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ABSTRACT

An Application of the Kuleshov Experiment on Generation X: Testing Viewer Reactions to Editing

by

Giselle Touzard

Dr. Lawrence Mullen, Examination Committee Chair
Director of Graduate Studies in Communication
University of Nevada, Las Vegas

The Kuleshov Experiment, conducted in Russia in 1919, concluded that audiences find meaning in the juxtaposition of unrelated shots. This discovery was one of the earliest observations used to formulate the theory of montage. This study combines historical information related to the original experiment, editing techniques, and theories in visual literacy. This is a quasi-experiment applied to a new generation of viewers.

A video that replicates the original experiment is used as a stimulus, and an instrument observes audience’s reactions to editing. The assumption made is that a new generation of viewers will be capable of recognizing the lack of connection between the shots. Generation X has had a vast exposure to film, television, and computer-based media; all of which have educated this peer group into recognizing the function of images in an established context. The results of this experiment are important to determine if a new generation of experienced viewers find meaning in the juxtaposition of unconnected shots.
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CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

"Editing is the creative force of filmic reality."

- Pudovkin (Dmytryk, 1984, ix)

A film is composed of several different shots, how these shots are arranged and the meaning conveyed by the arrangement of shots is strictly the result of editing. Lev Kuleshov experimented with the juxtaposition of shots. In his early work, he found that audiences would interpret a close-up even if it were used previously in a different context. Although the experiment tested a different generation of viewers, newer generations may find meaning from the juxtaposition of shots, reinforcing the idea that, "the shot is the building block of film, and its order is what generates the result" (Dancyger, 1997, p. 15).

In his most famous experiment, Kuleshov tried juxtaposing the same close-up of an actor after three different shots. Audiences were impressed by the actor's capability to react to each different situation. There are two versions of the story of this experiment. One recalls that the actor, Ivan Mozhukhin, received the instruction to appear expressionless (Messaris, 1994, p. 16). The other version describes that Kuleshov found a long strip of film with Mozhuzkin's close-up, and decided to experiment with it (Levaco, 1974, p. 8).
Russian director Pudovkin was impressed with the results of the experiment. He went even further in his attempt to create meaning through editing. In the film "Mother," he discovered that he could improve and manipulate performance with the use of close-ups. The following example illustrates his technique.

The son sits in prison. [He] receives a note that the next day he is to be set free. The problem was the expression, filmically of his joy. The photographing of a face lighting up with joy would have been flat and void of effect. [He] showed, therefore, the nervous play of his hands and a big close-up of the lower half of his face, the corners of the smile. These shots [he] cut in with other and varied material-shots of a brook, swollen with the rapid flow of spring, of the play of sunlight broken on the water, birds splashing in the village pond, and finally a laughing child. By the junction of these components [the] expression of 'prisoner's joy' takes shape (Dancyger, 1997, p. 16).

In this experimental kind of editing, Pudovkin created a narrative strategy.

---

Historical Background

Lev Vladimirovich Kuleshov is considered "the first aesthetic theorist of the cinema" (Levaco, 1974, p. 1). Born in the city of Tambov, on January 1, 1899, he expressed his fascination for drawing and machinery at a very early age. While studying in the School of Painting, Architecture and Sculpture, in Moscow, he started working at the Khanzhonkov Film Studio as a set designer. In 1917, "he completed his first film, made in the style of short-shots - later to become the basis of what became internationally known as Russian Montage" (Levaco, 1974, p. 4).
With his first film, Kuleshov discovered that he could juxtapose images of actors looking off-camera with different shots and create the illusion of being at the same time and place (Levaco, 1974). He created the "Artificial Landscape" in which actors came from different sites and distances to end up together in a two-shot. "In short, he sought to demonstrate that physical space and 'real' time could be made virtually subordinate to montage" (Levaco, 1974, p. 8).

In his better-known "Kuleshov Experiment," he juxtaposed the same close-up of an expressionless actor, Mozhukhin, after three different shots: A child playing; a bowl of soup; and a person in a coffin. He projected these shots to an audience. They had different interpretations to the actor's expression, and in each case, they thought the actor performed in response to the previous shot.

