looking for someone to produce a similar type of project will seek them out first. This is, for the most part, a positive effect. The successful media artist is recognized and given many opportunities to continue working on projects in that particular area. The same phenomenon may have some minor negative effects in that the artist will not have the same endorsement when trying to move into new areas. Artists, whether writers, producers or performers, quickly tire of repetitive projects. The ease with which they are apt to get work in the same area is a disincentive to move on but they tend to become frustrated and discontent if they do not.

...because it was a biography, as happens in this world, you get niched. So, the only work I could get anybody interested in was other biographies which is logical but not necessarily commendable...It's one thing to get pigeonholed, and for most people I'm sure that's not good. In my case, it happens to be something I really want to pursue more of.

The dance companies we approached wanted us (to direct). We were the people who were succeeding and getting the Emmy award nominations so that when we went to them, they wanted the best. They didn't want to take chances with new people... I'm tired. I think it's time for fresh blood.

After I got it on the air, suddenly I became an expert and people came to me. As a result of that, people were coming to me. They were coming to me to do that kind of program... Now I'm working on an old people's kind of on-going dramatic serial with my own company. If that succeeds, I'm quite sure I'll become an expert on geriatrics.

> And what is happening for me, of course, is that I really feel I'd like to do something else for a change, other than artists and working with paintings and graphic materials.

The majority of artists and arts organizations that have received grants from PITA report significant positive impacts on their economic situation and creativity. Chapter 6 will examine the impact of PITA projects on the broader arts disciplines and on artists and arts organizations that have not received grants from PITA.

Chapter 6

Impact on the Arts

Programming in the Arts (PITA) support for media projects has clearly impacted on the media as discussed in Chapter 4 and on participating artists and arts organizations as reported in Chapter 5. There have been indirect impacts as well on the arts disciplines and organizations which have not received funding from PITA. The broadcast of the major performing arts series on public television such as LIVE FROM LINCOLN CENTER, LIVE FROM THE MET, and DANCE IN AMERICA are reported by respondents to be welcome additions to the cultural life of the nation. Broadcasting the arts impacts on arts organizations and artists in a variety of ways. In this chapter, the impacts of PITA projects on non-participants and the general arts disciplines are presented.

The major findings discussed in Chapter 6 are:

- Most respondents believe that televising the arts has contributed significantly to the "explosion" in the arts over the past decade.
- Exposure to the arts on television has raised awareness of the arts and has generated new audiences for live performances.
- Respondents have found audiences at live performances to be more sophisticated and to have higher expectations as a result of their exposure to the best performing artists on television.
- Artists and arts organizations that have not appeared on television in the past are eager to be given the opportunity in the future.
- Performing artists in communities across the United States learn from watching the best performing artists in their disciplines on television.

An Explosion in the Arts?

Most respondents agreed that the performing arts on television have contributed to an "explosion" in the arts. An exciting atmosphere for arts organizations, artists and audiences now prevails. Televising the arts is frequently considered an important component of this activity.

> I believe that televising the arts probably has provided a grid work of that explosion. In other words, it's the paving stones or the superstructure or whatever you want to call it.
>
> (Columbia, SC)

> I don't think that TV caused the growth but it helped. The growth was there, it was happening, that's why it got on TV. More and more people have gotten into dance, it's good for them.
>
> (New York, NY)

> So many people are interested in dance and opera than were, and unlikely people...people that I think a decade ago would have been more likely to go to a pro football game if they were given a choice. In my personal experience there are quite a few people who have developed an interest in opera and ballet concurrent with the sudden appearance of programming in these arts.
>
> (Columbia, SC)

> Well the classic case of television is what's happened to the dance. I'm sure that can be documented at other places better than here but DANCE IN AMERICA -- it is generally considered and I certainly agree -- that DANCE IN AMERICA on television has resulted in, if anything, an explosion of all kinds of dance in this country.
>
> (Columbia, SC)

> In an age with many people, TV is the most powerful medium. Leaving the arts out would indicate they are not an important part of the country. Broadcasting the arts strengthens the arts in the mind of the American public.
>
> (San Francisco, CA)

Some believe the so-called explosion may simply be media-hype itself and others noted that any explosion is primarily national with little impact being felt in their own communities.

> In a national sense, it's hard to say. There seems to be more interest in art, but whether that's just kind of a trend thing that won't ultimately find support or substance is another question. But as far as Columbia, South Carolina goes, no, I don't think so.
>
> (Columbia, SC)

> Not an increase in the amount of activity on the scale of what you would call an explosion. It's like assuming that there has been an explosion in sex because everyone is talking about it but I'm not really convinced that the actual activity is greater or different than it was five years ago.
>
> (San Francisco, CA)

Only a few respondents felt that the selection of the performing arts which were showcased on television was somewhat limited and out of touch with what local companies were doing:

> For the most part, the kind of opera they're seeing is dinosaur opera. It's extremely grand opera. Now you've got City Opera broadcasts which are closer to what I would like to see on the tube.
>
> (Atlanta, GA)

> The Met is not going to change their ways of staging opera to suit television ... I guess I would be concerned if that was the only kind of opera experience we see on television.
>
> (Minneapolis, MN)

Creating New Audiences

The most commonly-held beliefs of the arts representatives interviewed in the present study is that putting the performing arts on television has

raised awareness and exposed a whole new audience to the performing arts, an audience who otherwise might never have been exposed to nor learned about the arts.

> Some of these people were interested in bowling and Bingo. Now they stop and talk to me about opera. I thought that I'd never discuss it with them. They tell me they saw it on television. They're very impressed with it, and in an affirmative way.
> (Chicago, IL)

> I think it's brought people like myself that never would have gone to local stuff, like the local symphony, more interested in that sort of thing. A general awareness level is much higher among people that ten years ago would never have mentioned Pavarotti. Or never would have known what Balanchine was. I think television exposure has helped general press exposure for these people. They print stuff here about Pavarotti now because people know who he is. Now that he has been on television.
> (South Carolina)

By exposing this new audience to the arts, television has served as a catalyst for the arts. This television-exposed audience is attracted to live performances of performing arts companies across the nation. Initially, there was some fear among performing arts groups that putting the arts on television would encourage the audience to stay at home, thus draining off attendance and, in turn, revenues from performing arts companies. There is an almost unanimous feeling, however, among arts organization representatives that this has not occurred. In fact, most contend that television has been one of the primary factors in attracting new and larger audiences. One arts representative stated, for example, that

> I really think to a great extent for dance, to a slightly lesser extent for opera, and probably to a negligible extent for theatre, that television has had a revolutionary impact on audiences. I think they've been contributory, not the sole cause, but the notorious dance explosion of the last decade has created an audience which outnumbers the audience for pro-football. At least, the live attendance. And I think television has to be primarily responsible. Maybe not in places like New York or Los Angeles, which have always had audiences for dance and opera, but

> for places like South Carolina, for the provinces, where they don't have the same opportunity to develop their taste, their ability to respond. I think this programming has had an immense impact.
>
> (Columbia, SC)

In some cases, arts representatives suggested that live performances on television were the key:

> I sort of equate this with what the record industry has done with live concert situations. I think the live programs have only enhanced peoples' desires to go see it in person, and I think it makes it more accessible to the general public and gives us a better awareness of what is available culturally and what our past is.
>
> (San Francisco, CA)

In several instances, the media performance has been used consciously to enhance attendance at the live event.

> Pilobolous was here last year and arrangements were made by the presenter to have the DANCE IN AMERICA show shown like a week or two weeks prior to that. I believe from talking to people about it, that there was a positive response in the way of ticket sales.
>
> (Atlanta, GA)

While the performing arts on television have served to expose new audiences to the arts and to cultivate attendance at live events, most respondents indicated there is not a direct correlation between putting the arts on television and an increased audience at these events. Generally, the relationship is felt to be somewhat indirect. When asked whether dance on television had changed the composition of the audience at live events, some respondents believed that they could detect differences:

> I suspect that our audiences are getting younger. That's just a visual survey. I've noticed, for example, we only have one matinee series on Sunday afternoons. Originally, when we were only doing three performances, our matinee series traditionally was the little old ladies that didn't want to come out at

night. I've noticed that during the last couple of years as we've added that fourth Sunday, that the composition of that audience has changed and there are a lot of young people.

(Washington, D.C.)

It used to be that when I went to a dance concert, only the members of society were there, very well-dressed. They were not necessarily there because they enjoyed dance, but because that was the place to be that particular evening. And now it seems that you see a little bit of everything ... so I would say that the composition has changed.

(Columbia, S.C.)

But about an equal number of respondents did not hold television responsible for any changes in the composition of live audiences.

I don't see it any different, there's just more. More young people. There always was the young people's group, it's more. More people have this greater affluence in our society now than there was 20-25 years ago. Younger people have more money than I remember young people having when I was a young person, much more spendable income, inflation notwithstanding. Therefore, the audience basis got bigger, but I think the same people come. I don't think the composition of the people really changed. Ballet audiences are different from opera audiences, they're different from symphonic audiences and that difference still exists.

(New York, N.Y.)

Not perceptibly, no. I mean, the audience has changed over the years but I don't think it's a function of TV. I just think it's the fact that things are less formal. So you see a different ... everybody's dressed a different way.

(San Francisco, CA)

Though there is debate concerning the demographic changes in the audiences for live performances, most respondents were agreed that television has contributed to a growing sophistication of audiences.

... By statistical evidence and research, and according to the number of people watching it, one would have to say that the audiences are becoming more sophisticated, and television must have been the reason for a lot of that.

(Boston, MA - Media Representative)

... they come with a better preparation, if they've seen Otello on television, they know how it ends and they're reassured that it won't bite. They will enjoy it. This is still a very young part of the country, remember, and it doesn't have a very long tradition.

(Seattle, WA)

I think the American public is different than it was prior to TV. We have a whole different public than we had in 1940. They're more alert, more intelligent ... let's say, more informed. Classical references are more easily picked up, things like that. We have a more intelligent public because of TV.

(San Francisco, CA)

Three years ago, Dance Theatre of Harlem was here and I was embarassed to be part of the audience. We were in a huge auditorium and virtually nobody was there. And last year, for the major production, there were .. well, there was a nice healthy audience. And so I think it (sophistication) is definitely increasing, and they tend to be more accepting of different things. For example, earlier they would balk at anything that was not story-oriented or something that was not traditionally considered beautiful. Whereas now, with the Nikolai Company in particular, I expected audiences not to respond well at all and they did, very well. They loved it... people were beginning to get excited and giving standing ovations. So, I would say they are becoming more accepted and accepting.

(Columbia, SC)

A few respondents disagreed. For example, one noted

We're talking about a minority of a minority of a minority, because there are certain people, a group of intellectual aesthetes who would watch any opera production, any ballet production on television. And they are a small portion of what is another minority: the people who watch public television at all.

(Columbia, SC)

Several respondents noted the danger in audiences receiving a "perfect" performance at home and the expectations they therefore bring to a live performance.

I think the expectations are different. I think that when you show on television the very best that anybody can do, edit out the pieces that aren't that good, you do create higher expectations. When you

> show them live (on television) you virtually have the best singers that are available. Then if you were to go to one local opera and that's not so good as what I heard last Saturday night was, I think that it's important for audiences to know that and to keep it in mind.
>
> (San Francisco, CA)

Televising the arts has had at least two other impacts on audiences. On the one hand, the behavior of the audience at live performances may have changed. One theatre company, for example, now announces before school matinees that the audience is not watching television and talking in the theatre can distract the actors. Not all arts representatives agree. Another impact that will be discussed at length below is that the audience now demands more of their local arts organizations. As one respondent suggests

> I think they are expecting a lot more because of what they've seen. As I say, you can't just give them schlop. You can't get out there and not dance. You can't give them a performance that isn't quality. They expect too much, more because they've seen the best you've got.
>
> (Washington, DC)

Impacts on Arts Organizations

Arts organizations in this chapter refer to non-participating arts organizations, i.e., those who have not appeared in performing arts broadcasts funded by the National Endowment for the Arts. Some of these organizations have appeared on other performing arts programs on television, funded through other sources.

Although a minority of respondents suggested that there has been no impact on the arts or on their own organizations as a result of projects supported by Programming in the Arts, most arts organization representatives maintain that the arts on television have had an impact on the arts in the United States and on their own organizations. In part, television is believed to have contributed to an "explosion" in the performing arts during the past decade or two which

has had a general spill-over on their own work. The impacts felt by these groups fall into three categories:

1. Financial impacts on the arts organizations;
2. Aesthetic impacts on the arts organizations;
3. Impacts (real and perceived) of appearing on television.

Financial Impacts

Arts organizations in the United States have frequently operated with budget deficits. This situation has not changed in the past five years for the non-participating arts organizations. Generally, they maintain that there has been no immediate financial impact as a result of PITA projects. No organizations represented in the sample in the present study, for example, would attribute any changes in the length of their performing season to television. However, if the assertion that a new audience is being attracted to the arts was true (see discussion above), then their market base may be widening and over time, new audiences will be attracted to live performances. These expanded audiences have the potential of bringing new revenues to the arts community. Arts organizations do, however, frequently believe that their ability to raise funds for local work has improved because there is now a more favorable "mood" for the performing arts among potential funding agencies.

> It certainly helps create a mood. It's sort of the supply and demand feeling. It it's more on people's mind and people are more interested in it, there's going to be more funding, no matter what, so I certainly think it (performing arts on TV) helps. It doesn't hurt.
>
> (San Francisco, CA)

Yeah, it helps because...I'm trying to remember who said it. Somebody said there's no such thing as bad PR...When a local arts council or the city ballet or whoever goes out looking for support, they're not going to be met with quite as many blank stares when they say "We are from the ballet." More people will probably at least know what they're talking about.

(Columbia, SC)

I think it helps create an awareness in the community in general about the arts. It has certainly opened up several large international organizations to support specific programs. Most of those have been specifically for the television programs' support. It may be that those specific organizations that are being televised are also -- because of their television support -- are getting large amounts of corporate support. In that case, it's beneficial.

(Atlanta, GA)

A very few disagreed.

No, I don't. I think the prevalence and growth of live performance has made it easier to raise money.

(Seattle, WA)

Still another financial impact on non-participating arts organizations is that the stars who have appeared on television are now a box-office draw in local communities. One representative commented,

It would make a great difference if we had, for instance, someone appearing as a soloist with us like Perlman -- he is very strong box office anyway, but if he were slightly less strong tha e is, I'm sure if his concert's here in Marc.i, it would sell out or come very close to doing so ... we'd all by saying, Well, it's all because people saw him on TV in February or January.

(San Francisco, CA)

Aesthetic Impacts

The standards of quality that a discipline develops, the criteria that arts organizations impose when presenting work to the public, rest upon aesthetic judgments. Several changes in the aesthetic standards and sophistication of arts communities across the country have been cited by respondents.

One of the foremost aesthetic impacts that result from the PITA-funded television series is that standards of excellent performance have been communicated to audiences and hence to arts organizations. As noted above, audiences are now demanding higher quality arts performances locally. One representative of a local company stated:

> But I think they (the audience) probably expect more because what they see on TV is very difficult for our local ballet company to come up with. We have very good sets but they're not "million-dollar" sets that professional companies would have. So naturally, our audiences would like to see something like that... They expect more, which is all right.
>
> (Columbia, S.C.)

Another arts representative commented:

> I think a lot of people in various parts of the country ... they've seen Baryshnikov, they've seen Nureyev, they've seen Suzanne Farrell, they go to the regional dance company and maybe they ask more of it.
>
> (San Francisco, CA)

As representatives of these non-participating arts organizations discuss the newly-created audience demands, some negative feelings are apparent.

> I've often wondered if the dancers are ready to give up after seeing Baryshnikov. When you see such excellence, it certainly gives you an idea of standards of performance in ballet. However, since we don't have the opportunities to see the companies in New York, and so many don't tour the Northwest, I think it's of great value.
>
> (Seattle, WA)

> Now, most of them know when the Met tour comes that they're getting ripped off if they're not seeing the good casts and productions that appear in New York. As a result, the tour has had to upgrade itself over the past few years to meet the demands of the local audiences that rent the tour. And yes, I think there are expectations, there are demands in the theatre and on the performing artists when they see good productions on the tube.
>
> (Atlanta, GA)

A negative effect noted by two theatre companies in the study was that they were losing actors to the small screen since television work paid better than live theatre.

Arts Organizations and TV: Real and Perceived Impacts

There is a great deal of interest among non-participating arts organizations in appearing on television. These "appearances" may include local Public Service Announcements as attention-getters for the company as well as full-length performance broadcasts. And some companies, of course, have appeared in major television specials or series funded by sources other than PITA.

Generally, an appearance on television builds reputations.

> The more we are on TV, the greater in stature we rise, for example. Or the more symphonic concerts there are on TV, the more familiar people get with the fact they exist. A very intangible value, but it's still a value.
>
> (Washington, D.C.)

There are some negative impacts in the relationship between the media and the arts. Some groups which have not been selected to be on Endowment-funded programs feel left-out and neglected. This comment arose notably for DANCE IN AMERICA since this is the only major performing arts program presumably open to organizations based outside of New York City.

Other benefits of being on TV as perceived by non-participants are that this is an accomplishment or milestone in an artist's professional career and that artists and the company reap financial benefits.

Effects on Artists

A few respondents in the present study pointed to impacts on artists from the presentation of the performing arts on television. Potential benefits to artists who appear on television parallel those noted for arts organizations. They include financial remuneration, opportunities for exposure and recognition,

exposure to critical standards, and a general recognition of the importance of their work. But even artists who have not performed on television claim to have benefitted from the programs. The performing arts on television creates a better environment for all artists to work in.

> Well, I think it's made our dancers a lot more enthusiastic. And they are more familiar now with those dancers [seen on TV]. I mean, the names roll off their lips because they have seen them.
>
> (Columbia, S.C.)

And for performing artists who live in communities which are less frequently toured by the major companies, the performing arts on television can contribute to professional training and education.

> [Students] get ideas about what to do and what not to do. They need to see it. In the case of some of them, to see what some beautiful singing is and see how the sound is produced, it's very helpful. They also need to look at staging, to see what is effective and what is ridiculous.
>
> (Minneapolis, MN)

> If you're speaking of students, it's a tremendously valuable thing because they can actually see the technique of those dancers better than when they see a live program. If they're just sitting studying the actual technique, they can see the preparation, and whether or not the preparation helped or not. They are very conscious of whether those arches are really arched....So, for students, it's marvelous, and for dancers who don't live in New York, it's wonderful for them to be able to truly get that scope of choreography since they can't possibly get that much [here].
>
> (Atlanta, GA)

Chapter 7

A Summing Up

This report began with a brief history of the relationship between the performing arts and the media through 1976 when LIVE FROM LINCOLN CENTER and DANCE IN AMERICA premiered on public television. The subsequent chapters have considered the quality of the radio and television programs supported by the Programming in the Arts (PITA) funding category at the National Endowment for the Arts, explained how they are distributed, estimated the audiences they have reached, and described the impacts of PITA support on the media and the performing arts. In this chapter, the historical thread is once again picked up with a summary of the growth in the union of the performing arts and media stimulated by PITA funding. The growth that is described here is impressive. Perhaps not surprisingly, it has spawned the development of many still-unresolved issues where PITA can have major policy impacts in the future.

1976-1980: A Flowering in Media Arts

Although only four years have passed since the major performing arts series supported by PITA premiered on public television, a significant pattern of impacts has emerged. PITA cannot claim sole responsibility for these series nor for the impacts they have had, but clearly PITA's financial contribution and high quality standards have made a difference. Judging from the comments of arts representatives and media representatives interviewed in this study, people who participated in these projects and people who did not, the performing arts have established a continuous, high quality presence on television that did not exist five years ago. Many of the impacts that these people reported could not have been predicted whenthe series began and negative consequences that people feared prior to the first programs -- discredit to the performer or the loss of audiences for live events -- have not materialized. The pattern of impacts that have emerged is depicted in Figure 7.1.

Figure 7.1

IMPACTS OF SUPPORT FOR PERFORMING ARTS ON TELEVISION

A PROCESS MODEL

	1950-1975				1980+
ARTS ON TELEVISION	Occasional Arts Specials →	DANCE IN AMERICA, LIVE FROM LINCOLN CENTER showcase the best →	DANCE IN AMERICA & LIVE FROM LINCOLN CENTER continue; LIVE FROM THE MET begins →	MAJOR SERIES continue; other "LIVE" Specials are produced; commercial TV re-enters →	More SERIES & SPECIALS planned; arts on Cable TV proposed
IMPACTS ON LIVE AUDIENCES	Audiences at performances increasing	First-time attendees at live performances increase	Attendance for previously less well-known groups increases	Audiences increase, perhaps younger people are attracted	Broader audiences impose higher standards on local performers
IMPACTS ON ARTS ORGANIZATIONS AND PERFORMERS	Performers distrust TV	Appearances bring increased exposure & additional income	Artists in outskirts accept TV models; participants have easy time booking tours, attract big stars	Sophisticated non-appearers want to be on, e.g. Balanchine, Pennsylvania Ballet	Arts orgs. exploit media exposure & want control of secondary distribution; performers become popular heroes
IMPACTS ON PUBLIC BROADCASTING	Lacking in funds, does some experimentation	Stations get positive response from audiences, attract new funding, continued publicity, corporate advertising		90% stations carry programs; use programs to raise funds	More stations want to produce arts programming; more money is needed to continue programming
IMPACTS ON TELEVISION AUDIENCES	Watched commercial television	Are informed about arts on TV & begin watching	Become educated to differences among groups, learn names, buy records, become more sophisticated		Membership in PTV is increasing; arts programming heavily watched

Figure 7.1 is a process model which traces the relationship of the performing arts and television. The pattern of impacts that it describes applies primarily to the arts disciplines that have showcased their most outstanding talents for television: opera, dance and symphonic music. The same phenomena are not obvious for theatre. Two major dramatic series, VISIONS and EARPLAY, were also funded by Programming in the Arts but they both featured original plays rather than the proven masterpieces of the theatre. The impacts of these series are more difficult to discern. Although VISIONS has had a tremendous impact on the individual artists who were supported to develop their work, theatre and television have not reflected these benefits. Perhaps the greatest impact of VISIONS on media arts will be the lessons learned and the resolve of producers to do things differently in the future. Currently, several projects are planned by public broadcasters and commercial broadcasters to put theatre productions on television. Each of these projects will showcase the outstanding talent and the masterpieces that have proven themselves in front of live audiences.

The application of the performing arts to television has impacted on several interest groups and in various ways. The arts, the media and the public have all been involved in the process. The impacts which were reported by each of these groups have been presented in different chapters of this report. They are presented here as part of a dynamic and still evolving process.

As Figure 7.1 points out, the relationship between artists and television from 1950 to 1975 was less than close. During this period, several attempts were made to fuse the arts and media but most performing artists remained skeptical. The technological quality of television broadcasts was quite inferior to film, and the treatment accorded performers was degrading. No facilities were provided to performers for practicing or warm ups; they were expected to dance on concrete studio floors; and they were moved about "like dolls" by the television producer.

The producers of DANCE IN AMERICA were determined to treat the performers and choreographers with the respect and sensitivity they were accustomed to in the live theatre. A new floor was built, dressing rooms and warm-up areas were provided, and the artists were paid a reasonable fee. Even more important,

the artists were given some control over what the television program would be. They dictated what material would be presented to the public and in what form. The producers and directors of the series were their partners in the enterprise, not distant technicians.

LIVE FROM LINCOLN CENTER was also concerned with attracting the best artists for television. An arts organization, Lincoln Center was familiar with performing artists and willing to meet their needs. The broadcasts required little extra preparation from the performers and they were paid additional fees.

As these programs were carried over the airwaves, they were also covered in the press. Opera stars, vocalists and dancers were featured on the television pages as well as in the arts section of newspapers across the country. The publicity surrounding these programs was outstanding, and audiences who had never been to the Met or Lincoln Center -- people who rarely ventured into the theatre, were elderly, or lived outside New York City -- were informed that they could stay at home and watch. People who could not afford a $35.00 ticket to the opera started watching at home. Artists in communities across the United States were given the opportunity to see how the "legends" were performing. The recognition of these performers on television have legitimized their own endeavors and provided models and standards to which they might aspire. By watching the best on television, audiences have grown more sophisticated and have begun to demand more of their local performers and arts companies. And to many people's surprise, the audiences for live performances did not decrease.

Most of the companies and performing artists who appeared on television in 1976 and 1977 in the major series considered here were celebrities even before they were televised. For many of the companies which have appeared in the series, it was not unusual to play to full houses in New York, but the impact of their television appearance was felt strongly when they went on tour. As the commercial networks had learned in the Sixties, television is the most powerful advertising vehicle in existence. When the television performance is aired in a city just prior to a company's road tour, ticket sales show a strong increase. The performers who have appeared on television are now as familiar to viewers in Madison, WI and Columbia, SC as they are in New York.

By 1978, some of the positive side effects of television appearances had become obvious. Observing the sudden attention that performing artists receive as soon as they are telecast, performing artists at Lincoln Center were willing to accept lower fees in exchange for television exposure. Hold-outs such as Balanchine agreed to work on the series. Sophisticated and qualified dance companies outside New York contacted DANCE IN AMERICA and asked to appear. Other companies are still waiting eagerly to be asked to appear.

The success and broad audience appeal of these performing arts programs have been noted by local television stations and the public broadcasting system as well. The major series are carried by more than 90% of the stations. The programs have been used to raise funds from community members and corporate underwriters. Many stations are considering local productions of the performing arts; when these programs are produced, a producer or director is usually brought in from New York.

The support of these major series has been divided between the broadcast stations and arts organizations. WNET receives the grant from PITA to produce DANCE IN AMERICA and then pays each performing arts company for their appearance. Lincoln Center and the Metropolitan Opera are funded directly by PITA to produce their own series. These organizations have explored ways of using the television exposure to increase membership and to solicit additional contributions. Other organizations are beginning to feel exploited when they are only paid a fee for their appearance. As arts organizations gain some experience with television production and begin to understand the benefits, they too want control over production and ownership of the product.

As they contemplate the future of media projects, more and more arts organizations are looking for different financial and production arrangements. The element most critical to the successful accomplishment of these series, at least in the eyes of the involved arts organizations, has been the producers and directors of the programs. These producers and directors have either been on salary at a broadcast station, or have acted as free lance media artists. Some arts organizations now planning future appearances on TV see little reason to go through the bureaucracy of a public television station or even a larger arts organization, if they can hire the production talent themselves. Were this possible, monies thus far contributing to the overhead of a broadcast institution

could in the future cover some of the operating expenses of the arts organization itself. As new markets for the distribution of media arts projects appear (cable, videocassette and disk), arts organizations want to reap the profits.

Competition for the income derived from presenting arts programming is no longer limited to public broadcasters and arts organizations. Now that these products have proven themselves, commercial broadcasters and cable operators have entered the field. The process does not stop in 1980, but only the next decade will reveal the directions it will take.

Other grants awarded under Programming in the Arts included support for a number of non-broadcast projects. For these grants, as for VISIONS and EARPLAY, the largest impacts have been felt by the individual artists who received the support. As less money from Programming in the Arts has gone to support these projects and has been dispersed over so many individuals, the impacts are slower to emerge. When individual artists do receive enough money to complete their projects and the products are broadcast or distributed, traces of the same process begin to appear. The common element is television and its power to raise awareness of an art form, an artist, a project or an idea.

The Future: Unresolved Issues

While the impacts of support from PITA have been considerable, many issues are still to be resolved as the relationship of media and the arts moves into the 1980's. Because PITA is an important funder of media arts projects, its decisions will continue to shape the relationship of media and the arts in the future. The National Endowment for the Arts, through Programming in the Arts, can provide leadership in media arts by addressing the following issues:

1. Who will be funded to produce media arts projects?
2. What criteria will be used for funding decisions?
3. What levels of funding will be provided?
4. How will media arts projects be disseminated?
5. What are the future funding priorities for Programming in the Arts?

These issues are interrelated. Each is discussed below, along with some of the options available to Programming in the Arts that were recommended in the course of this study by respondents.

Who will be funded?

More than 60% of all funds expended by PITA since 1972 have been granted to broadcasters. The remainder of the monies have been dispersed among arts organizations, production companies, schools and independent filmmakers and video artists. Each of these constituencies are perpetually in need of financial support.

Public broadcasters are faced with production costs which are increasing at a faster rate than the federal appropriations which they receive. Much of the arts programming which has had such significant impact, such as DANCE IN AMERICA, would probably have not happened without support from the Endowment. Even with grants from PITA, public broadcasters find themselves increasingly turning to corporate underwriters for financial support. Were PITA to decrease the proportion of funds directly granted to stations, their dependence upon corporate sources would most probably increase. The larger the role played by any one funder, the more control the funder will have over what appears on television.

Arts organizations have also faced economic crises throughout their history in the United States. Inflation has now aggravated their situation by increasing the costs of production. Even when performances are sold out, most arts organizations operate with deficits. The experience of the past five years of performing arts programming has taught arts organizations the value of a television appearance. Most often, it generates additional income many times over. Some arts organizations, such as Lincoln Center, can reap more of the economic benefits by producing the programs themselves than when working through the producing station. Other arts organizations have begun to plan their own productions, borrowing producers and directors from WNET, Lincoln Center or the Met, and they will be asking the Endowment to fund their projects directly.

These independent arts organizations have begun to express objections similar to those voiced by independent filmmakers and video artists. They want to be funded directly by PITA so that they can create and control their media arts projects. Independent filmmakers and video artists often have great difficulty finding sources of financial support for their work. Performing arts companies believe that they are being economically exploited by broad-

casters when the funds go to support an administration and operation they do not understand. Artists and arts organizations believe that with their artistic talent they could hire free lance production talent to mount first-class television productions.

Managers at producing broadcast stations suggest that this position reflects a naivete on the part of the arts organizations. They claim that the administrative costs and required expertise are not taken into account by the arts groups. The hidden costs of generating proposals, raising funds from various underwriters and sponsors, working out contracts with the multiple unions involved in production and coordinating production talent and equipment are some aspects of the enterprise rarely encountered by the arts organizations. The expertise accumulated by broadcast stations in these areas will be expensive to reproduce within each arts organization currently aspiring to produce their own programs.

There are some indications, however, that public broadcasters are beginning to listen to the feelings of arts organizations as their experience in performing arts production grows. One broadcaster noted that she is happy to share distribution rights with arts organizations to the extent that they in turn share the initial capital risks required for production. Other broadcasters are discussing co-productions with arts organizations in which fund-raising is shared as well as rights.

The competition between broadcasters and arts organizations, or independents for funds will not disappear as long as there are too few resources to go around. As commercial entrepreneurs enter the system through video and cable markets, the resources for production and the channels of distribution may be sufficient for both public broadcasters and artists to prosper. In the interim, a few representatives of public television strongly recommended that PITA fund only co-productions between stations and arts organizations or independent producers.

Within the public broadcasting system itself, there are other grievances related to competition for funds. Small stations feel that the larger stations receive a disproportionate share of PITA funds. Western stations believe that

the East Coast receives too much of the money, and Midwesterners suggest that too much goes to the coasts. The issue of geographic balance in funding is also relevant to the following discussion of criteria for funding decisions.

What criteria will be used for funding decisions?

Programming in the Arts has consistently strived to fund "high quality" media arts projects and, according to most of the people interviewed in this study, the projects supported by this funding category have met high standards. Many respondents underscored the importance of reserving PITA's limited funds for productions of only the highest quality. The impacts that have been most obvious have certainly resulted from support for series that featured the masterpieces in each field.

In contrast, another set of respondents stressed the importance of support from the Endowment for experimental and controversial subjects. "Film as art" and video art were cited as two neglected areas. Some people reasoned that corporate support has been available for performing arts media projects because these are safe; they therefore need Endowment support less. Independent films and video experimentation generally have much less access to alternate funding sources.

VISIONS is a case in point. VISIONS was widely regarded as an experiment with noble ideals, a project that deserved support even though the final product was of mixed quality. The creative arts cannot be sustained only through the presentation of the tried-and-true. On the other hand, experimental projects rarely achieve large audiences. As long as these programs are distributed over broadcast television, the imperatives of that system should be respected. Broadcasting is a mass medium. Public broadcasting, particularly when funded with public monies, has a responsibility to use the public airwaves to reach a reasonable share of the public.

The quality criterion was also raised by respondents in opposition to such criteria as geographic distribution, ethnic or racial distribution. The majority of respondents, whether located in New York or Atlanta, felt that high quality was the most important criteria for funding decisions.

What levels of funding will be provided?

Media production costs are spiralling and high quality television virtually demands big budgets. If PITA's goal is to create maximum public impact, then funding a few major projects at substantial levels is a focused and efficient way to achieve that impact. If, on the other hand, PITA is interested in increasing the quantity of programming available and/or in fostering the talents and opportunities of a large number of media artists, then smaller grants for more projects may be the best strategy. However, with smaller grants, recipients of funding must spend considerable energies raising additional funds. In the past, many projects have had to be reduced in scope or were never completed for lack of funds. At a time when Congressional appropriations to the Endowment are not increasing significantly, PITA needs to carefully consider its goals and the impacts it is striving to achieve.

How will media arts projects be disseminated?

Rights to television programs funded by PITA vary according to contracts negotiated between producers and talent. Arrangements are not consistent. LIVE FROM LINCOLN CENTER permits only one release for broadcast of each of its programs and retains the rights for future distribution. Programs produced by public television are usually negotiated for standard rights of four plays in three years. There is a feeling among some broadcasters that permitting Lincoln Center to retain those rights is unfair to public broadcasting.

Broadcasters also have a sense that wider secondary distribution is discouraged by the pay-back policies of some funders.

The issue of distribution is more pointed for independent filmmakers and arts organizations. Independents currently have a difficult time getting access to the public broadcasting system and other types of distribution. Programs which are not adequately distributed have little opportunity for impact. Arts organizations are beginning to feel economically exploited because they hold no secondary distribution rights. It may be appropriate for PITA to work more closely with grantees in the initial negotiation of contracts to assure fair and equitable

granting of rights and to find ways to ensure or encourage wider distribution of PITA-funded media arts projects.

What are the funding priorities for Programming in the Arts?

Between 1975 and 1979, PITA's first funding priority was for large-scale performing arts television series. With the issuance of a solicitation for a series on Design and Architecture in January, 1980, PITA signalled a new priority for the visual arts. Most respondents agreed that this new area needs a major effort and would prove most challenging. The advances made in televising the performing arts may also be possible in the visual arts.

Respondents were most eager to make recommendations to the Endowment concerning future funding policies and priorities. Most of these suggestions related specifically to the series that are now on or to projects that the Endowment has already planned, and these suggestions have been incorporated into the appropriate sections of this report. Several additional recommendations concerning funding policies were thoughtfully developed by respondents and deserve consideration.

a) Block grants funding

Several individuals requested that block grants be given, either to stations or to artists or to production companies, for an extended period of time. These suggestions are a response to various concerns. Producers and media personnel complained that the lengthy and costly process of applying for grants drained many of their resources. By extending support over a longer period, perhaps for a series of projects, PITA would enable artists to devote more of their time and effort to the development of their art. Longer term grants would allow producers to engage the best performers and production talent, many of whom have their time committed one or two years in advance. Block grants rather than project-specific grants were also suggested as a means of encouraging experimentation in media arts.

b) Funding for Promotion and Dissemination

The emphasis that respondents placed on promotion and dissemination of the projects that PITA funds led to several funding recommendations. Promotion of PITA projects through increased advertising and publicity was strongly encouraged. To date, promotion for PITA projects has been funded primarily by corporate underwriters and the public broadcasting system. Advertisements in TV Guide and the newspapers of major cities, however, may not be informing many of the people who would be most interested in viewing. A few respondents suggested that the Endowment could do more to develop its natural constituencies -- artists and arts organizations -- by promoting the PITA projects directly to these groups.

To increase dissemination of the PITA projects, as well as other projects funded by the Endowment, a few respondents suggested that the Endowment establish a nationwide television channel or service (via satellite or cable) to air programming on a regular basis. Another suggestion to aid dissemination was offered by one filmmaker and distributer. He proposed that the Endowment fund the buyers of programming: public libraries, university libraries, other exhibitors. This device would stimulate the market for independently produced media products.

c) Training producers

One last area of concern received funding recommendations from respondents. Numerous individuals bemoaned the lack of television producers with experience in the performing arts. When local stations develop performing arts projects, they are usually forced to import the established production talent from New York. Several attempts to remedy this situation have shown few results. An internship program was tried during the first year of production for DANCE IN AMERICA but participants found the experience less than satisfactory. Also, for the past few years, DANCE IN AMERICA producer, Merrill Brockway has held a series of summer seminars in which he shared his production expertise with a few station producers. According to people involved in that effort, attendees at the seminars have not yet produced their own performing arts programming. One respondent suggested another way to develop production talent: It was

recommended that the Endowment fund a small task force of production professionals to travel to the stations outside New York. They could advise and direct local personnel in the accomplishment of high quality arts programming. The local producers would have the actual experience of a professional production under the tutorage of experienced producers. They would then be able to produce future arts programming themselves.

The impact of PITA's support on media and the arts to date has been substantial. As each of these issues and policy areas raises new options, the position taken on them by PITA will shape its contribution for the future.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Corporation for Public Broadcasting. "Public Broadcasting: The First Ten Years." CPBreport, Vol. VIII, No. 24, November 7, 1977.

Dimaggio, Paul; Useem, Michael; and Brown, Paula. "Audience Studies of the Performing Arts and Museums: A Critical Review." Washington, D.C: Center for the Study of Public Policy, November 1977.

Harris, Patricia. "Musical Comedy Tonight---Audience Evaluation." Mimeographed. KCTS Research, July 1979.

Independent Film Feature Project. "The Independent Feature Conference." Mimeographed. New York, September 1979.

Katzman, N. and Wirt, K. "Arts and Cultural Programs on Radio and Television." Research Division, National Endowment for the Arts, August 1977.

Kiplinger, Austin. Washington Now. New York: Harper and Row, 1975.

Mahony, Sheila; De Martino, Nick; and Stengel, Robert. Keeping PACE with the New Television. New York: VNU Books International, 1980.

National Committee for Cultural Resources. A Report From the National Committee for Cultural Resources, New York, 1975.

National Research Center of the Arts, Inc. "The Joffrey Ballet Audience." Mimeographed. June, 1976.

Netzer, Dick. The Subsidized Muse. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1978.

Parlett, M. and Hamilton, D. "Evaluation as Illumination: A New Approach to the Study of Innovatory Programmes," in Hamilton, D. and others. Beyond The Numbers Game: A Reader in Educational Evaluation. Berkeley, CA: McCutchan Publishing, 1977.

PBS Communication Research. "Quarterly Reports." May 1978 - November 1979.

Peter D. Hart Research Associates, Inc. "A Survey of Attitudes Toward Public Television." Washington, D.C., November 1979.

Straight, Michael. Twigs for an Eagle's Nest. New York/Berkeley: Devon Press, 1979.

APPENDIX A

Descriptions of Major Series

DANCE IN AMERICA

About to begin its sixth season, DANCE IN AMERICA is a series of made-for-television programs featuring the outstanding choreographers and dance companies in the United States today. The talent is chosen by the producers of the series but the content of the programs is determined by the choreographer under the guidance of the production staff. Each artist is encouraged to adapt work for the camera and through close collaboration between the producers, the choreographer, and the performers, the integrity of the original work is maintained. In addition to the translation of existing work for the television medium, two pieces have been commissioned specifically for the series.

DANCE IN AMERICA was the outgrowth of several symposia on the creation of a major dance series for television. It was conceived as an alternative way to reach the growing numbers of people interested in the dance, many of whom lived in areas rarely toured by many dance companies. The project was initiated by the Public Media Program at the Endowment in conjunction with staff of the Dance Program and representatives of public broadcasting and leading dance companies.

On the basis of a proposal submitted in competition to Programming in the Arts at the Endowment, WNET was awarded a grant of $500,000 in 1975 to begin production of the series. The Corporation for Public Broadcasting and the Exxon Corpoation have also supported the project, each contributing $500,000 for the first season. Funding for the series has been consistently provided by these three organizations. The contribution by Programming in the Arts has been in the following amounts:

FY 1975:	$500,000
FY 1976:	500,000
FY 1977:	500,000
FY 1978:	500,000
FY 1979:	500,000

Additional funding for advertising and publicity is contributed by the Exxon Corporation. In 1979 a grant to the Public Broadcasting Service from CPB will pay for national advertisements in TV Guide, some of which will promote DANCE IN AMERICA.

The series is broadcast over PBS in prime time as part of WNET's showcase of Great Performances. A complete list of the programs broadcast during the first five seasons follows.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

DANCE IN AMERICA

ORIGINAL BROADCAST	PROGRAM CONTENT
January 21, 1976	City Center Joffrey Ballet -- "Olympics," and "Trinity," choreography by Arpino, "Parade," choreography by Massine, "The Green Table," choreography by Jooss; and "Remembrances," choreography by Joffrey (60 minutes)
March 24, 1976	Sue's Leg/Remembering the 30's -- choreography by Tharp, film collage (60 minutes)
April 7, 1976	Martha Graham Dance Company -- choreography by Graham (90 minutes)
June 2, 1976	Pennsylvania Ballet -- "Grosse Fugue," and "Adagio Hammerklavier," choreography by van Mannen; "Concerto Barocco," choreography by Balanchine, "Madrigalesco," choreography by Harkarvy; "Concerto Grosso," choreography by Czarny (60 minutes)
December 15, 1976	American Ballet Theatre -- "Billy the Kid," choreography by Loring, "Les Patineurs," choreography by Ashton (60 minutes)
January 5, 1977	Merce Cunningham and Dance Company -- choreography by Cunningham (60 minutes)
March 23, 1977	Dance Theatre of Harlem -- "Forces of Rhythm," choreography by Johnson, "Bugaku," choreography by Balanchine, "Holbert Suite," choreography by Mitchell; "The Beloved," choreography by Horton; "Dougla," choreography by Holder (60 minutes)
May 4, 1977	Pilobolus Dance Theatre -- choreography by the Pilobolus Dance Theatre (60 minutes)
June 22, 1977	Trailblazers of Modern Dance -- reconstructions include: "Five Brahms Waltzes in the manner of Isadora Duncan," choreography by Ashton; "Spear Dance of Japonesque," and "Polonaise," choreography by Shawn; "Soaring," choreography by St. Denis and Humphrey; "Etude and Mother," choreography by Duncan, re-interpreted by Gamson (60 minutes)
December 14, 1977	Choreography by Balanchine, Part 1 -- (60 minutes)
December 21, 1977	Choreography by Balanchine, Part 2 -- (68 minutes)
January 4, 1978	The Paul Taylor Dance Company -- choreography by Taylor (60 minutes)
June 7, 1978	San Francisco Ballet's "Romeo and Juliet," choreography by Smuin (120 minutes)
December 3, 1978	Choreography by Balanchine, Part 3 -- (60 minutes)
March 7, 1979	Choreography by Balanchine, Part 4 -- (69 minutes)
May 16, 1979	The Feld Ballet -- choreography by Feld (60 minutes)
May 30, 1979	Martha Graham Dance Company's "Clytemnestra," -- choreography by Graham (90 minutes)
February 20, 1980	Two Duets -- choreography by Robbins and Martins (60 minutes)
April 16, 1980	Divine Drumbeats -- choreography by Katherine Dunham (60 minutes)
May 21, 1980	Beyond the Mainstream -- choreography by Trisha Brown (60 minutes)

A total of 22 hours and 17 minutes of programming were produced during the first five seasons of DANCE IN AMERICA.