Kuleshov's interest focused not only in montage, but also in all areas of cinema. He compared the styles of American, European and Russian films. He arrived at the conclusion that the American films were more entertaining because of the number of shots, different camera angles, and close-ups used to emphasize a given moment (Levaco, 1974). In contrast, Russian film was characteristic for its lengthy shots from one single angle.

Justifications

The Kuleshov Experiment provided evidence that audiences tend to relate two different shots and find a connection between them. The experiment was conducted in 1919 when viewers were exposed to silent film in black and white. In contrast, the average viewer in our society is exposed to numerous visual messages, and may have
been trained to interpret visual literacy. Film and television provide with several edited messages using audio and video for rhetorical purposes. Whether or not viewers understand editing techniques, their reactions to them are important to this study.

The purpose of this study is to observe individual responses to the Kuleshov Experiment. The study will focus on viewer’s perception of meaning created by editing. Since this experiment studies a different generation than the original experiment, it is assumed that the results will be different. However, it is also assumed that the principles of editing have not changed. People react to the Kuleshov Experiment and interpret what they see based on “analogous real-life experience” (Messaris, 1994, p. 16). Hochberg and Brooks explained that, “all human beings beyond infancy construct a coherent sense of their immediate environment by making successive glances in various directions (Messaris, 1994, p. 15). This last assertion explains why people understand editing. Different cuts take the place of glances in various directions.

To gain some understanding into these assumptions, chapter two will review the most important aspects of the original Kuleshov Experiment. The review of literature will explain the recreation of reality in film and television, the interpretation of editing techniques, the importance of visual literacy, and characteristics of a new generation of viewers. An instrument for examining audience’s perception and its results will be explained in chapter three. This chapter will include a description of the sampling, coding, and methods used to interpret data. Chapter four will provide statistical analysis and a summary of the results. Finally, chapter five will offer concluding perspectives based on statistical analysis, the limitations found, and ideas for future research.
The instrument will attempt to analyze open-ended responses rather than provide choices that force the interviewee to answer in a particular way. It is more important for this study to determine if respondents can arrive at the same conclusions as the original experiment, and find a relative connection between the shots used in this quasi-experiment. A pilot study suggested that some viewers found associations; some of them created their own stories to explain the juxtaposition of shots. These results support the basic conclusions of the Kuleshov Experiment.

**Pilot Study**

A pilot study was conducted on July 2000. Students in a “Visual Communication” class responded the instrument survey. Thirteen students participated. Their answers varied on each part. The results of the experiment indicated that most participants could explain the relation between the shots used in each part of the experiment. They also provided with an explanation to associate these shots.

In the first part of the experiment, which combines a shot of a child playing and a close-up of a man, participants arrived at many interesting conclusions. Some of their observations expressed their concern for the child. One of the respondents answered that she was afraid for the little boy; she assumed that the child was in danger. Another, described the man in the close-up as “a stranger,” which may imply that her depiction was made considering the child’s point of view. Some participants included descriptions on the characteristics of the man and the child. Some made assumptions of their racial characteristics, which varied, from Arab, African American, American, and Hispanic.

The second part of the experiment, combining a bowl of soup and the same close up of the man, revealed that respondents found more connections between the shots.
Some were even filling in the blank for some action. A respondent said, "The man might be sitting at the table about to eat the soup." Another interesting answer was that the man was "homeless." Only two respondents identified the man as the same from the previous part.

One interesting explanation to part three connected the man in the casket and the man in the close-up as friends, possibly in an attempt to make a story. Another response went even further giving a context for these two shots: "one man is a mobster and he is dead, and the other man is his brother."

The original Kuleshov Experiment was conducted almost 80 years ago. In spite of the advance in technology and exposure to the media of newer generations, the results in the pilot study are similar to those found in the original experiment. Kuleshov predicted a behavior that is still found in viewers: people connect two shots and find a meaning. Even when not all participants in the pilot study found a connection, some of them did provide stories to link the shots together. Considering the different medium, the shortness of the experiment, lack of sound and context to explain the shots, these early results can be considered a successful predictor of viewer's behavior

Creating Meaning

The creation of meaning derived from moving images is "based on principles of real-life social perception" (Messaris, 1994, p. 16). One application of this convention is the distance from the subject to the camera. The closer the camera is to the subject, the closer the viewer is to the subject's emotions. A close-up brings a sense of intimacy with the subject. When the viewer comes closer to the protagonist's face, he/she can derive
meaning from the expression. Part of what the Kuleshov Experiment was attempting to do, was to create or force significance from this interaction.