LIVE FROM LINCOLN CENTER

Between January, 1976, and June, 1980, LIVE FROM LINCOLN CENTER has presented a series of 24 performing arts events to a national audience via public television. The events have been broadcast live and unaltered from Avery Fisher Hall, the New York State Theatre, and Metropolitan Opera House, all components of the Lincoln Center complex in New York City.

Each season the broadcasts have included symphonic concerts by the New York Philharmonic, ballets by the American Ballet Theatre or the New York City Ballet, operas performed by the New York City Opera, and solo recitals by celebrated performing artists.

Lincoln Center developed the series as a vehicle for bringing high quality performances to a broader audience. By expanding the size of the audience for a live performance, beyond the seating capacity of the concert hall to the audience at home, it was anticipated that the Center would also derive additional income. Early plans included the possibility of cable distribution of these programs though this has not yet occured.

Research and development of a technology which could provide high quality visual and aural transmission began several years prior to the first broadcasts. Special lenses now allow the television cameras to pick up the programs without using the bright lights normally required. Radio simulcasts now improve the quality of the sound for the home audience as well.

Programming in the Arts at the Endowment participated in funding the early research on LIVE FROM LINCOLN CENTER in cooperation with the Sloan Foundation, The Ford Foundation, the John and Mary R. Markle Foundation, the Ambrose Monell Foundation, and the van Amerigen Foundation.

Current funders of the series include the Exxon Corporation, the Andrew W. Mellon Foundation, and the Corporation for Public Broadcasting. PITA has made an annual commitment to support the series in the following amounts:

FY 1973:	$ 14,350
FY 1974:	50,000
FY 1975:	50,000
FY 1976:	240,000
FY 1977:	260,000
FY 1978:	260,000
FY 1979:	275,000

The Endowment's support for the 1979 season accounted for 17% of the $1,600,000 budget for the series. Additional funding for promotion of the series is provided by the Exxon Corporation.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

LIVE FROM LINCOLN CENTER

ORIGINAL BROADCAST DATE	COMPANY AND ARTISTS	PROGRAMS	INTERMISSION
January 30, 1976	New York Philharmonic Andre Previn, Conductor Van Cliburn, Pianist	Works by Berlioz, Grieg, Strauss	Previn Interview
April 21, 1976	New York City Opera Judith Somogi, Conductor	"Ballad of Baby Doe"	Harold Prince/Nancy Hanks Interview
June 30, 1976	American Ballet Theatre Natalia Makarova, Ivan Nagy	"Swan Lake"	Natalia Makarova/ Clive Barnes/Erik Bruhn/Lucia Chase Interviews
November 3, 1976	New York City Opera Sarah Caldwell, Conductor	"The Barber of Seville"	Beverly Sills/ Donald Gramm/ Julius Rudel Interviews
November 20, 1976	New York Philharmonic Rafael Kubelik, Conductor	Works by Beethoven, Dvorak	Cyril Harris/Aryat Amos Interviews
November 28, 1976	Recital at Avery Fisher Hall Andre Watts, Pianist	Works by Liszt, Rach Maninoff, Schubert, Gershwin	Watts Interview
June 2, 1977	American Ballet Theatre Natalia Makarova, Mikhail Baryshnikov, Martine Van Hamel	"Giselle"	Erik Bruhn Interview
September 24, 1977	New York Philharmonic Zubin Mehta, Conductor Shirley Verrett, Soloist	Works by Mozart, Wagner, Stravinsky	Mehta/Verrett Interviews
October 18, 1977	New York City Opera Julius Rudel, Conductor	"Manon"	Beverly Sills/Nico Castel/Julius Rudel/ Kitty Carlisle Hart/ Gov. Hugh Carey Interviews
October 29, 1977	New York Philharmonic Erich Leinsdorf, Condutor Andre Watts, Pianist	Works by Brahms, Strauss	Watts/Leinsdorf Interviews
January 21, 1978	New York City Ballet Patricia McBride, Helgi Tomasson, Shaun O'Brien	"Coppelia"	McBride/Tomasson/ Dudleva/O'Brien/ Robert Irving Interviews
February 12, 1978	Recital at Metropolitan Opera House	Great Performers Pavarotti in Concert	Pavarotti Interview
April 19, 1978	New York City Opera Cal Stewart Kellogg, Conductor	"Saint of Bleeker Street"	Gian Carlo Menotti/ Catherine Malfitano Interviews
May 17, 1978	American Ballet Theatre Mikhail Baryshnikov, Natalia Makarova, Ivan Nagy	Evening of Repertory	Natalia Makarova/ Fernando Bujones/ Erik Bruhn/Gelsey/ Tirtland Interviews
September 20, 1978	New York Philharmonic Zubin Mehta, Conductor	Works by Wagner, Prokofiev, Beethoven	Carles Moseley/Mehta Interviews
October 4, 1978	New York City Opera Julius Rudel, Conductor	"The Turn in Italy"	Beverly Sills/Donald Gramm/Rudel Interviews
December 10, 1978	Chamber Music Society of Lincoln	Beethoven, Brahms, Mendelssohn	Paula Robinson/ Itzhak Perlman/ Charles Wadsworth Interviews
January 17, 1979	New York Philharmonic Zubin Mehta, Conductor Itzhak Perlman, Violinist	Works by Stravinsky, Tchaikovsky, Mussorgsky Ravel	Perlman Interview
January 22, 1979	Recital at Avery Fisher Hall Richard Bonynge, Conductor	Great Performers Luciano Pavarotti, Joan Sutherland	Prerecorded rehearsal shots and Bonynge/ Pavarotti/Sutherland Interviews
May 20 1979	American Ballet Theatre Cynthia Gregory Fernando Bujones	"The Sleeping Beauty"	Marcos Paradas, Julinda Nemenoff, Gregory Bujones, John Lanchbery Interviews
October 15, 1979	Recital at Avery Fisher Hall Richard Bonynge, Conductor	Great Performers Joan Sutherland, Marilyn Horne	Prerecorded rehearsal
October 27, 1979	New York City Opera	"Carmen"	[illegible]
November 14, 1979	New York Philharmonic Zubin Mehta, Conductor	[illegible] Pianist	Pianist/Conductor Mehta Interviews
January 14, 1980	New York Philharmonic Zubin Mehta, Conductor	[illegible] Soloist Itzhak Perlman Surprise guest, soloist	Mehta/Pavarotti Prerecorded shots Pavarotti at home in Italy
May 5, 1980	Tribute to John Hutton	[illegible] Music from Africa including African Queen, Red Badge of Courage, Night of the Iguana	
May 29, 1980	American Ballet Theatre Natalia Makarova, Anthony [illegible]	"La Bayadere"	

LIVE FROM THE MET PROGRAMS

DATE OF BROADCAST	OPERA	PERFORMING ARTISTS
March 15, 1977**	"La Boheme" by Puccini	Scotto, Pavarotti
November 5, 1977	"Rigoletto" by Verdi	Quivar, MacNeil; Cotrubas, Domingo, Diaz, Conducted by Levine
March 16, 1978	"Don Giovanni"	Sutherland, Morris, Conducted by Bonynge
April 5, 1978	"Cavelleria Rusticana/ Pagliacci"	Troyanos, Jones, Kraft, MacNeil MacNeil, Atherton, Conducted by Levine
September 25, 1978	"Otello" by Verdi	Vickers, Scotto, Conducted by Levine
November 21, 1978	"Bartered Bride" by Smetana	Stratas, Gedda, Vickers
December 11, 1978	"Tosca" by Puccini	Verrett, Pavarotti, Conducted by Colon
January 29, 1979	"Luisa Miller" by Verdi	Scotto, Domingo, Kraft, Milnes, Conducted by Levine
November 27, 1979	"Mahagonny" by Weill	Domingo, Cruz-Romo, Milnes Conducted by Levine.
February 16, 1980	"Un Ballo in Maschera" by Verdi	Pavarotti, Ricciarelli, Bleegan, Berini, Conducted by Patane
April [illegible], 1980	Don Carlo by Verdi	Scotto, Troyanos, Malagnani, Conducted by Levine
May 17, 1980	Don Pasquale" by Donizetti	Sills, Kraus, Bacquier Hagegard, Costel

* There has been a total of 47 hours, of programming in the series as of August 30, 1980.
** This program was broadcast prior to the Programming in the Arts involvement in the series.

VISIONS

VISIONS is a series of original dramas especially commissioned for television. Early in 1972, staff members of the National Endowment for the Arts and the Ford Foundation agreed that an attempt should be made to provide leadership in bringing about the creation and broadcasting of original American television drama on the Public Broadcasting Service (PBS). The impetus for the series commenced with a seminar on American Television Drama, co-sponsored by the Theatre Communications Group (TCG), the Ford Foundation and the National Endowment for the Arts in March, 1973 at Tarrytown, New York. For that seminar, John Houseman prepared a position paper on "TV drama in the U.S.A." As a result of the seminar, the National Endowment, Ford Foundation, TCG and PBS jointly sent a letter to all public television stations on January 23, 1974 soliciting proposals for a new drama project. The project aimed to provide an opportunity for the identification and development of American writers and to increase diversity of artistic resources in the country.

In 1974, KCET's proposal for a new drama project was funded. The total cost for the three-year, 32 program series was estimated to be $10.2 million. Of this sum, the Ford Foundation was to commit $2.5 million, CPB $2.2 million, and NEA $1.5 million ($500,00/year over three years). These three agencies agreed to raise the remaining funds required.

According to the original proposal, half of the programs were to be produced in-studio by KCET; the remaining half by external artistic resources such as non-profit institutions, free-lance artists, and other public stations.

Eighteen hundred writers submitted original material for consideration. Four plays were commissioned to be developed for every program produced.

NEA's contribution to the VISIONS project is as follows:

FY 1974:	$ 500,000
FY 1975:	500,000
FY 1976:	500,000
FY 1977:	500,000
FY 1978:	500,000
	$2,500,000

This represents approximately 25% of VISIONS total funding over the project's lifespan.

TITLE	ORIGINAL BROADCAST DATE	PLAYWRIGHT	DIRECTOR/PRODUCER
"Two Brothers"	October 21, 1976	Conrad Bromberg	Burt Brinckerhoff/Barbara Schultz
"War Widow	October 28, 1976	Harvey Perr	Paul Bogart/Barbara Schultz
"El Corrido"	November 4, 1976	Luis Valdez	Kirk Browning/Barbara Schultz
"Gold Watch"	November 11, 1976	Mamoko Iko	Lloyd Richards/Barbara Schultz
"Liza's Pioneer Diary"	November 18, 1976	Nell Cox	Nell Cox
"The Great Cherub Knitwear Strike"	November 25, 1976	Ethel Tyne	George Tyne/Barbara Schultz
"Life Among the Lowly"	December 2, 1976	Adrian Hall	Adrian Hall/Robin Miller
"Pennsylvania Lynch"	December 9, 1976	David Epstein	Jeff Bleckner/Rick Bennewitz/Barbara Schultz
*Scenes from the Middle Class "Winter Tour" "Monkey in the Middle"	December 16, 1976	David Trainer, Betty Patrick	Rick Bennewitz/Barbara Schultz
"Phantom of the Open Hearth"	December 23, 1976	Jean Shepard	Fred Barzyk/David Loxton
"The Tapestry Circles"	December 30, 1976	Alexis Devaux	Maya Angelou/Barbara Schultz
"The Gardener's Son"	January 1, 1977	Cormac McCarthy	Richard Pearce/Richard Pearce, Michael Hausman
"Prison Game"	January 13, 1977	Susan Yankowitz	Robert Stevens/Barbara Schultz
"Iowa"	October 2, 1977	Murray Mednick	Rick Bennewitz/Barbara Schultz
"Freeman"	October 9, 1977	Phillip Hayes Dean	Lloyd Richards/Barbara Schultz
**"Alambrista"	October 16, 1977	Robert Young	Robert Young/Robert Young, Michael Hausman
"The Dancing Bear"	October 23, 1977	Conrad Broeberg	Burt Brinckerhoff/Barbara Schultz
"Hanook Taxi"	October 27, 1977	Ed Folger	Ed Folger/Jeff Hayes
"Over/Under/Sideways/Down"	October 30, 1977	Peter Gessner, Eugene Corr	Steve Wax, Eugene Corr/Cine Manifest
"Secret Space"	November 4, 1977	Rosalyn Regelson, Roberta Hodes	Robert Hodes/Roberta Hodes
"Pleasantville"	November 6, 1977	Ken Locker, Vicki Polon	Ken Locker, Vicki Polon
"You Can Run, But You Can't Hide"	November 13, 1977	Brother Jonathon Ringkamp	Rick Bennewitz/Barbara Schultz
"All I Could See From Where I Stood"	November 20, 1977	Elizabeth Clark	Burt Brinckerhoff/Barbara Schultz
"Charlie Smith and the Fritter Tree"	October 9, 1978	Charles Johnson	David Loxton/Fred Barzyk
"Escape"	October 16, 1978	Jonathon Reynolds	Robert Stevens/Barbara Schultz
**"Fans of the Kosko Show"	October 23, 1978	David Epstein	John Desmond/Barbara Schultz
"Blessings"	October 30, 1978	Murray Mednick	Arvin Brown/Barbara Schultz
"Blackout"	November 13, 1978	Naomi Foner	Rick Bennewitz/Barbara Schultz
"Ladies in Waiting"	January 8, 1980	Patricia Resnick	Michael Lindsay-Hogg/Barbara Schultz
"Shoes String"	January 12, 1980	Ted Shines, Alice Childress	Oz Scott/Barbara Schultz
"It's the Willingness"	January 19, 1980	Marsha Norman	Gordon Davidson/Barbara Schultz
"He Wants Her Back"	January 26, 1980	Stanton Kaye	Stanton Kaye/Barbara Schultz
"Supervision"	SHORT **	Outside Production - TVTV	Aired on various dates as filler material following shows running less than 50 minutes.

Unless otherwise indicated all programs were 90 minutes in length

* These programs were 2 hours

** This program was 105 minutes in length

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

WOMEN IN ART

WOMEN IN ART is a series of films focusing on the lives and work of American women artists. In each of six films a portrait of one outstanding woman artist is developed. The seventh film, "Anonymous Was a Woman", relates the story of many American women in the 18th and 19th centuries who demonstrated their creativity through the needlework and decorative crafts that adorned their homes.

The films were produced for WNET by Perry Miller Adato and several independent filmmakers over a period of several years. Work on the pilot, a half hour film about Mary Cassatt, began in 1973 with funding from the Endowment, the Corporation for Public Broadcasting, and the Robert Sterling Clark Foundation. A Chairman's Grant from the Endowment in 1975 and funds from the Xerox Corporation and several foundations enabled Ms. Miller Adato to take advantage of a unique invitation from Georgia O'Keeffe to film the artist at home in New Mexico. In 1977, Programming in the Arts granted WNET $200,000 toward completion of the series.

"Georgia O'Keeffe" was first broadcast nationally as a one-hour special on the occasion of the artist's 90th birthday. The program launched a week of PBS programming on women which coincided with the National Women's Conference in Houston in November 1977.

The seven films were then telecast in the winter of 1978 as part of a larger series entitled THE ORIGINALS, which also included ten films on "The Writer in America". WOMEN IN ART was rebroadcast in 1979 on PBS and six of the films are distributed as 16mm films, filmstrips or videotapes to colleges, libraries and musuems.

WOMEN IN ART PROGRAMS

ORIGINAL BROADCAST DATES	TITLE	PRODUCER/DIRECTOR
November 15, 1977 March 9, 1978	"Georgia O'Keeffe"	Perry Miller Adato
February 2, 1978	"Mary Cassatt: Impressionist From Philadelphia"	Perry Miller Adato
February 9, 1978	"Nevelson in Process"	Susan Fanshel and Jill Godmilow
February 16, 1978	"Spirit Catcher -- The Art of Betye Saar"	Suzanne Bauman
February 23, 1978	"Alice Neel -- Collector of Souls"	Nancy Baer
March 2, 1978	"Anonymous Was a Woman"	Mirra Bank
March 9, 1978	"Frankenthaler -- Toward a New Climate"	Perry Miller Adato

EARPLAY

EARPLAY is a radio drama series first broadcast in 1971 and airing since then over the National Public Radio system. Karl Schmidt, the creator and director of the series, has aimed to present high quality dramatic material to the radio audience. To accomplish this, plays were commissioned from outstanding American playwrights such as Edward Albee, Arthur Kopit, Archibald MacLeish, and David Mamet, while other productions were acquired from abroad. New materials are continually sought, and over 1,000 unsolicited scripts are read each year.

The first season of EARPLAY consisted of a variety of short dramas and features made possible by an unrestricted grant of $150,000 from the Corporation for Public Broadcasting. Since 1975, a typical season of EARPLAY consisted of 26 one-hour plays, some of which are acquired. This season, there will be 14 hours of acquired BBC productions in addition to 26 American plays.

EARPLAY is now carried by 91% of the NPR-affiliated stations though scheduling is at each station's discretion. This year EARPLAY has become part of the National Public Radio's drama program, but artistic control and production responsibility is maintained by the production unit in Madison, Wisconsin. Promotional materials are now coordinated through NPR.

The National Endowment for the Arts began to support EARPLAY in 1973 The amount of their grants since then have been:

FY 1973	$ 12,500
FY 1974	15,000
FY 1975	200,000
FY 1976	200,000
FY 1977	50,000
FY 1978	200,000
FY 1979	200,000

This support was designated for EARPLAY and granted to the production facilities at the University of Wisconsin or Minnesota Public Radio, or it was granted directly to EARPLAY. In 1979, National Public Radio received the grant for radio drama with the understanding that it was to be used for the continuation of EARPLAY.

The contribution by Programming in the Arts now accounts for 41% of the $490,000 annual budget. The Corporation for Public Broadcasting has provided the remainder of the funds for the series. No additional funds have been raised from foundations or corporate underwriters.

1975 Programs

HYRONYMUS
by Manfred Bieler

THE NIGHT BATHERS
by Leo Goldman
and
THINKING ABOUT VERA CRUZ
by Anne Leaton

PROPERTIES
by E.G. Burrows

VOICES IN MY HEAD
by Rose Goldemberg
and
BUSTER IS UPSTAIRS
by Anne Leaton

SHOW ME THE WAY TO GO HOME
by Kevin Faller
and
THE REUNION OF OLIVES AND DAISY
by Larry Reed

CLEM MAVERICK
by R.G. Vliet

BELLS IN EUROPE
by Peter Leonhard Braun

ARGIVE SOLILOQUIES:
Pt. 1: THE ROAD TO AULIS
by John Reeves

ARGIVE SOLILOQUIES:
Pt. 2: DEATH OF A ROYAL VIRGIN
by John Reeves

ARGIVE SOLILOQUIES:
Pt. 3: THIS SMASHED CITY, UNEARTHED
by John Reeves

ARGIVE SOLILOQUIES:
Pt. 4: THE PRICE OF POWER
by John Reeves

ARGIVE SOLILOQUIES:
Pt. 5: UNDER MOONLIGHT, A WINTER MAN WITH A KNIFE
by John Reeves

ARGIVE SOLILOQUIES:
Pt. 6: THE IRON KING
by John Reeves

HYNEAS
by Peter Leonhard Braun

THE STORE
by Mavor Moore
and
SINCERELY, BENNY LESTER
by Norman Kline
and
SQUIRRELS AREN'T LIKE THAT
by Norman Kline

OPERATION VEGA
by Friederich Durrenmatt

STANDARD SAFETY
by Julie Bovasso
and
ABSTRACT AND CONCRETE
by LaVerne Kehr

DEAR JANET ROSENBERG, DEAR MR. KOONING
by Stanley Eveling

NO KNOCKING ON PEOPLE'S DOORS
by Katherine Kennedy

LITTLE PICTURES
by Anne Leaton

DEPARTURES
by David Kranes
and
THE FRIENDS OF THE FAMILY
by Donald Barthelme

PROCESSIONAL
by John Reeves

A SENSE OF PROPERTY
by James W. Nichol

CRIME MARCHES ON
by Dudley Riggs' Brave New Workshop

THE MYSTERY
by Bill Haughton

THE GREAT AMERICAN FOURTH OF JULY PARADE
by Archibald MacLeish

1976-1977 Programs

LISTENING
by Edward Albee

J.B.
by Archibald MacLeish

MAN AND SUPERMAN
by George Bernard Shaw

A VISIT WITH JOHN HOWARD GRIFFIN
by John Howard Griffin

CAUSE CELEBRE
by Terrence Rattigan

A DOLL'S HOUSE
adapted by Marian Waldman

MY NAME IS BIRD MCKAI
by Anne Leaton

THE DISAGREEABLE OYSTER
by Giles Cooper
and
THE LITTLE BLACK HOLE
by Alan Gosling

THE DAY JOHN WILLIAM FELL DOWN THE STAIRS AND DIED
by James W. Nichol

KOWALSKI'S LAST CHANCE
by Leo Simpson
and
TIGER
by Derek Raby

TWENTY YEARS OF TWILIGHT
by Marian Waldman

MR. LUBY'S FEAR OF HEAVEN
by John Mortimer

THE AUSTERE GWENDOLINE PARKER ELLIOTT
by James W. Nichol

THE OLD ONE TWO
by A.R. Gurney Jr.

RANDOM MOMENTS IN A MAY GARDEN
by James Saunders

THE MAZE
by Stewart Farrar

THE MIDNIGHT MOCKER
by Leo Goldman
and
SCAT MELISMA
by Kirk Nurock

HAYWIRE AT HUMBLEFORD FLAG
by Ken Whitmore

THE CODICIL TO MARY PURTY'S WILL
by James W. Nichol

CRIME AND PUNISHMENT, Pt. 1
adapted by Bill Morrison

CRIME AND PUNISHMENT, Pt. 2
adapted by Bill Morrison

CRIME AND PUNISHMENT, Pt. 3
adapted by Bill Morrison

THE GRAPPLING COURT
by David Kranes

UNDER THE LOOFAH TREE
by Giles Cooper
and
DINOSAURS
by John Antrobus

TRUCKER
by Paula Schiller

THE SUMMER OF TIMOTHY ONCE
by James W. Nichol

WINGS
by Arthur Kopit

THE TEMPTATION GAME
by John Gardner

THE WATER ENGINE
by David Mamet

DELIVERY
by Valerie Windsor

LESSON OF THE MASTER
by Richard Howard

THE LAST PHONE-IN
by Keith Waterhouse

PORCH
by Jack Heifner

GIRLS OF THE GOLDEN WEST
by Anne Leaton

AMERICAN MODERN
by Joanna M. Glass

DEATH OF A PIG
by John Kirkmorris

PHOENIX TOO FREQUENT
by Christopher Fry

THE DISINTEGRATION OF AARON WEISS
by Mark Medoff

CHINAMAN'S CHANCE
by Roy London

1977-1978 Programs

JUDGEMENT, Pt. 1
by Barry Collins

JUDGEMENT, Pt. 2
by Barry Collins

THE SUN CITY CHRONICLES
by Dudley Rigg's Brave New Workshop

ANNULLA ALLEN: AN AUTOBIOGRAPHY OF A SURVIVOR
adapted by Emily Mann

A GAME OF DICE
by Dimitri Kehaidis, translated by John Chioles and Robert Towe, radio version by Bill Morrison

GOOD CAUSES: THE CONFESSIONS OF A TROUBADOR
by Gamble Rogers

STONES
by Shirley Gee

ORDER THERAPY
by David Kranes

THE DISSOLUTION OF MARCUS FLEISCHMAN
by Stephen David

GENERAL BRUTUS
by Jeff Wanshel

PRIEST/PENITENT
by Wally K. Daly

THE HUNTER GRACCHUS
by John Robinson

ANOTHER VISIT WITH JOHN HOWARD GRIFFIN
by John Howard Griffin

1979 Programs

I NEVER SANG FOR MY FATHER
by Robert Anderson

FIRE IN THE HOLE
by Tim O'Brien

CUSTER
by Robert Ingham

STEVIE
by Hugh Whitemore

STUFFINGS
by James Prideaux

LATER
by Corrine Jacker

ABSENT FRIENDS
by Alan Ayckbourn

THE ANTIQUE BEARERS
by Ray Aranha

SIGN OF THE SCARAB
by Peter Francis Browne

WHEN THE TIME COMES
by Lee Devin

YOU WOULDN'T REMEMBER
by John Wain

MANHATTAN TRANSFERENCE
by William Tucker

ATTRACTA
by William Trevor

LADYHOUSE BLUES
by Kevin O'Morrison

LAME DUCK
by Lynn Reid Banks

ANNULLA ALLEN: AN AUTOBIOGRAPHY OF A SURVIVOR
adapted by Emily Mann

THE 75TH
by Israel Horovitz

A QUESTION OF BENEFIT
by Dave Simpson

THIRD AND OAK: THE LAUNDROMAT
By Marsha Norman

THIRD AND OAK: THE POOL HALL
by Marsha Norman

COLD EARTH TRAVELING
by Mike Walker

THAW
by Michael Kennedy

DARTMOUR COURTMARTIAL
by Peter King

THE DOG IN THE ALLEY, THE CHILD IN THE SKY
by John Irving
and
THE LIE
by John Antrobus

MONK
by John Kirkmorris

SWEET POTATOES
by Rochelle Owens
and
STATION TO STATION
by Peter MacNicol

THE BATHYSAPHE
by Kit Reed

1980 Programs

THE MAN IN 605
by Alan Gross

MIDDLEMAN OUT
by Dick Riley

IN CAMERA
by Robert Pinger

STATEMENTS AFTER AN ARREST UNDER IMMORALITY ACT
Athol Fugard

E STAR
by James McLure

CANADIAN GOTHIC
by Joanna M. Glass

LADYBUG, LADYBUG FLY AWAY HOME
by Mary Rhode

HOT DOGS AND SODA POP
by Thomas Babe

HOLIDAYS: Four Plays
by Preston Jones, Megan Terry, Oliver Hailey, & John Guare

FIND ME
by Olwen Wymark

PRARIE DU CHIEN
by David Mamet

DANCIN' TO CALLIOPE
by Jack Gilhooley

MADONNA
by Cripin Larangeira

KENNEDY'S CHILDREN
by Robert Patrick

CHILDREN OF THE NIGHT
by Neal Bell

LAUNDRY AND BOURBON
by James McLure

THE DEERSLAYER
by John Gehm

ALMS FOR THE MIDDLE CLASS
by Stuart Hample

THE STOLEN JEW
by Jay Neugeboren

BEGGAR'S CHOICE
by Kathleen Betsko

VT. WARS
by James McLure

THE DESERT
by Janet Niepris

BLOOD JET: A PORTRAIT OF SYLVIA PLATH
adapted by Barry Kyle

GREAT DAYS: THREE DIALOGUES BY DONALD BARTHLEME
by Donald Barthleme

RIGHT BETWEEN THE EARS
by the Brave New Workshop

ANYTHYNGE YOU WANT
by The Firesign Theatre

APPENDIX B

Organizations and Individuals in the Sample

Representatives of the following organizations were interviewed for this research.

Academy Theatre, Atlanta, GA
A.C. Nielsen Co., Chicago, IL
A Contemporary Theater, Seattle, WA
Aman Dance, Los Angeles, CA
American Ballet Theatre, NYC
American Conservatory Theater, San Francisco, CA
American Contemporary Dance Theater, Seattle, WA
Arena Stage Theatre, Wash., D.C.
Atlanta Ballet, Atlanta, GA.
Atlanta Symphony, Atlanta, GA
Bill Evans Dance Co., Seattle, WA
Black Rep. Company, Wash., D.C.
Capital Ballet, Wash., D.C.
Brave New Workshop, Minneapolis, MN
Chicago Alliance for the Performing Arts, Chicago, IL
Chicago Lyric Opera, Chicago, IL
Chicago Moving Co., Chicago, IL
Chicago Symphony Orchestra, Chicago, IL
Children's Theatre Company & School, Minneapolis, MN
The Cleveland Ballet, Cleveland, OH
The Cleveland Orchestra, Cleveland, OH
Cleveland Playhouse, Cleveland, OH
Columbia Broadcasting Services System, NYC
Columbia Chamber Orchestra, Columbia, SC
Columbia City Ballet, Columbia, SC
Columbia Lyric Opera, Columbia, SC
Columbia Music Festival Association, Columbia, SC
Columbia Philharmonic Orchestra, Columbia, SC
Corporation for Public Broadcasting, Wash., D.C.
Cultural Alliance of Washington, Wash, D.C
Dayton Hudson Foundation, Minneapolis, MN
EARPLAY, Madison, WI
Exxon Corporation, NYC
Footpath Dance Co., Cleveland, OH
Foundation for Independent Video & Film, NYC
Georgia Council for the Arts and Humanities, Atlanta, GA
Georgia Educational Television Network, Atlanta, GA
Global Village, NYC,
Goodman Theater, Chicago, IL
Guthrie Theater, Minneapolis, MN
Home Box Office, New York, NY
Imaginary Theatre, Atlanta, GA
Improvisory Theater Program, Los Angeles, CA
Intiman Theater, Seattle, WA
Margaret Jenkins Dance Co., San Francisco, CA
KCET, Los Angeles, CA
KCPX-TV, Kansas City, MO
KCTS, Seattle, WA
KCUR-FM, Kansas City, MO
KTCA-TV, St. Paul, MN
KUSC Radio, Los Angeles, CA
KQED, San Francisco, CA
Kansas City Arts Council, Kansas City, MO
Kansas City Ballet, Kansas City, MO
Kansas City Lyric Opera, Kansas City, MO
Karamu House, Cleveland, OH
Kansas City Philharmonic, Kansas City, MO
Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts, Wash., D.C.
Ben Kubasik, Inc., NYC
Landsman Dance Theater, Kansas City, MO
Lettumplay, Wash., D.C.
Lincoln Center for the Performing Arts, NYC
Mark Taper Forum, Los Angeles, CA
Massachusetts Arts and Humanites, MS
Andrew W. Mellon Foundation, NYC
Merce Cunningham Dance Co., NYC
Metropolitan Opera Association, NYC
Metropolitan Opera Guild, NYC
Mid-America Arts Alliance, Kansas City, MO
Minn. Dance Theatre and School, Inc., MN
Minn. State Arts Council, Minn. MN
Minnesota Opera Co., St. Paul, MN
Minnesota Public Radio, St. Paul, MN
Missouri Repertory Theatre, Kansas City, MO
Mo Ming Dance & Arts Center, Chicago, IL
Moving South Dance Company, Columbia, SC
National Broadcasting Company, NYC
National Public Radio, Wash., D.C.
National Radio Theater of Chicago, IL
National Symphony, Wash., D.C.
New York City Ballet, NYC
New York Public Theatre, NYC
New York State Council on the Arts, NYC
Oberlin Dance Coalition, San Francisco, CA
Ohio Arts Council, OH
Pacific Northwest Ballet, Seattle, WA
Public Broadcasting Service, Wash., D.C.
The Playwright's Lab, Minneapolis, MN
Pyramid Films, Santa Monica, CA
Rockefeller Foundation, NYC
San Francisco Ballet, San Francisco, CA
San Francisco Opera, San Francisco, CA
San Francisco Symphony, San Francisco, CA
Seattle Opera, Seattle, WA
Seattle Repertory Theater, Seattle, WA
Seattle Symphony, Seattle, WA
1750 Arch Street, Berkeley, CA
South Carolina Arts Commission, Columbia, SC
South Carolina ETV, Columbia, SC
Stage South, Columbia, SC
St. Nicholas Theater, Chicago, IL
St. Paul Chamber Orchestra, St. Paul, MN
Theatre Development Fund, NYC
Turner Broadcasting System, Atlanta, GA
Twyla Tharp Dance Co., NYC
WABE-FM, Atlanta, GA
WCLV-FM, Cleveland, OH
WETA-TV, Wash., DC.
WETV Channel 30, Atlanta, GA
WFMT-FM, Chicago, IL
WLTR-FM, Columbia, SC
WNET/Channel 13, NYC
WPFW-Pacifica, Wash., D.C.
WTTW-TV, Chicago, IL
WVIZ-TV, Cleveland, OH
Walker Art Center, Minneapolis, MN
Washington Arts Commission, Wash. D.C.
Washington Opera, Wash., D.C.
Westinghouse Broadcasting, NYC

In addition to the organization representatives listed above, the following individuals were interviewed for this research.

Ken Albers, Actor, Cleveland, OH
Dorothy Alexander Dancer, Choreographer, Atlanta, GA.
Stephen Beck, Video Artist, Berkeley, CA
Pat Berman, Critic, Columbia Record, Columbia, SC
Livia Blankman, Dancer, San Francisco, CA
Mitchell Block, Filmmaker & Distributer, NYC
Susan Bradford, Dancer, Chicago, IL
Kirk Browning, Director, NYC
Peter Campus, Video Artist, Boston, MA
Joy Carlin, Actress, San Francisco, CA
Richard Christiansen, Critic-at-large, Chicago Tribune, Chicago, IL
Gene Corr, Writer,Director, San Francisco, CA
Jamie Cunningham, Choreographer, Boston, MA
Jeff Denberg, TV Critic Atlanta Journal, Atlanta, GA
Benjamin Dunlap, Film teacher, Columbia, SC
Jeremy Geidt, Actor, Boston, MA
John Gilbert, Actor, Seattle, WA
Cynthia Gilliam, Actress, Director, Columbia, SC
Jill Godmilow, Filmmaker, NYC
Maxine Cushing Gray, Critic, Seattle, WA
Alex Gringold, Director, Wash., D.C.
Peter Howard, Cellist, St. Paul, MN
Liz Huddle, Actress, San Francisco, CA
Larry Jordan, Filmmaker, San Francisco, CA
Larry Josephson, Radio Producer, NYC
Joanne Kelley, Dancer, Producer, San Francisco, CA
Chris Komar, Dancer, NYC
Alan Kriegsman, Critic, Washington Post, Wash., D.C.
Richard LeBlond, Director of the San Francisco Ballet, San Francisco, CA
Mickey Lemle, Filmmaker, NYC
Bela Lewitsky, Dancer, Choreographer, Los Angeles, CA
Bill Mandell, TV Critic, San Francisco Examiner, San Francisco, CA
Henry Mazer, Conductor, Chicago, IL
Alan Miller, Producer, NYC
Danny Newman, Arts Publicist, Chicago, IL
Caroline Hall Otis, Dance Critic, Minnesota Daily, Minneapolis, MN
Maurice Peress, Conductor, Kansas City, MO
Dick Pearce, Writer, Director Los Angeles, CA
Nancy Quinn, Arena Stage Theatre, Wash., D.C.
Michael Rice, Aspen Institute for Humanistic Studies, NYC
Wilma Salisbury,Critc, Cleveland Plain Dealer, Cleveland, OH
Irving Saraf, Filmmaker, San Francisco, CA
Christopher Sarson, Producer, NYC
Sandra Schulberg, Associate Producer, Story Editor, NYC
Terry Schwartz, Music Critic, Atlanta Constitution, Atlanta, GA.
Barbara Schultz, TV Producer, Los Angeles, CA
Henry Siegel, Concert Master, Seattle, WA
June Spencer, Planning Consultant, Madison, WI
Robert Young, Filmmaker, NYC
Tommy Scott-Young, Actor, Poet, Columbia, South Carolina
Helen Smith, Dance & Drama Critic, Atlanta Constitution, Atlanta, GA.
Vern Sutton, Tenor, St. Paul, MN
Theodore Timreck, Filmmaker, NYC
Sharon Tynan, Dancer, Cleveland, OH

Appendix C

Research Design and Methodology

The present evaluation utilizes an illuminative approach to assessing the impacts of support granted by Programming in the Arts. Illuminative evaluation is an approach to evaluation methodology which grew out of research conducted at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology in association with B. R. Snyder and M. J. Kahne in regard to curriculum innovation (Parlett and Hamilton, 1977). Its aims are to study the innovative program: how it operates, how it is influenced by the various situations in which it is applied; what those directly involved regard as its advantages and disadvantages; and how the audience is affected. It aims to discover and document what it is like to be participating in the program, whether as a participant or audience, and to discern and discuss the innovation's most significant features. Illuminative evaluation relies on a multi-method data collection approach, drawing on both quantitative and qualitative data.

Any program with the breadth and diversity of Programming in the Arts is apt to impact differently on different groups and individuals. While it is most likely to affect the people and organizations who have received funds to support their work, it is also likely to affect non-participants and to have consequences that could not have been predicted when the program began. It was therefore both participants in Programming in the Arts-funded projects and non-participants who provided the illumination for this study. These include artists, arts organizations and media representatives. In relating their experiences and their reactions to activities funded by Programming in the Arts, these "stakeholders" have created a personal and qualitative description of the program under investigation.

Within the three month time frame of the evaluation, six stages of research activity may be discerned:

1. Preliminary interviewing
2. Selection of Sample
3. Development of Instruments
4. Collection of Data
5. Analysis and Interpretation of Data
6. Reporting of the Findings

The purpose and conduct of each stage is described in detail below.

Preliminary Interviewing

In mid-December, 1979, sixteen open-ended interviews were conducted by Project Manager Donna Lloyd-Kolkin and Senior Evaluator Karen Shapiro with staff members of the National Endowment for the Arts and knowledgeable representatives of the arts and media. The preliminary interviews included members of the Public Broadcasting Service (PBS) in Washington, D. C., personnel at several public television stations, arts organizations, other funding agencies and a few individual artists.

These interviews ranged in length from 45 minutes to several hours. They provided the researchers with background information on Programming in the Arts and introduced the researchers to concerns and issues that might be encountered in later interviews. Each of the interviewees also supplied the names of individuals who might contribute to the evaluation. Individuals who might be both favorable and unfavorable in their opinions about Programming in the Arts were deliberately sought. On the basis of these interviews and the original questions posed by staff at the Endowment in the solicitation for the evaluation, selection of the study's sample was undertaken and the interview schedules were prepared.

Selection of the Sample

Eleven categories of respondents were identified in this evaluation. They are listed below. Following each description, the number in parentheses indicates the number of respondents in each category. These numbers include preliminary interviewees.

I. Representatives of arts organizations that had participated in a Programming in the Arts-funded project (N = 25)

II. Representatives of arts organizations that had not participated in a Programming in the Arts-funded project (N = 73)

III. Individual artists who had participated in a project funded under Programming in the Arts (N = 16)

IV. Individual artists who had not participated in a project funded under Programming in the Arts (N = 23)

V. Representatives of public broadcasting stations that had produced programs with support from Programming in the Arts (N = 23)

VI. Representatives of public broadcasting stations that had not produced programs with support from Programming in the Arts (N = 20)

VII. Representatives of commercial media organizations (N = 8)

VIII. Representatives of the national public broadcasting organizations: the Corporation for Public Broadcasting, the Public Broadcasting Service; and National Public Radio (N = 13)

IX. Representatives of organizations that participated in funding media programming in the arts such as foundations, corporations and arts councils (N = 13)

X. Professional critics of media programming in the arts (N = 11)

XI. The public

Respondents for the study were drawn from the first ten categories. Limits placed on time and cost for the study prohibited inclusion of an adequate sample of the public. Several secondary sources of information which had been gathered from larger samples of the public were included in the data analysis. These included national and local audience studies furnished by A. C. Nielsen; qualitative ratings commissioned by the Corporation for Public Broadcasting (CPB), and several more general studies attitudes toward television or toward the arts. In addition, other indications of public response to programs sponsored by NEA such as letters to the producers, phone calls to the broadcast stations, and requests for offerings made during telecasts were reviewed when available.

The sample of interviewees selected for each of the ten populations was stratified along three dimensions: 1) geographic location; 2) type of project included under Programming in the Arts; and 3) art forms.

1) geographic location--To insure a nationally representative expression of opinions on the quality and impact of projects supported by the NEA's "Programming in the Arts" program, interviews were conducted with members of arts organizations, media organizations, and individual artists and critics in thirteen cities. Interviews were distributed as follows:

CITY	INTERVIEWS
Atlanta, Georgia	16
Boston, Massachusetts	11
Chicago, Illinois	14
Cleveland, Ohio	12
Columbia, South Carolina	19
Kansas City, Missouri	11
Los Angeles, California	14
Madison, Wisconsin	2
Minneapolis, Minnesota	22
New York City, New York	43
San Francisco, California	22
Seattle, Washington	18
Washington, D.C.	21
TOTAL	225

2) project category--Within each geographic area an attempt was made to interview individuals who had participated in projects that fell within the scope of "Programming in the Arts," whether or not the specific project had been funded by the Endowment. The relevant categories of projects included radio or television series that contained material related to an art form or performances; radio or television specials related to the arts; film or video projects that focused on the arts or developed an art form; and experimental works combining art and media. A complete list of projects funded by "Programming in the Arts" from 1972 through 1979 provided a starting point for locating individuals and organizations who had participated in projects with program support. Individuals who had participated in each of the major series under investigation, some of the smaller series and many of the specials that had been broadcast were interviewed. A few individuals who had received smaller grants for production or residencies were also inter-

viewed. As might be expected, individuals who had successful experiences are better known in the relevant art communities and therefore, were more easily contacted.