Editing can affect viewer’s interpretation of an actor’s presentation. Kuleshov explained, “under the powerful influence of montage, the spectator perceives an intentionally created Gestalt in which the relationship of shot to shot overrides the finer aspects of any actor’s performance” (Levaco, 1974, p. 7). The Kuleshov Experiment affirmed that the actor’s expression was subordinated to the context in which the close-up was presented. The reconstruction of reality through editing appeared to be more influential and powerful.

Whittlock (1998) affirmed, “Human behavior is above all goal-directed behavior. Hence the importance of motive, purpose, and outcome – of all that is apprehended in the classical canonical narrative which stresses a protagonist, sequences of acts, human intentions and emotions, and a forward thrusting temporal progression” (p. 1). If this assertion were true, the viewer’s goal would be to find a motive for the presentation of close shots in the Kuleshov Experiment. An experienced viewer\(^1\) knows that a close-up intensifies emotions, and will try to identify what motivates the protagonist. The viewer may also question the director’s goal when using such close shots. They may understand that the proximity is an attempt to emphasize the emotions of the actor.

If the viewer submerges into the reality of films, his/her participation is passive and unconscious. Baird (2000) explained, “Films can manipulate us, in part, by actually manipulating our environments, constructing energy fields we take, before reason, to be extensions of the physical world” (p. 12). Watching films requires that viewers will

\(^1\)“Experienced” viewer refers to people who have learned how to interpret visual narrative due to their frequent exposure to films and television programs.
accept what they see and not question each part of the film separately. Audiences appreciate the overall content in films.

**Visual Literacy Education Applied to Generation X**

The recreation of the Kuleshov Experiment studies the responses of members of Generation X. This generation is known for being more visually oriented and experienced (Ritchie, 1995). According to Messaris (1994) visual education enhances perception of reality. He stated, “Images, like language, are a distinct means of making sense of reality and [visual] education [provides with] an alternative, but equally valuable, form of access to knowledge and understanding” (p. 21).

Since the instrument for examining viewer’s perceptions will be tested in students in their late teens to early twenties, it is appropriate to describe the characteristics of this particular generation. Studies have found that this generation had a strong exposure to television since very early in their lives. With the increase of both parents having to work outside the home, the media took the place of the caregiver (Ritchie, 1995). This frequent exposure to the media made this generation more skeptical and less vulnerable to persuasion. For example, this peer group has learned to recognize advertising manipulation and is more likely to distrust promises seen in advertisements.

According to Mangleburg and Bristol (1998) “Skepticism to advertising is an attitude learned through interaction with parents, peers and television” (p. 7). The skeptical personality of this generation is different to the trusting characteristics of the viewers of 1919. Stories of early audience’s reaction to films are not uncommon. The first time spectators saw a train running in direction to the screen, they panicked.
assuming that a real train was coming. "[These] familiar stories of early spectator naiveté seem always to imply that more modern, media-savvy viewers can resist manipulation. No one today, after all, runs from or faints before hurtling movie trains, or flinches from camera-directed gunplay" (Baird, 2000, p. 2).

Knowing what goes behind visual images and the anticipation of intent can be useful to recognize persuasion behind an advertising campaign; however, the study on skepticism may not apply to what this type of audience sees in the Kuleshov Experiment. The viewer has learned that an advertising campaign has a purpose. The Kuleshov Experiment has no commercial purposes; its intent is not clear. The main questions behind this experiment are: How are respondents going to react? Will they derive any meaning from the juxtaposition of shots? Are experienced viewers capable of noticing that there is no connection between the shots? If they associate the shots, how are they going to explain the relation? The expectation in this quasi-experiment questions participant’s ability to arrive at the same results as the original experiment.

Assumptions

The main assumption is that this study may not arrive at similar conclusions as the original experiment, although the pilot study seems to indicate a tendency to associate and explain the shots used in the experiment. Viewer’s exposure to television and film may affect participant’s perception. It is yet to determine if participants’ exposure will make them aware of the disassociation between the shots, or if their experience with the media will allow them to create a context to explain the juxtaposition of the images.