Distribution of sample of participants by category of project

Funded by Programming in the Arts 1972-1979	Number Included in Sample	Percent of Projects Category Included in Sample
29 SERIES	12 SERIES	41%
25 SPECIALS (TV)	13 SPECIALS	52%
64 FILM/VIDEO PRODUCTIONS	9 FILM/VIDEO	14%
39 PILOTS/R&D/OTHER	11 PILOTS/R&D/OTHER	28%

Names of art organizations and individual artists who had not received funding through Programming in the Arts were supplied by state and local arts councils in each location. The final sample consisted of 32 interviews with people who had participated in this program, either as individuals or as members of organizations; 98 interviews with non-recipients; 45 interviews at media organizations that had produced projects under this program; 29 interviews at media organizations that had not produced programs with funding from Programming in the Arts: and 21 others such as representatives of foundations, corporations, art councils and professional critics.

3) art forms--Within each city the sample was also stratified to represent the variety of art forms that have been treated by Programming in the Arts projects. These respondents were particularly helpful in judging the quality of programs in their respective fields, and in assessing the impact of the programs on their own work. Artists and members of arts organizations represented the various art forms as follows:

ART FORM	INDIVIDUALS INTERVIEWED
DANCE	45
OPERA	15
MUSIC	18
THEATRE	40
FILMMAKERS/VIDEOMAKERS	19

Within each art form, an attempt was made to interview established artists as well as more experimental artists.

Individuals who were contacted to participate in this research were screened to determine whether or not they had watched any of the major series we were evaluating. Most people claimed to have seen some of the programs; those few people who had not were more likely to attribute their disinterest to a generally negative attitude toward television or to a busy schedule. They were asked to suggest other people in their position or organization that were likely to have seen these shows. No one suggested that the quality of the programs or the content kept them from watching.

The willingness of individuals to participate in the research was exceedingly high. A complete list of organizations represented through interviews is found in Appendix B. People who were interviewed as individuals, rather than as representatives of an organization are listed separately, also in Appendix B.

Development of Instruments

Ten separate interview schedules were developed. A copy of these schedules can be found in Appendix D. In addition to items about quality, dissemination and impacts, information was gathered from the interviewees to provide a context in which to set their responses: background information on the individual or organization; past experiences with the Media Arts Division at the National Endowment for the Arts; funding arrangements; and future plans for media arts projects. Suggestions for improvements or new programs that would

be appropriate for Programming in the Arts were solicited. Thus, participants were encouraged to criticize by pointing out what may have been neglected in the past.

The interview schedules were prepared in consultation with Dr. Michael Scriven and Dr. Barbara Davis of the Evaluation Institute at the University of San Francisco. They were piloted in San Francisco at the beginning of January, 1980, and modified several times before the interviewers took them into the field.

Collection of Data

Two hundred and twenty-five in-person interviews* served as the primary source of data for the evaluation. Six interviewers visited thirteen cities to conduct the interviews which ranged in length from one half hour to an hour and a half. Prior to the interview, participants were advised that no comments would be attributed to them, and that their responses would in no way affect present or future funding from NEA. The interviews were audio taped and returned to San Francisco for transcription at the end of January. Due to a lack of funds only 76% of the interviews were completely transcribed. The rest were listened to and main points were pulled out.

Archival materials such as press releases, feature stories, reviews and reports on the funded projects were collected from broadcast station personnel, arts organizations, producers, PBS, NPR, and other participants in the projects.

Information on audience exposure was gathered from several sources. Particularly helpful in supplying numbers and advice on how to interpret them were Ken Wirt at PBS; Carolyn Keegan at CPB; Tom Church at CPB; Jim Hannon at WNET; and Bill Miller at A. C. Neilsen.

*Four interviews were conducted by telephone due to illness and problems in rescheduling appointments.

Analysis and Interpretation of Data

The data were analyzed using ethnographic methods. First, the audiotapes of interviews were transcribed. Next, the transcriptions were duplicated and coded paragraph by paragraph. During a first reading, paragraphs were coded in broad categories pertaining to impacts on the arts, impacts on the media, impacts on participants, quality, background information, recurrent issues/concerns, distribution and promotion. Each category was then examined to allow the representative viewpoints to emerge. The analysis of verbatims within categories compared comments by geographic origin, media representatives vs. arts representatives, and participants vs. non-participants. Unless otherwise noted, the verbatims presented throughout the report were chosen for their representativeness.

Other than economic impacts, there were surprisingly few impacts that distinguished participating artists from non-participating artists. The most significant factor underlying differences in the opinions and positions expressed by respondents was whether they represented arts organizations or the media.

Judgments of "performance quality," "technical quality" and "overall quality" were collected and quantified for the major series.* In this procedure, respondents were asked to rate these components of quality for each series with which they were familiar on a scale ranging from "very high" through "very low." These results are presented in Chapter 2 in Tables 2.1, 2.2, 2.3, and 2.4.

Respondents rated only those series they knew well enough to judge, and this meant that they had seen or heard at least three programs within a series. Fewer than 35% of the respondents were familiar with EARPLAY or WOMEN IN ART, so those responses are not included. The quality rating checklist was completed by 88 respondents. The checklist was used by interviewers to supplement the interview schedule (see Appendix D) when time permitted. It was not applied to all 225 respondents.

---

*A fourth quality dimension, "ability to hold audience attention," was also rated for each series. The results are not included in Tables 2.1 through 2.4 because this item appeared to be mis-interpreted by many respondents and very few rated it.

There were five possible ratings for each of the three quality dimensions: "very high," "somewhat high," "mixed," "somewhat low," and "very low." The two ratings of "very high" and "somewhat high" were combined in Tables 2.1 - 2.4 under "high" and the two corresponding low categories were combined under "low."

The 88 respondents who rated the series are divided two ways. In the upper portion of each table, they are identified as either media or arts representatives, while in the lower portion they are divided into participants and non-participants. Participants are those who took part in any of the projects funded by PITA. Each table compares media vs. art representatives, and participants vs. non-participants.

The analysis of the Nielsen audience ratings was undertaken by Research and Programming Services and is described in detail in Chapter 3.

Reporting the Findings

The presentation of qualitative findings requires some explanation. The comments presented throughout this report were selected because they best characterized the prevalent views. Many opinions that were expressed by only one or two respondents do not appear in this report.

Verbatims reported in Chapter 4, Impact on Media, can be assumed to be the comments of media representatives; comments of arts representatives are presented in Chapter 6, Impact on the Arts, unless otherwise noted.

Many of the respondents have requested copies of the report when it is made available. Their cooperation, enthusiasm and accessibility for this research shows a strong interest in the future of Programming in the Arts and a desire to remain informed of its status and plans.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

APPENDIX D

Interview Instruments

INTERVIEW SCHEDULE I for ARTS ORGANIZATIONS -- PARTICIPATING

A. BACKGROUND

1. Can you tell me how _____(name of project) was started?

2. What role have you played in the project?

3. What did you hope to accomplish with _____(name of project)?

*4. How successful do you think _____(name of project) has been?

PROBE: what factors are responsible for success or failure?

what could be improved?

5. Was this the first/only media project you have been involved in?

B. FUNDING

1. What percent of the funds for this project did NEA/media programming in the arts contribute (by year)?

2. Was this funding earmarked for a particular part of the project?

3. Who were the other funders of the project?

*4. Did the support from NEA have any significance beyond the financial contribution?

PROBE: did it add credibility?

did it make it easier or harder to attract other funding?

5. Did you run into any problems in attempting to fulfill the requirements of different funders?

6. How is this organization primarily supported?

PROBE: what percent of its funding comes from grants (gov't., corporate, foundation)?

*7. Did your budget for the project include funds for promotion of the programs?

C. RELATIONSHIP TO NEA/MEDIA PROGRAMMING IN THE ARTS

*1. How closely did NEA monitor what you were working on?

PROBE: were there any constraints that limited what you were able to accomplish artistically?

INTERVIEW SCHEDULE I for ARTS ORGANIZATIONS -- PARTICIPATING

C. RELATIONSHIP TO NEA/MEDIA PROGRAMMING IN THE ARTS (Cont.)

*2. Did NEA affect the distribution of the programs?

PROBE: did it encourage broad distribution?

did it in anyway inhibit the broader distribution of the programs?

*3. Have you ever applied to the Media Programming in the Arts program at the Endowment and been turned down?

PROBE: what were the circumstances?

do you feel that you were treated fairly?

D. AWARENESS

1. In addition to _____ (name of project they were involved with), how familiar are you with the rest of these SERIES? (SHOW LIST OF SERIES)

2. (If series not seen), was there there any particular reason that you did not watch _____ (name of series)?

3. Were any of the programs in the series outstanding? Why?

PROBE: any of them particularly good?

particulary bad?

4. Do you remember seeing any of these specials or film and video productions? (SHOW LIST OF ONE-SHOT SPECIALS AND PRODUCTIONS)

PROBE: which ones?

what do you remember about them?

E. PROGRAM EFFECTS

*1. What effect has participation in _____ (name of program) had on _____ (this organization)?

PROBE: positive effects? income from the program?

negative effects?

unexpected effects?

unexpected by-products?

INTERVIEW SCHEDULE I for ARTS ORGANIZATIONS -- PARTICIPATING

E. PROGRAM EFFECTS (Cont.)

2. Has the length of the performance season changed?

since airing of the program?

in the past few years (since 1976)?

*3. Has attendance at live performances changed?

since airing of the program?

in the past few years (since 1976)?

for the specific performances that were aired?

what indications do you have?

if there are records of attendance, may I copy them?

4. Has the ability of _____(name of organization) to attract other forms of support increased since the airing of _____(name of program)?

5. Have memberships or subscriptions increased, decreased or remained the same?

*6. Do you know of other projects that were generated as a result of _____(program we are discussing)?

for yourself?

for others?

7. Do you have any measures of the size of the audience viewing at home?

*8. Did you receive mail, phone calls or presents from the audience viewing at home after the airing of _____(name of program)?

if so, do you have records of this response?

9. Have the sales of _____(records, plays, etc.)

increased as a result of _____(name of program)?

10. Do you think there has been an explosion in the performing arts over the past few years? if so, what role do you think televising the arts has played?

INTERVIEW SCHEDULE I for ARTS ORGANIZATIONS -- PARTICIPATING

E. PROGRAM EFFECTS (Cont.)

12. Do you think that the appearance of _____(art organizations, such as dance companies, or whichever one the interviewer is involved with) on television has altered the composition of audiences at live performances?

PROBE: how?

13. Do you think that audiences have different expectations of the live performance after seeing _____(art form, such as dance) on tv?

14. Do you think that television has changed the sophistication of the live audiences?

PROBE: if so, in what ways?

15. Do you think these programs have affected artists who were not featured on them?

PROBE: have they been helped?

have they been hurt ?

INTERVIEW SCHEDULE I for ARTS ORGANIZATIONS -- PARTICIPATING

F. PROGRAM QUALITY

1. I'd like to ask your opinion about the quality of some of the series that NEA has funded. Let's start with _____ (one of the series that interviewee said he/she has seen). What is your opinion of the _____ (e.g., PRODUCTION & TECHNICAL QUALITY) of the series? Would you say that it is VERY HIGH, SOMEWHAT HIGH, MIXED, SOMEWHAT LOW, or VERY LOW?
(PROBE: if answers VERY HIGH or VERY LOW - any particular reasons?)

[CIRCLE INTERVIEWEE'S ANSWERS]

DANCE IN AMERICA

TECHNICAL QUALITY (lighting, sound, camera) and PRODUCTION QUALITY (editing, pacing, sequencing)	VH (why?)	SH	M	SL	VL (why?)	?
PERFORMANCE QUALITY	VH (why?)	SH	M	SL	VL (why?)	?
ABILITY OF PROGRAMS TO HOLD AUDIENCE'S ATTENTION	VH (why?)	SH	M	SL	VL (why?)	?
OVERALL QUALITY	VH (why?)	SH	M	SL	VL (why?)	?

THE MET

TECH/PRODUCTION QUALITY	VH (why?)	SH	M	SL	VL (why?)	?
PERFORMANCE QUALITY	VH (why?)	SH	M	SL	VL (why?)	?
ABILITY TO HOLD ATTENTION	VH (why?)	SH	M	SL	VL (why?)	?
OVERALL QUALITY	VH (why?)	SH	M	SL	VL (why?)	?

LINCOLN CENTER

TECH/PRODUCTION QUALITY	VH (why?)	SH	M	SL	VL (why?)	?
PERFORMANCE QUALITY	VH (why?)	SH	M	SL	VL (why?)	?
ABILITY TO HOLD ATTENTION	VH (why?)	SH	M	SL	VL (why?)	?
OVERALL QUALITY	VH (why?)	SH	M	SL	VL (why?)	?

F. PROGRAM QUALITY (cont'd)

VISIONS

TECH/PRODUCTION QUALITY	VH (why?)	SH	M	SL	VL (why?)	?
PERFORMANCE QUALITY	VH (why?)	SH	M	SL	VL (why?)	?
ABILITY TO HOLD ATTENTION	VH (why?)	SH	M	SL	VL (why?)	?
OVERALL QUALITY	VH (why?)	SH	M	SL	VL (why?)	?

EARPLAY

TECH/PRODUCTION QUALITY	VH (why?)	SH	M	SL	VL (why?)	?
PERFORMANCE QUALITY	VH (why?)	SH	M	SL	VL (why?)	?
ABILITY TO HOLD ATTENTION	VH (why?)	SH	M	SL	VL (why?)	?
OVERALL QUALITY	VH (why?)	SH	M	SL	VL (why?)	?

WOMEN IN ART

TECH/PRODUCTION QUALITY	VH (why?)	SH	M	SL	VL (why?)	?
PERFORMANCE QUALITY	VH (why?)	SH	M	SL	VL (why?)	?
ABILITY TO HOLD ATTENTION	VH (why?)	SH	M	SL	VL (why?)	?
OVERALL QUALITY	VH (why?)	SH	M	SL	VL (why?)	?

INTERVIEW SCHEDULE I for ARTS ORGANIZATIONS -- PARTICIPATING

F. PROGRAM QUALITY (Cont.)

*2. Are there individuals or groups that you believe have been overlooked?

_____NO _____YES IF SO, Who are they?

3. Do you have any thoughts on how these programs could be improved?

4. What do you think has been accomplished, generally, by funding these series?

PROBE: Do you think NEA has created an archive of the best performing artists?

Do you think the experience of being at a performance has been shared with the audience at home?

Have tv's/radio's capabilities been used to enhance a performing arts performance (e.g., close-ups and subtitles)?

Have these programs encouraged innovative combinations of art and media?

5. Do you have any other comments concerning the quality of these programs?

G. DISSEMINATION AND PROMOTION

1. What broadcast rights were granted to local stations in the copyright agreements for _____(name of program)?

2. What auxiliary rights were granted?

3. Has _____(program) been available for rental or purchase?

Through which sources?

If YES, may I see the figures on sales, rental, etc.?

4. Is _____(program) available for use in schools?

If YES, with what frequency has it been requested?

5. Has _____been used in telecourses at colleges?

6. Have print materials been associated with the program?

If YES, may I see them?

INTERVIEW SCHEDULE I for ARTS ORGANIZATIONS -- PARTICIPATING

G. DISSEMINATION AND PROMOTION (Cont.)

7. Has _____(program) been distributed internationally?

   If YES, how was this arranged under what terms?

8. Has _____(program material) been adapted for use in other media? (e.g., radio plays have become stage plays)

9. Have you ever attempted to co-produce media arts programming with organizations outside of the public tv/radio system in the U.S.?

10. Do you have plans for distributing these programs via cable, video-cassette, video disk or through information utilities?
    IF SO, WHAT ARE THE PLANS? IF NOT, why not?
    Have you retained any rights to the programs?

11. What efforts were made to promote these programs?
    (FOR P.I. OR P.R. PERSONNEL)
    PROBE: Which media - t.v. spots, radio, newspapers, posters, t.v. guide, magazines?

12. Do you have any indication of the success of their efforts?

13. May I have copies of print materials used to promote the programs?

    press packets?
    advertisements?
    materials to send away for?

14. Do you have a file of reviews or feature stories on _____
    (name of program or the other series, specials, etc.)?
    If SO, may I make copies?

15. Has this program won any awards or prizes?

*16. Do you think that distribution of the programs could have been handled better? In what ways?

H. FUTURE MEDIA ARTS PROJECTS

1. Do you have plans for media arts programming in the near future?
   If SO, what are they?

2. Are these projects that would be appropriate for NEA support?
   IF SO, will you ask for their advice, assistance or participation?

3. Do you have any plans to be involved in commercial television programming in the arts?

*4. What do you think NEA should be doing in this area that hasn't been done?

*5. Would you have any hesitation in participating in another _____

_____(project) with the Media Arts program at NEA?

PROBE: reasons?

INTERVIEW SCHEDULE II for ARTS ORGANIZATIONS -- NON-PARTICIPATING

A. BACKGROUND

1. Before I ask you about the programs that NEA has supported, it would help me to have some background information about this orgnization and your work here. Could you tell me something about the type of work _____(name of organization) does?

2. (IF IT'S NOT OBVIOUS) Does _____(name of organization) try to do experimental or innovative types of projects?

3. Has _____(name of organization) ever been televised or involved in a media arts project?

   PROBE: If SO, could you tell me about the project?

   What was it trying to accomplish? Were you involved in the project?

   How successful was it? What factors contributed to its success/failure?

4. What is your role at _____(organization)?

5. Can you tell me a little about your background?

B. FUNDING

1. How is this organization primarily supported?

   PROBE: what percent of its funding comes from grants (gov't., corporate, foundation)?

C. RELATIONSHIP TO NEA/MEDIA PROGRAMMING IN THE ARTS

*1. Has _____(name of organization) ever applied to the "Media programming in the Arts" program at the Endowment?

   PROBE: If SO, what were the circumstances?

   (If application was rejected) Do you feel that you were treated fairly?

   PROBE: (If they never applied) why not?

2. Has _____(name of organiztion) ever applied to other divisions of NEA for support?

   PROBE: If SO, what were the projects?

INTERVIEW SCHEDULE II for ARTS ORGANIZATIONS -- NON-PARTICIPATING

D. AWARENESS

1. How familiar are you with these SERIES? (SHOW LIST OF SERIES)

2. (If series not seen), was there there any particular reason that you did not watch _____(name of series)?

3. Were any of the programs outstanding in the series? Why?

   PROBE: any of them particularly good?

   particulary bad?

4. Do you remember seeing any of these specials or film and video productions? (SHOW LIST OF ONE-SHOT SPECIALS AND PRODUCTIONS)

   PROBE: which ones?

   what do you remember about them?

E. EFFECTS

1. Has the length of your performance season changed over the past few years? (since 1976)

   PROBE: If SO, How and why?

2. Has attendance at live performances changed in the past few years?

   PROBE: If SO, Are there attendance records that reflect these changes and if so, may I copy them?

3. Have memberships or subscriptions for _____(name of organization) increased, decreased or remained the same in the past few years?

4. Do you think there has been an explosion in the performing arts over the past few years?

   PROBE: If SO, What role do you think televising the arts has played?

5. Do you think that televising the ARTS has attracted new or increased fundings for arts organizations?

6. Do you think that the appearance of _____(arts organizations in the field of this interviewee, such as "dance companies") on television has altered the composition of audiences at live performances?

   PROBE: HOW?

INTERVIEW SCHEDULE II for ARTS ORGANIZATIONS -- NON-PARTICIPATING

E. EFFECTS (cont'd)

7. Do you think that audiences have different expectations of the live performance after seeing the performing arts on television?

PROBE: what are the differences?

what indications do you have?

8. Do you think that television has changed the sophistication of the live audience?

PROBE: If SO, in what ways?

*9. Do you think that this organization has been affected by the broadcast of these media arts projects?

PROBE: If SO, Has it benefited? HOW?

Has it been hurt? HOW?

F. PROGRAM QUALITY

1. I'd like to ask your opinion about the quality of some of the series that NEA has funded. Let's start with _____ (one of the series that interviewee said he/she has seen). What is your opinion of the _____ (e.g., PRODUCTION & TECHNICAL QUALITY) of the series? Would you say that it is VERY HIGH, SOMEWHAT HIGH, MIXED, SOMEWHAT LOW, or VERY LOW?
(PROBE: if answers VERY HIGH or VERY LOW - any particular reasons?)

[CIRCLE INTERVIEWEE'S ANSWERS]

DANCE IN AMERICA

TECHNICAL QUALITY (lighting, sound, camera) and PRODUCTION QUALITY (editing, pacing, sequencing)	VH (why?)	SH	M	SL	VL (why?)	?
PERFORMANCE QUALITY	VH (why?)	SH	M	SL	VL (why?)	?
ABILITY OF PROGRAMS TO HOLD AUDIENCE'S ATTENTION	VH (why?)	SH	M	SL	VL (why?)	?
OVERALL QUALITY	VH (why?)	SH	M	SL	VL (why?)	?

THE MET

TECH/PRODUCTION QUALITY	VH (why?)	SH	M	SL	VL (why?)	?
PERFORMANCE QUALITY	VH (why?)	SH	M	SL	VL (why?)	?
ABILITY TO HOLD ATTENTION	VH (why?)	SH	M	SL	VL (why?)	?
OVERALL QUALITY	VH (why?)	SH	M	SL	VL (why?)	?

LINCOLN CENTER

TECH/PRODUCTION QUALITY	VH (why?)	SH	M	SL	VL (why?)	?
PERFORMANCE QUALITY	VH (why?)	SH	M	SL	VL (why?)	?
ABILITY TO HOLD ATTENTION	VH (why?)	SH	M	SL	VL (why?)	?
OVERALL QUALITY	VH (why?)	SH	M	SL	VL (why?)	?

F. PROGRAM QUALITY (cont'd)

VISIONS

TECH/PRODUCTION QUALITY	VH (why?)	SH	M	SL	VL (why?)	?
PERFORMANCE QUALITY	VH (why?)	SH	M	SL	VL (why?)	? ?
ABILITY TO HOLD ATTENTION	VH (why?)	SH	M	SL	VL (why?)	?
OVERALL QUALITY	VH (why?)	SH	M	SL	VL (why?)	?

EARPLAY

TECH/PRODUCTION QUALITY	VH (why?)	SH	M	SL	VL (why?)	?
PERFORMANCE QUALITY	VH (why?)	SH	M	SL	VL (why?)	?
ABILITY TO HOLD ATTENTION	VH (why?)	SH	M	SL	VL (why?)	?
OVERALL QUALITY	VH (why?)	SH	M	SL	VL (why?)	?

WOMEN IN ART

TECH/PRODUCTION QUALITY	VH (why?)	SH	M	SL	VL (why?)	?
PERFORMANCE QUALITY	VH (why?)	SH	M	SL	VL (why?)	?
ABILITY TO HOLD ATTENTION	VH (why?)	SH	M	SL	VL (why?)	?
OVERALL QUALITY	VH (why?)	SH	M	SL	VL (why?)	?

INTERVIEW SCHEDULE II for ARTS ORGANIZATIONS -- NON-PARTICIPATING

F. PROGRAM QUALITY (Cont.)

*2. Are there individuals or groups that you believe have been overlooked?

_____NO _____YES IF SO, Who are they?

3. Do you have any thoughts on how these programs could be improved?

4. What do you think has been accomplished, generally, by funding these series?

PROBE: Do you think NEA has created an archive of the best performing artists?

Do you think the experience of being at a performance has been shared with the audience at home?

Have tv's/radio's capabilities been used to enhance a performing arts performance (e.g., close-ups and subtitles)?

Have these programs encouraged innovative combinations of art and media?

5. Do you have any other comments concerning the quality of these programs?

H. FUTURE MEDIA ARTS PROJECTS

*1. Do you have plans for media arts projects in the near future?

PROBE: If SO, what are they?

2. Are these projects that would be appropriate for NEA to support?

PROBE: If SO, will you ask for their advice, assistance or participation?

3. Do you have any plans to be involved in commercial tv programming in the arts?

*4. What do you think NEA should be doing in this area that hasn't been done?

*5. Would you have any hesitation in participating in a project with the Media Arts program at NEA?

PROBE: Why?

INTERVIEW SCHEDULE III for INDIVIDUAL ARTISTS -- PARTICIPATING

A. BACKGROUND

1. Could you give me a little background information on _____(name of project)?

PROBE: How did you get involved?

2. Did you have any particular goals in undertaking _____(name of project)?

PROBE: If SO, what were they?

*3. How successful do you think _____(name of project) has been?

PROBE: what factors are responsible for success or failure?

what could be improved?

4. Was this the first/only media project you have been involved in?

B. FUNDING

1. Did you feel that the income you received for your participation in _____(name of project) was adequate?

2. Was your income affected by your participation in any other ways?

PROBE: If SO, in what ways?

(If it's not obvious) How do you know?

3. Did the support from NEA have any significance beyond the financial contribution?

PROBE: did it add credibility?

did it make it easier or harder to attract other funding?

C. RELATIONSHIP TO NEA/MEDIA PROGRAMMING IN THE ARTS

*1. How closely did NEA monitor what you were working on?

PROBE: were there any constraints that limited what you were able to accomplish artistically?

*2. Did NEA affect the distribution of the programs?

PROBE: did it encourage broad distribution?

did it in anyway inhibit the broader distribution of the programs?

*3. Have you ever applied to the Media Programming in the Arts program at the Endowment and been turned down?

PROBE: what were the circumstances?
do you feel that you were treated fairly?

INTERVIEW SCHEDULE III for INDIVIDUAL ARTISTS -- PARTICIPATING

D. AWARENESS

1. In addition to _____ (name of project they were involved with), how familiar are you with the rest of these SERIES? (SHOW LIST OF SERIES)

2. (If series not seen), was there there any particular reason that you did not watch _____(name of series)?

3. Were any of the programs outstanding in the series? Why?

PROBE: any of the particularly good?

particulary bad?

4. Do you remember seeing any of these specials or film and video productions? (SHOW LIST OF ONE-SHOT SPECIALS AND PRODUCTIONS)

PROBE: which ones?

what do you remember about them?

E. EFFECTS

1. What effect has participation in _____(name of project) had on you?

positive effects
negative effects
unexpected effects
unexpected by-products

2. Has the length of the performance season changed?

since airing of the program?

in the past few years (since 1976)?

*3. Has attendance at live performances changed?

since airing of the program?

in the past few years (since 1976)?

for the specific performances that were aired?

what indications do you have?

*4. Do you know of other projects that were generated as a result of _____(program we are discussing)?

for yourself?

for others?

INTERVIEW SCHEDULE III for INDIVIDUAL ARTISTS -- PARTICIPATING

I. EFFECTS (cont'd)

5. Have the sales of _____(records, plays, etc.) increased as a result of _____(name of program)?

6. Do you think that the appearance of _____(art organizations, such as dance companies, or whichever one the interviewee is involved with) on television has altered the composition of audiences at live performances?

   PROBE: how?

7. Do you think that audiences have different expectations of the live performance after seeing _____(art form, such as dance) on tv?

8. Do you think that television has changed the sophistication of audiences?

   PROBE: if so, in what ways?

9. Do you think these programs have affected artists who were not featured on them?

   PROBE: have they been helped?

   have they been hurt ?

INTERVIEW SCHEDULE III for INDIVIDUAL ARTISTS -- PARTICIPATING

F. PROGRAM QUALITY

1. I'd like to ask your opinion about the quality of some of the series that NEA has funded. Let's start with _____ (one of the series that interviewee said he/she has seen). What is your opinion of the _____ (e.g., PRODUCTION & TECHNICAL QUALITY) of the series? Would you say that it is VERY HIGH, SOMEWHAT HIGH, MIXED, SOMEWHAT LOW, or VERY LOW?
(PROBE: if answers VERY HIGH or VERY LOW - any particular reasons?)

[CIRCLE INTERVIEWEE'S ANSWERS]

DANCE IN AMERICA

TECHNICAL QUALITY (lighting, sound, camera) and PRODUCTION QUALITY (editing, pacing, sequencing)	VH (why?)	SH	M	SL	VL (why?)	?
PERFORMANCE QUALITY	VH (why?)	SH	M	SL	VL (why?)	?
ABILITY OF PROGRAMS TO HOLD AUDIENCE'S ATTENTION	VH (why?)	SH	M	SL	VL (why?)	?
OVERALL QUALITY	VH (why?)	SH	M	SL	VL (why?)	?

THE MET

TECH/PRODUCTION QUALITY	VH (why?)	SH	M	SL	VL (why?)	?
PERFORMANCE QUALITY	VH (why?)	SH	M	SL	VL (why?)	?
ABILITY TO HOLD ATTENTION	VH (why?)	SH	M	SL	VL (why?)	?
OVERALL QUALITY	VH (why?)	SH	M	SL	VL (why?)	?

LINCOLN CENTER

TECH/PRODUCTION QUALITY	VH (why?)	SH	M	SL	VL (why?)	?
PERFORMANCE QUALITY	VH (why?)	SH	M	SL	VL (why?)	?
ABILITY TO HOLD ATTENTION	VH (why?)	SH	M	SL	VL (why?)	?
OVERALL QUALITY	VH (why?)	SH	M	SL	VL (why?)	?

INTERVIEW SCHEDULE III for INDIVIDUAL ARTISTS -- PARTICIPATING

F. PROGRAM QUALITY (cont'd)

VISIONS

TECH/PRODUCTION QUALITY	VH (why?)	SH	M	SL	VL (why?)	?
PERFORMANCE QUALITY	VH (why?)	SH	M	SL	VL (why?)	? ?
ABILITY TO HOLD ATTENTION	VH (why?)	SH	M	SL	VL (why?)	?
OVERALL QUALITY	VH (why?)	SH	M	SL	VL (why?)	?

EARPLAY

TECH/PRODUCTION QUALITY	VH (why?)	SH	M	SL	VL (why?)	?
PERFORMANCE QUALITY	VH (why?)	SH	M	SL	VL (why?)	?
ABILITY TO HOLD ATTENTION	VH (why?)	SH	M	SL	VL (why?)	?
OVERALL QUALITY	VH (why?)	SH	M	SL	VL (why?)	?

WOMEN IN ART

TECH/PRODUCTION QUALITY	VH (why?)	SH	M	SL	(why?)	?
PERFORMANCE QUALITY	VH (why?)	SH	M	SL	VL (why?)	?
ABILITY TO HOLD ATTENTION	VH (why?)	SH	M	SL	VL (why?)	?
OVERALL QUALITY	VH (why?)	SH	M	SL	VL (why?)	?

INTERVIEW SCHEDULE III for INDIVIDUAL ARTISTS -- PARTICIPATING

F. PROGRAM QUALITY (Cont.)

*2. Are there individuals or groups that you believe have been overlooked?

_____NO _____YES IF SO, Who are they?

3. Do you have any thoughts on how these programs could be improved?

4. What do you think has been accomplished, generally, by funding these series?

PROBE: Do you think NEA has created an archive of the best performing artists?

Do you think the experience of being at a performance has been shared with the audience at home?

Have tv's/radio's capabilities been used to enhance a performing arts performance (e.g.,*close-ups and subtitles)?

Have these programs encouraged innovative combinations of art and media?

5. Do you have any other comments concerning the quality of these programs?

G. DISSEMINATION AND PROMOTION

1. Did you have any involvement with the promotion or distribution of _____(name of project)?

IF YES, Who has the program reached?

*2. Do you think that dissemination of the programs could have been handled better? In what ways?

3. Do you have copies of reviews or stories _____(name of project)?

H. FUTURE MEDIA ARTS PROJECTS

1. Do you have plans for media arts programming in the near future? IF SO, what are they?

2. Are these projects that would be appropriate for NEA support? IF SO, will you ask for their advice, assistance or participation?

3. Do you have any plans to be involved in commercial television programming in the arts?

*4. What do you think NEA should be doing in this area that hasn't been done?

*5. Would you have any hesitation in participating in another _____ _____(project) with the Media Arts program at NEA?

PROBE: reasons?

INTERVIEW SCHEDULE IV for INDIVIDUAL ARTISTS -- NON-PARTICIPATING

A. BACKGROUND

1. Before I ask you about the programs that NEA has supported, it would help me to have some background information about your work. Could you tell me something about the type of work you do?

2. (IF IT'S NOT OBVIOUS)

   Do you do experimental or innovative types of projects?

3. Have you ever been televised or involved in a media art project?

   PROBE: If SO, Could you tell me about the project?
   What were you trying to accomplish?
   How successful was it?

B. FUNDING

1. How is your work primarily supported?

   PROBE: What percent of your support depends on grants (foundations, gov't., corporate, endowment)?

C. RELATIONSHIP TO NEA/MEDIA PROGRAMMING IN THE ARTS

*1. Have you ever applied to the "Media programming in the Arts" program at the Endowment?

   PROBE: If SO, what were the circumstances?

   (If application was rejected) Do you feel that you were treated fairly?

   PROBE: (If they never applied) why not?

2. Have you ever applied to other divisions of NEA for support?

   PROBE: If SO, what were the projects?

D. AWARENESS

1. How familiar are you with these SERIES? (SHOW LIST OF SERIES)

2. (If series not seen), was there there any particular reason that you did not watch _____(name of series)?

3. Were any of the programs outstanding in the series? Why?

   PROBE: any of them particularly good?
   particulary bad?

4. Do you remember seeing any of these specials or film and video productions? (SHOW LIST OF ONE-SHOT SPECIALS AND PRODUCTIONS)

   PROBE: which ones?
   what do you remember about them?

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

INTERVIEW SCHEDULE IV for INDIVIDUAL ARTISTS -- NON-PARTICIPATING

I. EFFECTS

1. Has the length of your performance season changed in the past few years? (since 1976)

   PROBE: If SO, In what ways?

   If SO, do you know why?

2. Has attendance at live perfomances changed in the past few years? (since 1976)

   PROBE: If SO, In what ways

   If SO, do you know why?

3. Do you think there has been an explosion in the performing arts over the past few years?

   PROBE: If SO, What role do you think televising the arts has played?

4. Do you think that the appearance of _____ _____(arts organizations in the field of this interviewee, such as "dance companies") on television has altered the composition of audiences at live performances?

   PROBE: HOW?

5. Do you think that audiences have different expectations of the live performance after seeing the performing arts on television?

   PROBE: what are the differences?

   what indications do you have?

6. Do you think that television has changed the sophistication of the live audience?

   PROBE: If SO, in what ways?

7. Do you think that your career has been affected by the broadcast of these media art projects?

   PROBE: If SO, Has it benefited? In what ways?

   If SO, Has it been hurt? How?

8. Do you know of artists whose careers have been affected?

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

INTERVIEW SCHEDULE IV for INDIVIDUAL ARTISTS -- NON-PARTICIPATING

F. PROGRAM QUALITY

1. I'd like to ask your opinion about the quality of some of the series that NEA has funded. Let's start with _____ (one of the series that interviewee said he/she has seen). What is your opinion of the _____ (e.g., PRODUCTION & TECHNICAL QUALITY) of the series? Would you say that it is VERY HIGH, SOMEWHAT HIGH, MIXED, SOMEWHAT LOW, or VERY LOW?
(PROBE: if answers VERY HIGH or VERY LOW - any particular reasons?)

[CIRCLE INTERVIEWEE'S ANSWERS]

DANCE IN AMERICA

TECHNICAL QUALITY (lighting, sound, camera) and PRODUCTION QUALITY (editing, pacing, sequencing)	VH (why?)	SH	M	SL	VL (why?)	?
PERFORMANCE QUALITY	VH (why?)	SH	M	SL	VL (why?)	?
ABILITY OF PROGRAMS TO HOLD AUDIENCE'S ATTENTION	VH (why?)	SH	M	SL	VL (why?)	?
OVERALL QUALITY	VH (why?)	SH	M	SL	VL (why?)	?

THE MET

TECH/PRODUCTION QUALITY	VH (why?)	SH	M	SL	VL (why?)	?
PERFORMANCE QUALITY	VH (why?)	SH	M	SL	VL (why?)	?
ABILITY TO HOLD ATTENTION	VH (why?)	SH	M	SL	VL (why?)	?
OVERALL QUALITY	VH (why?)	SH	M	SL	VL (why?)	?

LINCOLN CENTER

TECH/PRODUCTION QUALITY	VH (why?)	SH	M	SL	VL (why?)	?
PERFORMANCE QUALITY	VH (why?)	SH	M	SL	VL (why?)	?
ABILITY TO HOLD ATTENTION	VH (why?)	SH	M	SL	VL (why?)	?
OVERALL QUALITY	VH (why?)	SH	M	SL	VL (why?)	?

INTERVIEW SCHEDULE IV for INDIVIDUAL ARTISTS -- NON-PARTICIPATING

F. PROGRAM QUALITY (cont'd)

VISIONS

TECH/PRODUCTION QUALITY	VH (why?)	SH	M	SL	VL (why?)	?
PERFORMANCE QUALITY	VH (why?)	SH	M	SL	VL (why?)	? ?
ABILITY TO HOLD ATTENTION	VH (why?)	SH	M	SL	VL (why?)	?
OVERALL QUALITY	VH (why?)	SH	M	SL	VL (why?)	?

EARPLAY

TECH/PRODUCTION QUALITY	VH (why?)	SH	M	SL	VL (why?)	?
PERFORMANCE QUALITY	VH (why?)	SH	M	SL	VL (why?)	?
ABILITY TO HOLD ATTENTION	VH (why?)	SH	M	SL	VL (why?)	?
OVERALL QUALITY	VH (why?)	SH	M	SL	VL (why?)	?

WOMEN IN ART

TECH/PRODUCTION QUALITY	VH (why?)	SH	M	SL	VL (why?)	?
PERFORMANCE QUALITY	VH (why?)	SH	M	SL	VL (why?)	?
ABILITY TO HOLD ATTENTION	VH (why?)	SH	M	SL	VL (why?)	?
OVERALL QUALITY	VH (why?)	SH	M	SL	VL (why?)	?

INTERVIEW SCHEDULE IV for INDIVIDUAL ARTISTS -- NON-PARTICIPATING

F. PROGRAM QUALITY (Cont.)

*2. Are there individuals or groups that you believe have been overlooked?

_____NO _____YES IF SO, Who are they?

3. Do you have any thoughts on how these programs could be improved?

4. What do you think has been accomplished, generally, by funding these series?

PROBE: Do you think NEA has created an archive of the best performing artists?

Do you think the experience of being at a performance has been shared with the audience at home?

Have t.v's/radio's capabilities been used to enhance a performing arts performance (e.g., close-ups and subtitles)?

Have these programs encouraged innovative combinations of art and media?

5. Do you have any other comments concerning the quality of these programs?

H. FUTURE MEDIA ARTS PROJECTS

1. Do you have plans for media arts programming in the near future? IF SO, what are they?

2. Are these projects that would be appropriate for NEA support? IF SO, will you ask for their advice, assistance or participation?

3. Do you have any plans to be involved in commercial television programming in the arts?

*4. What do you think NEA should be doing in this area that hasn't been done?

*5. Would you have any hesitation in participating in another _____

_____(project) with the Media Arts program at NEA?

PROBE: reasons?

INTERVIEW SCHEDULE Va for PUBLIC BROADCASTING STATION REPRESENTATIVES-PRODUCING

A. BACKGROUND

1. Can you tell me how _____(name of project) was started?

2. What role have you played in the project?

3. What did you hope to accomplish with _____(name of project?

4. How successful do you think _____(name of project) has been?

   PROBE: What factors are responsible for the success or failure?

   What could be improved?

5. Can you tell me which of these series and specials have been carried by this station? (SHOW LIST)
   (PROGRAMMING PERSONNEL)

   PROBE: (IF SERIES OR PROGRAM WAS NOT CARRIED), Do you know why it wasn't carried?

6. Have you carried other arts series not included on this list?

   If SO, What?

7. Have you done any local performing arts programming?

   If SO, What?

B. FUNDING (FOR DEVELOPMENT PERSONNEL)

1. Do you know what percent of the funds for this project NEA/media programming in the arts contributed (by year)?

2. Was this funding earmarked for a particular part of the project?

3. Who were the other funders of the project?

4. Did the support from NEA have any significance beyond the financial contribution?

   PROBE: did it add credibility?

   did it make it easier or harder to attract other funding?

5. Did you run into any problems in attempting to fulfill the requirements of different funders?

6. Have any of these programs been used for fund raising during pledge nights and festivals? (SHOW LIST)

   PROBE: If SO, Do you have records of how many members pledged in response to particular shows?

   How much money was raised?

INTERVIEW SCHEDULE Va for PUBLIC BROADCASTING STATION REPRESENTATIVES-PRODUCING

B. FUNDING (cont'd)

7. Did your budget for the project include funds for the promotion of _____(name of project)?

   PROBE: If SO, Where did the funding for the promotion come from?

8. Have you encountered problems in attempting to get performing arts programs funded?

9. Does this differ for local vs. national programming?

C. RELATIONSHIP TO NEA/MEDIA PROGRAMMING IN THE ARTS

1. How closely did NEA monitor what you were working on?
   (FOR PROGRAMMING/PRODUCTION PERSONNEL)

   PROBE: Were there any constraints that limited what you could accomplish artistically?

2. Did NEA affet the distribution of the programs?

   PROBE: Did it encourage broad distribution?

   Did it in anyway inhibit the broader distribution of the programs?

3. Did this station ever apply to the Media programming in the arts program at NEA for other projects?

   PROBE: Have they ever been turned down?

   If SO, What were the circumstances?

   Were you treated fairly?

D. AWARENESS

1. In addition to the programs you were involved with, which of these series do you remember seeing?
   (SHOW LIST)
   (ALL PERSONNEL)

2. (IF SERIES WAS NOT SEEN)
   Was there any particular reason that you did not watch _____(name of series)

3. Were any of the programs in the series particularly outstanding?

   PROBE: particularly good?

   particularly bad?