---

2 It is important to recognize that new technologies incorporate sensorial experiences that affect viewer’s perception. According to Shapiro and McDonald (1995) virtual reality “produces some physiological and emotional responses similar to responses to the real thing” (p. 332).
The length of the shots and apparent lack of action that characterizes the experiment may affect the results. The expressionless close-up may be difficult to interpret. As Dmytryk (1984) explained, “cutting to a close-up when no enhancement of emotions is called for is not only wasteful, but tends to diminish the value of subsequent close-ups when they are legitimately needed” (p. 25). Participants may find no connection after being exposed to the same reaction shot.

Some studies argue that silent scenes demand more attention. According to Dmytryk (1984), “viewers are more attentive to silent sequences than they are to dialogue scenes” (p. 79). But later he explains that this applies to mystery or suspense sequences. The silent video may demand more attention from viewers who will attempt to understand the message based on visual cues only. The question remains to what could be the reaction of the audience to a silent video knowing that film and television are unlike media that affect viewer’s perception differently. The difference in presentation might affect arriving at the same results of the original experiment.

Even more important is the fact that viewers have to immerse into the reality of the images presented and recognize them as true representations of a message that they will need to uncover. Willing suspension of disbelief is defined as a voluntary act of the viewer or reader to suspend the comparison between the fictional and real world (Saltzstein, 1994). The level of involvement of the viewer in a television presentation is less than the same in film. P. N. Furbank explained that “willing suspension of disbelief doesn’t exist for television: the screen is not compelling enough, the outside world intrudes too greatly... ‘Willing suspension of disbelief’ must be facilitated by a medium which is ‘compelling enough’ and an environment which is separated from the ‘outside
world" (Saltzstein, 1994, p. 3). The size of a television screen compared to a film screen can affect viewers' involvement in this experiment.

Another important assumption is that participants would try to associate not only the shots on each part, but also relate all the shots used in the experiment. Gestalt Theory explains that people make sense of an overall context. The summation of all the visual information will have more impact than individual shots. Participants will also bring their previous experience and exposure to film and television program. This previous knowledge is better defined as Schema Theory. Participants will compare acquired knowledge to explain what they see in the recreation of this experiment.

The repetition of the close-up is a fundamental component that establishes an idea and creates a certain rhythm. In film, repetition can help the viewer to establish a general idea related to human conduct. According to Eisenstein (1968) different portrayals and different characters can exemplify tragedy throughout scenes and ultimately a film. At the end, the viewer will simplify the message and arrive at the conclusion that people react to misfortune in a certain way.

The effect of repetition explained by Eisenstein refers to different portrayals that reinforce the theme. The repetition of the close-up in the recreation of the Kuleshov experiment does not reinforce an idea. The apparent lack of emotion in the actor’s expression can affect their interpretation, and give more emphasis to the shot used before. Since the close-up remains the same, participants may see that the first shot derives more meaning. It might be important to determine if more importance is given to the observation of the first shot. This would indicate if repetition conditions the viewer to pay
more attention to the man in the close up, or if the lack of emotion in the close-up will make them observe the other shot in search for meaning.

Methodology

This quasi-experiment will observe participant's reactions to the Kuleshov Experiment. A video recreating the shots used in the original experiment will serve as a stimulus. It will be shown to students in different classes in Communication Studies at University of Nevada, Las Vegas. An instrument will measure participants' responses to the video. The questionnaire includes demographics, i.e. age, gender, and level of education. The experiment consists of three parts: Part one shows a child playing followed by a close up of a man; part two juxtaposes a bowl of soup followed by the same man's close up; part three portrays a funeral setting and the close up. After each part, the interviewee will, in open-ended format, write about reactions and whether or not he or she found a connection between the shots. The following questions are included for each part: What did you see? Who are the characters? Is there any connection between the two shots?
CHAPTER 2

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

Brief History of the Kuleshov Experiment

In 1911, Ricciotto Canudo, a pioneer of film theory, recognized film as a pictorial art. "He believed the cinema to be an art which was born to provide the ultimate expression for the human body and soul, and regarded it a pageant created by images that were painted with brushes made of light" (Kuleshov, 1987, p. 12). Lev Kuleshov adopted the same understanding of film as a new art in development. At that early stage, cinema was considered more of a pictorial art than a performing art. More importance was given to analyzing the beauty of images than the actor's performance. Kuleshov began exploring the rhetorical effect in films and the most effective ways of communicating a message. Part of his study included observing audiences' reactions to American films, especially films by D.W. Griffith. He found out that American films were preferred because of the combination of short length shots and multiple camera angles\(^3\) (Kuleshov, 1987).