INTERVIEW SCHEDULE Va for PUBLIC BROADCASTING STATIONS -- PRODUCERS

D. AWARENESS (cont'd)

4. Do you remember seeing any of these specials or film and video productions? (SHOW LIST OF ONE-SHOT SPECIALS AND PRODUCTIONS)

   PROBE: which ones?

   what do you remember about them?

E. PROGRAM EFFECTS

1. Do you know of other projects that were generated as a result of _____(name of project)?

2. Has the ability of this station to raise funds for other projects changed as a result of _____(name of project)

3. Has participation in _____(name of project) had other effects on this station?

   PROBE: positive effects?

   negative effects?

4. How do you decide when to run one of these programs?

   (PROGRAMMING PERSONNEL)

5. Do you have audience figures on any of these shows?

   If SO, may I copy them?

   (P.I. PERSONNEL)

6. Did you receive mail, phone calls or presents from the audience after the airing of these programs?

   If SO, do you have records of this response?

   (ALL PERSONNEL)

7. Do you think there has been an explosion in the performing arts over the past few years?

INTERVIEW SCHEDULE Va for PUBLIC BROADCASTING STATIONS -- PRODUCERS

F. PROGRAM QUALITY

1. I'd like to ask your opinion about the quality of some of the series that NEA has funded. Let's start with _____(one of the series that interviewee said he/she has seen). What is your opinion of the _____(e.g., PRODUCTION & TECHNICAL QUALITY) of the series? Would you say that it is VERY HIGH, SOMEWHAT HIGH, MIXED, SOMEWHAT LOW, or VERY LOW?
(PROBE: if answers VERY HIGH or VERY LOW - any particular reasons?)

[CIRCLE INTERVIEWEE'S ANSWERS]

DANCE IN AMERICA

TECHNICAL QUALITY (lighting, sound, camera) and PRODUCTION QUALITY (editing, pacing, sequencing)	VH (why?)	SH	M	SL	VL (why?)	?
PERFORMANCE QUALITY	VH (why?)	SH	M	SL	VL (why?)	?
ABILITY OF PROGRAMS TO HOLD AUDIENCE'S ATTENTION	VH (why?)	SH	M	SL	VL (why?)	?
OVERALL QUALITY	VH (why?)	SH	M	SL	VL (why?)	?

THE MET

TECH/PRODUCTION QUALITY	VH (why?)	SH	M	SL	VL (why?)	?
PERFORMANCE QUALITY	VH (why?)	SH	M	SL	VL (why?)	?
ABILITY TO HOLD ATTENTION	VH (why?)	SH	M	SL	VL (why?)	?
OVERALL QUALITY	VH (why?)	SH	M	SL	VL (why?)	?

LINCOLN CENTER

TECH/PRODUCTION QUALITY	VH (why?)	SH	M	SL	VL (why?)	?
PERFORMANCE QUALITY	VH (why?)	SH	M	SL	VL (why?)	?
ABILITY TO HOLD ATTENTION	VH (why?)	SH	M	SL	VL (why?)	?
OVERALL QUALITY	VH (why?)	SH	M	SL	VL (why?)	?

INTERVIEW SCHEDULE Va for PUBLIC BROADCASTING STATIONS -- PRODUCERS

F. PROGRAM QUALITY (cont'd)

VISIONS

TECH/PRODUCTION QUALITY	VH (why?)	SH	M	SL	VL (why?)	?
PERFORMANCE QUALITY	VH (why?)	SH	M	SL	VL (why?)	? ?
ABILITY TO HOLD ATTENTION	VH (why?)	SH	M	SL	VL (why?)	?
OVERALL QUALITY	VH (why?)	SH	M	SL	VL (why?)	?

EARPLAY

TECH/PRODUCTION QUALITY	VH (why?)	SH	M	SL	VL (why?)	?
PERFORMANCE QUALITY	VH (why?)	SH	M	SL	VL (why?)	?
ABILITY TO HOLD ATTENTION	VH (why?)	SH	M	SL	VL (why?)	?
OVERALL QUALITY	VH (why?)	SH	M	SL	VL (why?)	?

WOMEN IN ART

TECH/PRODUCTION QUALITY	VH (why?)	SH	M	SL	VL (why?)	?
PERFORMANCE QUALITY	VH (why?)	SH	M	SL	VL (why?)	?
ABILITY TO HOLD ATTENTION	VH (why?)	SH	M	SL	VL (why?)	?
OVERALL QUALITY	VH (why?)	SH	M	SL	VL (why?)	?

INTERVIEW SCHEDULE Va for PUBLIC BROADCASTING -- PRODUCERS

F. PROGRAM QUALITY (Cont.)

*2. Are there individuals or groups that you believe have been overlooked?

_____NO _____YES IF SO, Who are they?

3. Do you have any thoughts on how these programs could be improved?

4. What do you think has been accomplished, generally, by funding these series?

PROBE: Do you think NEA has created an archive of the best performing artists?

Do you think the experience of being at a performance has been shared with the audience at home?

Have tv's/radio's capabilities been used to enhance a performing arts performance (e.g., close-ups and subtitles)?

Have these programs encouraged innovative combinations of art and media?

5. Do you have any other comments concerning the quality of these programs?

G. DISSEMINATION AND PROMOTION
(PROGRAMMING PERSONNEL)

1. Looking at DANCE IN AMERICA, LIVE FROM LINCOLN CENTER, LIVE FROM THE MET, and VISIONS, did you air these programs at the time PBS fed them to you?

DIA YES ☐ NO ☐

LINCOLN CENTER YES ☐ NO ☐

MET YES ☐ NO ☐

VISIONS YES ☐ NO ☐

2. Were you satisfied with the times PBS scheduled each of the programs?

If NO, Why not?

DIA YES ☐ NO _____

LINCOLN CENTER YES ☐ NO _____

MET YES ☐ NO _____

VISIONS YES ☐ NO _____

3. When did you run the other series and programs?

Prime time?

INTERVIEW SCHEDULE Va FOR PUBLIC BROADCASTING STATIONS -- PARTICIPATING

G. DISSEMINATION AND PROMOTION (cont'd)

4. What broadcast rights were granted to local stations in the copyright agreements for _____(name of program)?

5. What auxiliary rights were granted?

6. Has _____(program) been available for rental or purchase?

   Through which sources?

   If YES, may I see the figures on sales, rental, etc.?

7. Is _____(program) available for use in schools?

   If YES, with what frequency has it been requested?

8. Has _____been used in telecourses at colleges?

9. Have print materials been associated with the program?

   If YES, may I see them?

10. Has _____(program) been distributed internationally?

    If YES, how was this arranged under what terms?

11. Has _____(program material) been adapted for use in other media? (e.g., radio plays have become stage plays)

12. Have you ever attempted to co-produce media arts programming with organizations outside of the public tv/radio system in the U.S.?

13. Do you have plans for distributing these programs via cable, video-cassette, video disk or through information utilities?
    IF SO, WHAT ARE THE PLANS? IF NOT, why not?
    Have you retained any rights to the programs?

14. What efforts were made to promote these programs?
    (FOR P.I. OR P.R. PERSONNEL)
    PROBE: Which media - t.v. spots, radio, newspapers, posters, t.v. guide, magazines?

15. Do you have any indication of their success?

*16. May I have copies of print materials used to promote the programs?

    press packets?
    advertisements?
    materials to send away for?

*17. Do you have a file of reviews or feature stories on _____
    (name of program or the other series, specials, etc.)?
    If SO, may I make copies?

18. Has this program won any awards or prizes?

*19. Do you think that distribution of the programs could have been handled better? In what ways?

INTERVIEW SCHEDULE Va for PUBLIC BROADCASTING STATION REPRESENTATIVES-PRODUCERS

II. FUTURE MEDIA ARTS PROJECTS

1. Do you have plans for media arts programming in the near future?
   IF SO, what are they?

2. Are these projects that would be appropriate for NEA support?
   IF SO, will you ask for their advice, assistance or participation?

*3. What do you think NEA should be doing in this area that hasn't been done?

*4. Would you have any hesitation in participating in another _____ _____ (project) with the Media Arts program at NEA?

   PROBE: reasons?

INTERVIEW SCHEDULE V for PUBLIC BROADCASTING STATIONS

A. BACKGROUND

1. Before I ask you about the programs that NEA has supported, it would help me to have some background information about _____(this station) and your work here. Has _____ (this station) produced many programs on the performing arts or the visual arts?

   PROBE: If SO, Could you tell me about them? Where did funding come from?

*2. What were you trying to accomplish with these projects?

   PROBE: Were they successful?

   What factors would you say contributed to their success/failure?

3. Can you tell me which of these series and specials have been carried by this station? (SHOW LIST)
(PROGRAMMING PERSONNEL)

   PROBE: (IF SERIES OR PROGRAM WAS NOT CARRIED), Do you know why it wasn't carried?

5. Have you carried other arts series not included on this list?

   If SO, What?

B. FUNDING

1. Have you encountered problems in attempting to get performing arts programs funded?

2. Does this differ for local vs. national programming?

C. RELATIONSHIP TO NEA/MEDIA PROGRAMMING IN THE ARTS

*1. Has _____(name of organization) ever applied to the "Media programming in the Arts" program at the Endowment?

   PROBE: If SO, what were the circumstances?

   (If application was rejected) Do you feel that you were treated fairly?

   PROBE: (If they never applied) why not?

2. Has _____(name of organiztion) ever applied to other divisions of NEA for support?

   PROBE: If SO, what were the projects?

INTERVIEW SCHEDULE V for PUBLIC BROADCASTING STATIONS

D. AWARENESS

1. How familiar are you with the rest of these SERIES? (SHOW LIST OF SERIES)

2. (If series not seen), was there there any particular reason that you did not watch _____(name of series)?

3. Were any of the programs outstanding in the series? Why?

   PROBE: any of them particularly good?

   particulary bad?

4. Do you remember seeing any of these specials or film and video productions? (SHOW LIST OF ONE-SHOT SPECIALS AND PRODUCTIONS)

   PROBE: which ones?

   what do you remember about them?

E. EFFECTS

1. Do you know of other projects that were generated as a result of these programs?

(PROGRAMMING PERSONNEL)

2. How do you decide when to run one of these programs?

(PROGRAMMING PERSONNEL)

3. Do you have audience figures on any of these shows?

   If SO, may I copy them?

(P.I. PERSONNEL)

4. Did you receive mail, phone calls or presents from the audience after the airing of these programs?

   If SO, do you have records of this response?

(ALL PERSONNEL)

5. Do you think there has been an explosion in the performing arts over the past few years?

   If SO, what role do you think televising the arts has played?

*6. Do you think that this station has been affected by the broadcast of these media arts projects?

   PROBE: If SO, Has it benefited? How?

   Has it been hurt? How?

INTERVIEW SCHEDULE V for PUBLIC BROADCASTING STATIONS

F. PROGRAM QUALITY

1. I'd like to ask your opinion about the quality of some of the series that NEA has funded. Let's start with _____(one of the series that interviewee said he/she has seen). What is your opinion of the _____(e.g., PRODUCTION & TECHNICAL QUALITY) of the series? Would you say that it is VERY HIGH, SOMEWHAT HIGH, MIXED, SOMEWHAT LOW, or VERY LOW?
(PROBE: if answers VERY HIGH or VERY LOW - any particular reasons?)

[CIRCLE INTERVIEWEE'S ANSWERS]

DANCE IN AMERICA

TECHNICAL QUALITY (lighting, sound, camera) and PRODUCTION QUALITY (editing, pacing, sequencing)	VH (why?)	SH	M	SL	VL (why?)	?
PERFORMANCE QUALITY	VH (why?)	SH	M	SL	VL (why?)	?
ABILITY OF PROGRAMS TO HOLD AUDIENCE'S ATTENTION	VH (why?)	SH	M	SL	VL (why?)	?
OVERALL QUALITY	VH (why?)	SH	M	SL	VL (why?)	?

THE MET

TECH/PRODUCTION QUALITY	VH (why?)	SH	M	SL	VL (why?)	?
PERFORMANCE QUALITY	VH (why?)	SH	M	SL	VL (why?)	?
ABILITY TO HOLD ATTENTION	VH (why?)	SH	M	SL	VL (why?)	?
OVERALL QUALITY	VH (why?)	SH	M	SL	VL (why?)	?

LINCOLN CENTER

TECH/PRODUCTION QUALITY	VH (why?)	SH	M	SL	VL (why?)	?
PERFORMANCE QUALITY	VH (why?)	SH	M	SL	VL (why?)	?
ABILITY TO HOLD ATTENTION	VH (why?)	SH	M	SL	VL (why?)	?
OVERALL QUALITY	VH (why?)	SH	M	SL	VL (why?)	?

INTERVIEW SCHEDULE V for PUBLIC BROADCASTING STATIONS

F. PROGRAM QUALITY (cont'd)

VISIONS

TECH/PRODUCTION QUALITY	VH (why?)	SH	M	SL	VL (why?)	?
PERFORMANCE QUALITY	VH (why?)	SH	M	SL	VL (why?)	? ?
ABILITY TO HOLD ATTENTION	VH (why?)	SH	M	SL	VL (why?)	?
OVERALL QUALITY	VH (why?)	SH	M	SL	VL (why?)	?

EARPLAY

TECH/PRODUCTION QUALITY	VH (why?)	SH	M	SL	VL (why?)	?
PERFORMANCE QUALITY	VH (why?)	SH	M	SL	VL (why?)	?
ABILITY TO HOLD ATTENTION	VH (why?)	SH	M	SL	VL (why?)	?
OVERALL QUALITY	VH (why?)	SH	M	SL	VL (why?)	?

WOMEN IN ART

TECH/PRODUCTION QUALITY	VH (why?)	SH	M	SL	VL (why?)	?
PERFORMANCE QUALITY	VH (why?)	SH	M	SL	VL (why?)	?
ABILITY TO HOLD ATTENTION	VH (why?)	SH	M	SL	VL (why?)	?
OVERALL QUALITY	VH (why?)	SH	M	SL	VL (why?)	?

INTERVIEW SCHEDULE V for PUBLIC BROADCASTING STATIONS

F. PROGRAM QUALITY (Cont.)

*2. Are there individuals or groups that you believe have been overlooked?

_____NO _____YES IF SO, Who are they?

3. Do you have any thoughts on how these programs could be improved?

4. What do you think has been accomplished, generally, by funding these series?

PROBE: Do you think NEA has created an archive of the best performing artists?

Do you think the experience of being at a performance has been shared with the audience at home?

Have tv's/radio's capabilities been used to enhance a performing arts performance (e.g., close-ups and subtitles)?

Have these programs encouraged innovative combinations of art and media?

5. Do you have any other comments concerning the quality of these programs?

G. DISSEMINATION AND PROMOTION

1. Looking at DANCE IN AMERICA, LIVE FROM LINCOLN CENTER, LIVE FROM THE MET, and VISIONS, did you air these programs at the time PBS fed them to you?

DIA YES ☐ NO ☐

LINCOLN CENTER YES ☐ NO ☐

MET YES ☐ NO ☐

VISIONS YES ☐ NO ☐

2. Were you satisfied with the times PBS scheduled each of the programs?

If NO, Why not?

DIA YES ☐ NO _____

LINCOLN CENTER YES ☐ NO _____

MET YES ☐ NO _____

VISIONS YES ☐ NO _____

3. When did you run the other series and programs?

Prime time?

INTERVIEW SCHEDULE V for PUBLIC BROADCASTING STATIONS

G. DISSEMINATION AND PROMOTION (cont'd)

4. Have you ever attempted to co-produce media arts programming with organizations outside of the public tv/radio system in the U.S.?

(IF THEY HAVE DONE ARTS PROGRAMMING)

5. Do you have plans for distributing these programs via cable, videocassette, video disk or through information utilities?
IF SO, WHAT ARE THE PLANS? IF NOT, why not?
Have you retained any rights to the programs?

6. What efforts were made to promote the NEA programs?
(FOR P.I. OR P.R. PERSONNEL)
PROBE: Which media - t.v. spots, radio, newspapers, posters, t.v. guide, magazines?

7. Do you have any indication of the success of these promotion efforts?

8. May I have copies of print materials used to promote the programs?
press packets?
advertisements?
materials to send away for?

9. Do you have a file of reviews or feature stories on _____ (name of program or the other series, specials, etc.)?
If SO, may I make copies?

*10. Do you think that distribution of the programs could have been handled better? In what ways?

H. FUTURE MEDIA ARTS PROJECTS

*1. Do you have plans for media arts projects in the near future?

PROBE: If SO, what are they?

2. Are these projects that would be appropriate for NEA to support?

PROBE: If SO, will you ask for their advice, assistance or participation?

*3. What do you think NEA should be doing in this area that hasn't been done?

*4. Would you have any hesitation in participating in a project with the Media Arts program at NEA?

PROBE: Why?

INTERVIEW SCHEDULE VI COMMERCIAL MEDIA ORGANIZATIONS

A. BACKGROUND

1. Has _____(this station/organization produced any performing arts or visual arts programming?

   If SO, What?

2. How successful has arts programming been for this station?
   Do you have ratings?
   What factors would you say contributed to the success/failure of these programs?

3. How important is arts programming for your schedule?
   For commercial T.V. in general?

B. FUNDING

1. How difficult is it to get advertisers to support arts programming?

2. Has this changed in the past few years?

   PROBE: If SO, What factors contributed to this change?

D. AWARENESS

1. How familiar are you with these SERIES? (SHOW LIST OF SERIES)

2. (If series not seen), was there there any particular reason that you did not watch _____(name of series)?

3. Were any of the programs outstanding in the series? Why?

   PROBE: any of them particularly good?

   particulary bad?

4. Do you remember seeing any of these specials or film and video productions? (SHOW LIST OF ONE-SHOT SPECIALS AND PRODUCTIONS)

   PROBE: which ones?

   what do you remember about them?

E. EFFECTS

1. Do you know of other projects that were generated as a result of these NEA programs?

2. Has your work been affected by the airing of these programs on Public radio or television?

   If SO, How?

3. Do you think there has been an explosion in the performing arts over the past few years?

   if so, what role do you think televising the arts has played?

INTERVIEW SCHEDULE VI COMMERCIAL MEDIA ORGANIZATIONS

F. PROGRAM QUALITY

1. I'd like to ask your opinion about the quality of some of the series that NEA has funded. Let's start with _____ (one of the series that interviewee said he/she has seen). What is your opinion of the _____ (e.g., PRODUCTION & TECHNICAL QUALITY) of the series? Would you say that it is VERY HIGH, SOMEWHAT HIGH, MIXED, SOMEWHAT LOW, or VERY LOW?
(PROBE: if answers VERY HIGH or VERY LOW - any particular reasons?)

[CIRCLE INTERVIEWEE'S ANSWERS]

DANCE IN AMERICA

TECHNICAL QUALITY (lighting, sound, camera) and PRODUCTION QUALITY (editing, pacing, sequencing)	VH (why?)	SH	M	SL	VL (why?)	?
PERFORMANCE QUALITY	VH (why?)	SH	M	SL	VL (why?)	?
ABILITY OF PROGRAMS TO HOLD AUDIENCE'S ATTENTION	VH (why?)	SH	M	SL	VL (why?)	?
OVERALL QUALITY	VH (why?)	SH	M	SL	VL (why?)	?

THE MET

TECH/PRODUCTION QUALITY	VH (why?)	SH	M	SL	VL (why?)	?
PERFORMANCE QUALITY	VH (why?)	SH	M	SL	VL (why?)	?
ABILITY TO HOLD ATTENTION	VH (why?)	SH	M	SL	VL (why?)	?
OVERALL QUALITY	VH (why?)	SH	M	SL	VL (why?)	?

LINCOLN CENTER

TECH/PRODUCTION QUALITY	VH (why?)	SH	M	SL	VL (why?)	?
PERFORMANCE QUALITY	VH (why?)	SH	M	SL	VL (why?)	?
ABILITY TO HOLD ATTENTION	VH (why?)	SH	M	SL	VL (why?)	?
OVERALL QUALITY	VH (why?)	SH	M	SL	VL (why?)	?

INTERVIEW SCHEDULT VI COMMERCIAL MEDIA ORGANIZATIONS

F. PROGRAM QUALITY (cont'd)

VISIONS

TECH/PRODUCTION QUALITY	VH (why?)	SH	M	SL	VL (why?)	?
PERFORMANCE QUALITY	VH (why?)	SH	M	SL	VL (why?)	? ?
ABILITY TO HOLD ATTENTION	VH (why?)	SH	M	SL	VL (why?)	?
OVERALL QUALITY	VH (why?)	SH	M	SL	VL (why?)	?

EARPLAY

TECH/PRODUCTION QUALITY	VH (why?)	SH	M	SL	VL (why?)	?
PERFORMANCE QUALITY	VH (why?)	SH	M	SL	VL (why?)	?
ABILITY TO HOLD ATTENTION	VH (why?)	SH	M	SL	VL (why?)	?
OVERALL QUALITY	VH (why?)	SH	M	SL	VL (why?)	?

WOMEN IN ART

TECH/PRODUCTION QUALITY	VH (why?)	SH	M	SL	VL (why?)	?
PERFORMANCE QUALITY	VH (why?)	SH	M	SL	VL (why?)	?
ABILITY TO HOLD ATTENTION	VH (why?)	SH	M	SL	VL (why?)	?
OVERALL QUALITY	VH (why?)	SH	M	SL	VL (why?)	?