He theorized the creation of movement though editing. He explained that films were bits of information held together by a "symbol" or a central idea. As early as 1916,

\(^3\) According to Kuleshov (1987) this type of technique came as a result of the demands of the American audience. He added that American viewers "wanted to get value for [their] money in terms of impressions, entertainment, and action" (p. 133).
Kuleshov concluded, “the source of the cinema’s impact on the viewer lay in the system of alternating shots and sequences comprising a film” (Kuleshov, 1987, p. 134).

Kuleshov (1987) explained “the rhythmic succession of motionless shots or short sequences conveying motion is the technique known as montage” (p.12). Although he was the first one to theorize the impact of editing techniques, it is important to recognize that other filmmakers used montage. “The discovery of editing belongs neither to Kuleshov or Griffith. It had been used by Edwin Porter, Evgeni Bauer, [and] Yakov Protazanov (Kuleshov, 1987, p. 17).

The implications of the Kuleshov Experiment are numerous. First is that an actor’s performance can be manipulated. Second, is that meaning can be created with the appropriate juxtaposition of shots. Third, viewers can derive meaning from this arrangement even when the director had no intention of creating a reaction. With these findings, Kuleshov believed that actors and objects had equal importance in films. Subjects and objects would assist in the delivery of the cinematic message. However, montage was considered the most essential process to manipulate the message.

Film has the characteristic of involving people with a story. Explaining about the characteristics of the spectators and their involvement in the stories, Sergei Eisenstein (1968) wrote, “The general characteristics of the theme enter the spectator’s

---

4 Porter is considered “the father of American story film” (MacIntyre, Mar 26, 2001, p.1). He was one of the first directors to use editing to tell a story effectively. He is best known for his film “The Great Train Robbery” produced by the Edison Company in 1903. He also “pre-dated Griffith with the use of close-ups, editing of film to create suspense, and the dissolve.” (MacIntyre, Mar 26, 2001, p.1). Soviet filmmaker Yakov Protazanov began his career as an actor and produced over 40 films between 1905 and 1917 (Yahoo! Video Shopping, Mar 26, 2001). Evgeni Bauer was a film director when Lev Kuleshov started working as a set designer at the Alexandr Khazonkov Studios (Horton, Mar. 26, 2001). Bauer believed that “the director [should] have total control over all aspects of the film, such as sets, lighting, and costume” (Horton, Mar. 26, 2001). His ideas influenced Kuleshov’s approach in film.
consciousness *en passant*\(^2\). The generalized concept of the event is embedded in the spectator’s feelings” (p. 151). Viewers find themselves caught by the story and part of their participation involves their emotions as they either sympathize or empathize with the actors on the screen. The events and circumstances motivate viewers and not the technical effects used in the film. Eisenstein attributed these characteristics to the rhetorical effect of film.

Recreating Reality

“*Communication begins with intent*”

- (Harrington, 1973, p.34)

The theme in a film is what holds a story together. It is the essential message that filmmakers want to communicate to their audience. Generally, “films are both instruments of communication and works of art” (Harrington, 1973, p. 98). Rhetorical criticism in most cases applies to the thematic content of the film. Aesthetic considerations help to enhance and emphasize parts of the story. The *look* of the film is the most suasive element that the director can manipulate. Camera angles, distance from the camera, performance, lighting scheme, audio, and editing techniques are examples of aesthetic considerations that are used to reinforce the theme of the film. Communicating a statement in film implies more than sending a direct message; the statement is usually hidden behind a story. “Thematic points frequently bounce against other ideas, creating a dynamic tension allowing the implications and complications of a message to be considered and revealed” (Harrington, 1973, p. 98).

\(^2\) *En passant* means incidentally: in the course of doing something else.
Films are sensorial experiences that rely on visual and aural forms of communication. People see and hear messages. Usually, people believe in what they have experienced through their senses. The sensorial experience adds credibility to the message in films. Films affect a viewer’s intellectual and sensorial capacities. According to Harrington (1973) audiences make “conscious and unconscious conclusions” (p. 33) based on all the information received.