INTERVIEW SCHEDULE VI COMMERCIAL MEDIA ORGANIZATIONS

F. PROGRAM QUALITY (Cont.)

*2. Are there individuals or groups that you believe have been overlooked?

___ NO ____YES IF SO, Who are they?

3. Do you have any thoughts on how these programs could be improved?

4. What do you think has been accomplished, generally, by funding these series?

PROBE: Do you think NEA has created an archive of the best performing artists?

Do you think the experience of being at a performance has been shared with the audience at home?

Have tv's/radio's capabilities been used to enhance a performing arts performance (e.g., close-ups and subtitles)?

Have these programs encouraged innovative combinations of art and media?

5. Do you have any other comments concerning the quality of these programs?

G. DISSEMINATION AND PROMOTION

1. (IF THEY HAVE HAD INVOLVEMENT WITH ARTS PROGRAMMING), What rights to these programs are retrained by the artists?

2. How have they been remunerated?

3. Who has arranged for the distribution of the programs?

4. What efforts were made to promote these programs?

5. How adequate were these efforts?

6. Do you think that efforts to promote and distribute the programs sponsored by NEA have been effective?

PROBE: How could they be improved?

H. FUTURE MEDIA ARTS PROJECTS

1. Do you have plans for media arts programming in the near future?

If SO, What are they?

If NOT, Why not?

2. What do you think NEA could be doing in this area that hasn't been done?

3. How important do you think arts programming will be in the future?

INTERVIEW VII FOR CPB, PSB, NPR

A. BACKGROUND

1. At what stage in the development of _____(name of programs) did _____(this organization) get involved?

2. How do you decide which programs to support?

3. Did this organization have any set goals or objectives in supporting these projects?

4. How successful do you think these projects have been?

PROBE: What factors do you think contributed to the success/failure of these projects?

B. FUNDING

1. What level of support was granted to these projects (by years).

2. How much of the support you have given to these programs has gone into promotion?

GATHER AS MUCH INFO AS AVAILABLE ON PROMOTIONAL EFFORTS
GATHER SAMPLES

C. RELATIONSHIP TO NEA/MEDIA PROGRAMMING IN THE ARTS

1. Was NEA already involved in the project?

If SO, how did that affect your participation?

PROBE: DID IT ENCOURAGE YOU TO BACK IT?
Did it affect the amount of support _____(this organization) contributed?

2. What was the significance, beyond financial, of NEA's support for these projects?

3. Have you run into any problems as a result of NEA's involvement in the project?

4. Are there any restrictions or constraints imposed by NEA that have affected your involvement in a media programming in the arts project?

D. AWARENESS

1. How familiar are you with the rest of these SERIES? (SHOW LIST OF SERIES)

2. (If series not seen), was there there any particular reason that you did not watch _____(name of series)?

3. Were any of the programs outstanding in the series? Why?

PROBE: any of them particularly good?
particulary bad?

4. Do you remember seeing any of these specials or film and video productions? (SHOW LIST OF ONE-SHOT SPECIALS AND PRODUCTIONS)

PROBE: which ones?
what do you remember about them?

INTERVIEW SCHEDULE VII FOR CPB, PSB, NPR

E. EFFECTS

1. What effect has _____(name of series) had on Public T.V./radio?

   PROBE: positive effects?
   negative effects?
   unexpected effects?
   by-products

2. Do you think that the ability of the stations or others involved in arts programming, to raise funds, has increased as a consequence of these programs?

3. Do you know of other projects that were generated as a result of these programs?

4. Do you have audience figures on these programs?

5. Were these programs scheduled during the festivals and fund raising drives?

   PROBES: If SO, do you have records of their effectiveness?
   membership?
   money raised?

6. Do you have records of phone calls or letters received in response to these programs?

   From the general audience?
   From special interest groups?

7. Do you have other indications of audience response?

8. Do you have a clipping service? A file of reviews and press coverage?

9. Do you think there has been an explosion in the performing arts over the past few years? if so, what role do you think televising the arts has played?

10. Do you think these programs have affected artists who were not featured on them?

    PROBE: have they been helped?

    have they been hurt ?

INTERVIEW SCHEDULE VII FOR CPB, PBS, NPR

F. PROGRAM QUALITY

1. I'd like to ask your opinion about the quality of some of the series that NEA has funded. Let's start with _____(one of the series that interviewee said he/she has seen). What is your opinion of the _____(e.g., PRODUCTION & TECHNICAL QUALITY) of the series? Would you say that it is VERY HIGH, SOMEWHAT HIGH, MIXED, SOMEWHAT LOW, or VERY LOW?
(PROBE: if answers VERY HIGH or VERY LOW - any particular reasons?)

[CIRCLE INTERVIEWEE'S ANSWERS]

DANCE IN AMERICA

TECHNICAL QUALITY (lighting, sound, camera) and PRODUCTION QUALITY (editing, pacing, sequencing)	VH (why?)	SH	M	SL	VL (why?)	?
PERFORMANCE QUALITY	VH (why?)	SH	M	SL	VL (why?)	?
ABILITY OF PROGRAMS TO HOLD AUDIENCE'S ATTENTION	VH (why?)	SH	M	SL	VL (why?)	?
OVERALL QUALITY	VH (why?)	SH	M	SL	VL (why?)	?

THE MET

TECH/PRODUCTION QUALITY	VH (why?)	SH	M	SL	VL (why?)	?
PERFORMANCE QUALITY	VH (why?)	SH	M	SL	VL (why?)	?
ABILITY TO HOLD ATTENTION	VH (why?)	SH	M	SL	VL (why?)	?
OVERALL QUALITY	VH (why?)	SH	M	SL	VL (why?)	?

LINCOLN CENTER

TECH/PRODUCTION QUALITY	VH (why?)	SH	M	SL	VL (why?)	?
PERFORMANCE QUALITY	VH (why?)	SH	M	SL	VL (why?)	?
ABILITY TO HOLD ATTENTION	VH (why?)	SH	M	SL	VL (why?)	?
OVERALL QUALITY	VH (why?)	SH	M	SL	VL (why?)	?

INTERVIEW SCHEDULE VII FOR CPB, PBS, NPR

F. PROGRAM QUALITY (cont'd)

VISIONS

TECH/PRODUCTION QUALITY	VH (why?)	SH	M	SL	VL (why?)	?
PERFORMANCE QUALITY	VH (why?)	SH	M	SL	VL (why?)	? ?
ABILITY TO HOLD ATTENTION	VH (why?)	SH	M	SL	VL (why?)	?
OVERALL QUALITY	VH (why?)	SH	M	SL	VL (why?)	?

EARPLAY

TECH/PRODUCTION QUALITY	VH (why?)	SH	M	SL	VL (why?)	?
PERFORMANCE QUALITY	VH (why?)	SH	M	SL	VL (why?)	?
ABILITY TO HOLD ATTENTION	VH (why?)	SH	M	SL	VL (why?)	?
OVERALL QUALITY	VH (why?)	SH	M	SL	VL (why?)	?

WOMEN IN ART

TECH/PRODUCTION QUALITY	VH (why?)	SH	M	SL	VL (why?)	?
PERFORMANCE QUALITY	VH, (why?)	SH	M	SL	VL (why?)	?
ABILITY TO HOLD ATTENTION	VH (why?)	SH	M	SL	VL (why?)	?
OVERALL QUALITY	VH (why?)	SH	M	SL	VL (why?)	?

INTERVIEW SCHEDULE VII FOR CPB, PBS, NPR

F. PROGRAM QUALITY (Cont.)

*2. Are there individuals or groups that you believe have been overlooked?

_____NO _____YES IF SO, Who are they?

3. Do you have any thoughts on how these programs could be improved?

4. What do you think has been accomplished, generally, by funding these series?

PROBE: Do you think NEA has created an archive of the best performing artists?

Do you think the experience of being at a performance has been shared with the audience at home?

Have tv's/radio's capabilities been used to enhance a performing arts performance (e.g., close-ups and subtitles)?

Have these programs encouraged innovative combinations of art and media?

5. Do you have any other comments concerning the quality of these programs?

G. DISSEMINATION AND PROMOTION

1. When were these programs scheduled? (SHOW LIST)

2. What percent of the stations took them when PBS fed them?

3. Do you have records of when other stations ran them?

4. COLLECT ANY OTHER INFORMATION THEY HAVE ON DISSEMINATION

5. What changes do you expect in the way programs are distributed in the future?

6. Do you think that dissemination of the programs could have been handled better? In what ways?

7. Have these programs won any awards or prizes?

H. FUTURE MEDIA ARTS PROJECTS

1. What plans do you have for media arts programming in the near future?

2. Are these projects that would be appropriate for NEA support?

3. Are there certain projects that you would not ask NEA to co-fund?

If SO, Why not?

INTERVIEW SCHEDULE VIII OTHER FUNDERS

A. BACKGROUND

1. At what stage in the development of _____(name of project) did you get involved?

2. How do you decide which programs to support?

3. What did you hope to accomplish with _____(name of project)?

4. How successful do you think _____(name of project) has been?

PROBE: what factors are responsible for success or failure?

what could be improved?

5. Was this the first/only media project you have been involved in?

B. FUNDING

1. What level of support was granted to these projects (by years)?

2. How much of the support you have given to these programs has gone into promotion?

C. RELATIONSHIP TO NEA/MEDIA PROGRAMMING IN THE ARTS

1. Was NEA already involved in the project?

If SO, how did that affect your participation?

PROBE: DID IT ENCOURAGE YOU TO BACK IT?
Did it affect the amount of support _____(this organization) contributed?

2. What was the significance, beyond financial, of NEA's support for these projects?

3. Have you run into any problems as a result of NEA's involvement in the project?

4. Are there any restrictions or constraints imposed by NEA that have affected your involvement in a media programming in the arts project?

D. AWARENESS

1. In addition to _____(name of project they were involved with), how familiar are you with the rest of these SERIES? (SHOW LIST OF SERIES)

2. (If series not seen), was there there any particular reason that you did not watch _____(name of series)?

3. Were any of the programs in the series outstanding? Why?

PROBE: any of them particularly good?
particulary bad?

INTERVIEW SCHEDULE VIII OTHER FUNDERS

D. AWARENESS (cont'd)

4. Do you remember seeing any of these specials or film and video productions? (SHOW LIST OF ONE-SHOT SPECIALS AND PRODUCTIONS)

PROBE: which ones?

what do you remember about them?

E. PROGRAM EFFECTS

*1. What effect has participation in _____(name of program) had on _____(this organization)?

PROBE: positive effects? income from the program?

negative effects?

unexpected effects?

unexpected by-products?

*2. Do you know of other projects that were generated as a result of _____(program we are discussing)?

for yourself?

for others?

*3. Did you receive mail or phone calls from the audience viewing at home after the airing of _____(name of program)?

- from special interest groups?

If so, do you have records of this response?

4. Do you have any measures of the size of the audience viewing at home?

5. Do you think there has been an explosion in the performing arts over the past few years? If so, what role do you think televising the arts has played?

6. Do you have other indications of audience response?

7. Do you have a clipping service? A file of reviews and press coverage?

INTERVIEW SCHEDULE VIII OTHER FUNDERS

F. PROGRAM QUALITY

1. I'd like to ask your opinion about the quality of some of the series that NEA has funded. Let's start with _____(one of the series that interviewee said he/she has seen). What is your opinion of the _____(e.g., PRODUCTION & TECHNICAL QUALITY) of the series? Would you say that it is VERY HIGH, SOMEWHAT HIGH, MIXED, SOMEWHAT LOW, or VERY LOW?
(PROBE: if answers VERY HIGH or VERY LOW - any particular reasons?)

[CIRCLE INTERVIEWEE'S ANSWERS]

DANCE IN AMERICA

TECHNICAL QUALITY (lighting, sound, camera) and PRODUCTION QUALITY (editing, pacing, sequencing)	VH (why?)	SH	M	SL	VL (why?)	?
PERFORMANCE QUALITY	VH (why?)	SH	M	SL	VL (why?)	?
ABILITY OF PROGRAMS TO HOLD AUDIENCE'S ATTENTION	VH (why?)	SH	M	SL	VL (why?)	?
OVERALL QUALITY	VH (why?)	SH	M	SL	VL (why?)	?

THE MET

TECH/PRODUCTION QUALITY	VH (why?)	SH	M	SL	VL (why?)	?
PERFORMANCE QUALITY	VH (why?)	SH	M	SL	VL (why?)	?
ABILITY TO HOLD ATTENTION	VH (why?)	SH	M	SL	VL (why?)	?
OVLRALL QUALITY	VH (why?)	SH	M	SL	VL (why?)	?

LINCOLN CENTER

TECH/PRODUCTION QUALITY	VH (why?)	SH	M	SL	VL (why?)	?
PERFORMANCE QUALITY	VH (why?)	SH	M	SL	VL (why?)	?
ABILITY TO HOLD ATTENTION	VH (why?)	SH	M	SL	VL (why?)	?
OVERALL QUALITY	VH (why?)	SH	M	SL	VL (why?)	?

INTERVIEW SCHEDULE VIII OTHER FUNDERS

F. PROGRAM QUALITY (cont'd)

VISIONS

TECH/PRODUCTION QUALITY	VH (why?)	SH	M	SL	VL (why?)	?
PERFORMANCE QUALITY	VH (why?)	SH	M	SL	VL (why?)	? ?
ABILITY TO HOLD ATTENTION	VH (why?)	SH	M	SL	VL (why?)	?
OVERALL QUALITY	VH (why?)	SH	M	SL	VL (why?)	?

EARPLAY

TECH/PRODUCTION QUALITY	VH (why?)	SH	M	SL	VL (why?)	?
PERFORMANCE QUALITY	VH (why?)	SH	M	SL	VL (why?)	?
ABILITY TO HOLD ATTENTION	VH (why?)	SH	M	SL	VL (why?)	?
OVERALL QUALITY	VH (why?)	SH	M	SL	VL (why?)	?

WOMEN IN ART

TECH/PRODUCTION QUALITY	VH (why?)	SH	M	SL	VL (why?)	?
PERFORMANCE QUALITY	VH (why?)	SH	M	SL	VL (why?)	?
ABILITY TO HOLD ATTENTION	VH (why?)	SH	M	SL	VL (why?)	?
OVERALL QUALITY	VH (why?)	SH	M	SL	VL (why?)	?

INTERVIEW SCHEDULE VIII OTHER FUNDERS

F. PROGRAM QUALITY (Cont.)

*2. Are there individuals or groups that you believe have been overlooked?

_____NO _____YES IF SO, Who are they?

3. Do you have any thoughts on how these programs could be improved?

4. What do you think has been accomplished, generally, by funding these series?

PROBE: Do you think NEA has created an archive of the best performing artists?

Do you think the experience of being at a performance has been shared with the audience at home?

Have tv's/radio's capabilities been used to enhance a performing arts performance (e.g., close-ups and subtitles)?

Have these programs encouraged innovative combinations of art and media?

5. Do you have any other comments concerning the quality of these programs?

G. DISSEMINATION AND PROMOTION

1. Do you have records of when the programs you supported were run?

2. Were they distributed in any way other than broadcast?

PROBE: How?

3. Do you think that the distribution of these programs could have been handled better? In what ways?

4. How active a role does _____(this organization) play in the distribution?
[GATHER AS MUCH INFO AS POSSIBLE ON PROMOTION. GATHER SAMPLES OF ADS]

5. Has this program won any awards or prizes?

H. FUTURE MEDIA ARTS PROJECTS

*1. Do you have plans for media arts projects in the near future?

PROBE: If SO, what are they?

2. Are these projects that would be appropriate for NEA to support?

PROBE: If SO, will you ask for their advice, assistance or participation?

3. Do you have any plans to be involved in commercial tv programming in the arts?

INTERVIEW SCHEDULE VIII OTHER FUNDERS

H. FUTURE MEDIA ARTS PROJECTS (cont'd)

*4. What do you think NEA should be doing in this area that hasn't been done?

*5. Would you have any hesitation in participating in a project with the Media Arts program at NEA?

PROBE: Why?

INTERVIEW SCHEDULE IX CRITICS

A. BACKGROUND

1. Before I ask you about these projects that NEA has supported, it would help me to have a little background information.

   Have you been covering _____(whatever) for a long time?

   How long have you been at _____(this paper or magazine)?

2. How important do you think it is, generally, to have arts programming on television?

   PROBE: Why do you feel that way?

3. Have you ever been involved on the production side of a non-print media art project?

   PROBE: IF SO, Could you tell me about it?

C. RELATIONSHIP TO NEA/MEDIA PROGRAMMING IN THE ARTS

1. Have you ever applied to the Media Programming in the Arts program at the Endowment?

   PROBE: IF SO, What were the circumstances

2. Have you ever served on a panel of the Endowment?

   PROBE: What was the experience like?

D. AWARENESS

1. How familiar are you with these SERIES? (SHOW LIST OF SERIES)

2. (If series not seen), was there there any particular reason that you did not watch _____(name of series)?

3. Were any of the programs outstanding in the series? Why?

   PROBE: any of them particularly good?

   particulary bad?

4. Do you remember seeing any of these specials or film and video productions? (SHOW LIST OF ONE-SHOT SPECIALS AND PRODUCTIONS)

   PROBE: which ones?

   what do you remember about them?

INTERVIEW SCHEDULE IX CRITICS

E. EFFECTS

1. (IF ARTS CRITIC)

   Do you think that attendance at live performances has changed in the past few years?

   PROBE: IF SO, in what ways?

2. Do you think there has been an explosion in the performing arts over the past few years? if so, what role do you think televising the arts has played?

3. Do you think that the appearance of _____(art organizations, such as dance companies, or whichever one the interviewee is involved with) on television has altered the composition of audiences at live performances?

   PROBE: how?

4. Do you think that audiences have different expectations of the live performance after seeing _____(art form, such as dance) on tv?

5. Do you think that television has changed the sophistication of audiences?

   PROBE: IF SO, in what ways?

6. Do you think these programs have affected artists who were not featured on them?

   PROBE: have they been helped?

   have they been hurt ?

INTERVIEW IX CRITICS

F. PROGRAM QUALITY

1. I'd like to ask your opinion about the quality of some of the series that NEA has funded. Let's start with _____(one of the series that interviewee said he/she has seen). What is your opinion of the _____(e.g., PRODUCTION & TECHNICAL QUALITY) of the series? Would you say that it is VERY HIGH, SOMEWHAT HIGH, MIXED, SOMEWHAT LOW, or VERY LOW?
(PROBE: if answers VERY HIGH or VERY LOW - any particular reasons?)

[CIRCLE INTERVIEWEE'S ANSWERS]

DANCE IN AMERICA

TECHNICAL QUALITY (lighting, sound, camera) and PRODUCTION QUALITY (editing, pacing, sequencing)	VH (why?)	SH	M	SL	VL (why?)	?
PERFORMANCE QUALITY	VH (why?)	SH	M	SL	VL (why?)	?
ABILITY OF PROGRAMS TO HOLD AUDIENCE'S ATTENTION	VH (why?)	SH	M	SL	VL (why?)	?
OVERALL QUALITY	VH (why?)	SH	M	SL	VL (why?)	?

THE MET

TECH/PRODUCTION QUALITY	VH (why?)	SH	M	SL	VL (why?)	?
PERFORMANCE QUALITY	VH (why?)	SH	M	SL	VL (why?)	?
ABILITY TO HOLD ATTENTION	VH (why?)	SH	M	SL	VL (why?)	?
OVERALL QUALITY	VH (why?)	SH	M	SL	VL (why?)	?

LINCOLN CENTER

TECH/PRODUCTION QUALITY	VH (why?)	SH	M	SL	VL (why?)	?
PERFORMANCE QUALITY	VH (why?)	SH	M	SL	VL (why?)	?
ABILITY TO HOLD ATTENTION	VH (why?)	SH	M	SL	VL (why?)	?
OVERALL QUALITY	VH (why?)	SH	M	SL	VL (why?)	?

INTERVIEW IX CRITICS

F. PROGRAM QUALITY (cont'd)

VISIONS

TECH/PRODUCTION QUALITY	VH (why?)	SH	M	SL	VL (why?)	?
PERFORMANCE QUALITY	VH (why?)	SH	M	SL	VL (why?)	? ?
ABILITY TO HOLD ATTENTION	VH (why?)	SH	M	SL	VL (why?)	?
OVERALL QUALITY	VH (why?)	SH	M	SL	VL (why?)	?

EARPLAY

TECH/PRODUCTION QUALITY	VH (why?)	SH	M	SL	VL (why?)	?
PERFORMANCE QUALITY	VH (why?)	SH	M	SL	VL (why?)	?
ABILITY TO HOLD ATTENTION	VH (why?)	SH	M	SL	VL (why?)	?
OVERALL QUALITY	VH (why?)	SH	M	SL	VL (why?)	?

WOMEN IN ART

TECH/PRODUCTION QUALITY	VH (why?)	SH	M	SL	VL (why?)	?
PERFORMANCE QUALITY	VH (why?)	SH	M	SL	VL (why?)	?
ABILITY TO HOLD ATTENTION	VH (why?)	SH	M	SL	VL (why?)	?
OVERALL QUALITY	VH (why?)	SH	M	SL	VL (why?)	?