Film is primarily a visual medium. Images carry “the burden of communication” (Harrington, 1973, p.97) even more than aural messages. Sound in film is necessary to enhance thematic content. Dialogue and background music help to “maintain narrative continuity” (Chesebro and Bertelsen, 1996, p. 141) in films and television programs. As viewers become more experienced due to their constant exposure to these media, they come to understand that visual and aural cues complement the story. When one is absent, audiences pay attention to the other. Chesebro and Bertelsen (1996) explained, “silence or the disruption of ambient sound, in film or a television program often directs viewers to a visual cue” (p. 142).

The Kuleshov Experiment conducted in 1919 was a silent film. With no aural cues, viewers had to pay attention to all visual elements. The absence of sound in the experiment forced viewers to pay attention to visual details. Sound invokes ideas in the viewer. “The sound is both sensory and the embodiment of an idea, functioning almost identically to a visual image” (Harrington, 1973, p. 40). The choice of sound can help to support a link between shots, or can disconnect the shots and parts of the experiment.
Visual images in motion pictures take precedence over sound. Sound enhances visuals by the use of narration, music, ambience sound, or dialogue (Zettl. 1990). "Sound adds new dimensions to the sense of sight. It has the power to alter such emotions as joy, terror, love, and hate" (Metallinos. 1996, p. 38). At the time when the experiment was conducted, audiences were used to seeing silent films. They would convey meaning from silent scenes with occasional written explanations or dialogue. On the other hand, newer generations are used to deriving meaning from the combination of visual and aural information.

Even more evidence of this analysis can be found through the words of Eisenstein, later reinforced by Grodal. "Where some, like Eisenstein, have argued that the sound track should not simply reinforce what visuals are showing us, Grodal calls attention to the way our brains/minds automatically integrate messages from different sense sources into an overall interpretation enabling us to maximize the information we receive about things in the real world" (Whittock. 1998, p.1).

Sound in film is a key component that provides a background for the story, creates an ambiance, and helps the viewer's immersion in the story. "The sound is both sensory and the embodiment of an idea, functioning almost identically to a visual image" (Harrington. 1973, p. 40). The use of music creates a reality for the story and viewers respond with an emotional involvement. Sound invokes ideas in the viewer.

In television the combination of images and sound are equally important in relation to the recreation of reality. According to Zettl (1990), "we cannot simply ignore or even neglect the audio portion of [television mediated] events. It is often the sound track that lends the authenticity to the pictures and not the other way around" (p. 335). He
continues by saying, "we need sound for essential or supplemental information. The visuals alone are usually not enough to tell the whole story. Just try to follow a television show by watching the pictures with the sound turned off. It will be difficult, if possible at all, for you to understand what is going on even though the story may be highly visual" (p. 335).

The use of sound is important to understand a particular message or give background information related to a story presented either in film or television. However, the use of sound would jeopardize the effectiveness of the Kuleshov Experiment. The use of sound under one or two shots or under the three parts of the experiment would provide a background of additional information creating an association. Silence is therefore preferable. Considering what Harrington (1973) said "Silence. ... is effective only as a hiatus in the presence of sound. When all sound ceases, silence creates strong moods if set in the proper context" (p. 39). Silence in the experiment forces viewers to think of visual information only.

**Seeing Behind The Camera And The Reality Created By Editing**

Editing serves the function of keeping the most essential parts of the film. Long shots are mundane representations of an event. By cutting a film, an editor leaves the most significant components that tell the story better and more efficiently. Cutting a film means to create a new version of how things happened. Editing implies the reconstruction of reality, the recreation of events based on a storyline. "Frequently people who have been involved in an event know little about the most significant aspects until they see the event as someone has recorded it" (Harrington, 1973, p. 33). The camera has the ability
to record details that may skip the attention of the person who was a participant in the event.

In film the distance can be manipulated. The camera can bring closer a reaction, a movement of the hands enhancing characterization, an expression that changes the meaning of something said or heard, and other intentional details that "may add an unexpected touch of pathos to another word or phrase" (Pudovkin. 1935, p. 50). The camera records action happening behind and in front of a person revealing more information than the participant in the event can see. The human eye discriminates and focuses on one object or subject at a time. The camera "sees indiscriminately" (Harrington. 1973, p. 26). All the objects and subjects included in the shot will affect the outcome and the meaning perceived by the viewer. The viewer reads all the elements present in the film as information related to the story. The combination of seeing the reconstruction of reality, with all the information captured by the camera is what attracts viewers in the first place.

**Why Does Editing Work?**

Viewing patterns, conscious and unconscious movements of the eyes, as well as fragmented ideas we see in dreams might bring an explanation of why do we understand edited materials. What we perceive with our eyes as continuous information is in reality the accumulation of "successive glances in various directions" (Messaris, 1994, p. 15). Our viewing mechanism has the ability to see different directions and different distances. All the information is connected and people experience time continuously. According to Murch (1995), "the visual reality we perceive is a continuous stream of linked images" (p. 5). Edited materials seen in films and television programs, contradict the continuous
visual reality. However, viewers accept the disruptions and understand what they see as a whole. What viewers understand is the content that holds together all the scenes and shots in film or television programs.

**Blinking and Cutting**

Viewing patterns parallel film standards. Blinking can be compared to a cut in film. When a person sees objects in a distance and then an object closer, that action in film would be a cut from a long shot to a close-up. In the process of looking at an object farther away to an object closer we blink. Blinking is a physiological mechanism "that interrupts the apparent visual continuity of our perceptions" (Murch, 1995, p. 60). Murch added that blinking is a function that helps to "separate thoughts, sort things out, and regain control" (p. 61). Blinking is associated with ideas and thoughts and might be related to a separation of these ideas in viewer minds. Another instance that explains the similarity between blinking and a cut in film occurs when observing two people talk. A third party observing the conversation between two people would move his/her eyes from the speaker to the listener. In the process, the person observing blinks. The observer's eyes would cut from one person to the other, as it would happen in film or television programs.

**The cut: A transition device**

A cut is a transition device that changes one image to the other. It is the most basic of all transitional devices used in film and television programs. The cut makes an instant change with no interruptions between one image and the next. It follows human viewing capabilities. When a person sees an object in a distance and then focuses on a

---

* Zettl (2000) mentions four basic transitional devices: the cut, the dissolve, the wipe, and the fade. All four links one shot to the other but serve a different function (p. 319). The Kuleshov Experiment uses a cut.
closer object, the eyes do not scan all the information in between. In between these two places, the eyes blink, making a cut similar to the one seen in film or television programs.

The mental map

As explained before, editing allows the viewer to see shots that are fragments of the story, which combined produce meaning and reproduce the story in the most effective way. Close-ups seen in television have an effect in the viewer according to vectors\(^7\) and what Zettl (2000) calls "the mental map" (p.323-324). When two people talk in a television programs, usually they are shown in a long or medium shot that establishes their presence in the same space and at the same time. Subsequent close-ups will show them in profiles as they talk to each other. Even when viewers do not see the other person, they will assume his/her presence off-screen. The vectors of directions created by the eyes of the speaker in the close-up contribute to tell the audience that the speaker is looking in the direction of the other person. This aesthetic convention is widely used in news programs. Audiences have already learned to assume the presence of someone else off-screen even when they have missed seeing the introduction of the program showing an establishing shot.

Looking at the camera

A close-up of a person looking at the camera has a different effect. The viewer might feel that the person in the close-up is attempting to communicate with him/her. Even when viewers understand the spatial difference that separates them from the person on the screen, they see a close up of a person making direct eye contact with them. In the Kuleshov Experiment the person in the close-up is looking at the camera. Yet, the

\(^7\) Vectors are directional forces that pull the viewer attention to a certain aspect or part of an image (Zettl, 1990).
experiment showed that audiences make an association with the shots seen in anticipation to the close-up.

**The Artificial Landscape**

The success of Lev Kuleshov's experiment with what he called "The Artificial Landscape" (Levaco. 1974) follows the human viewing patterns as well. In his experiment, he shot people in different locations and times and juxtaposed these shots together creating the illusion of being in the same place and time. A similar sensation can be recreated when viewers are in a location and see in opposite directions. Just by turning their heads, they might experience two different settings, i.e. the view of the ocean in one side and the city on the opposite. The human viewing mechanism allows people to see two different sites without scanning all the information in between.

**Fragmented Viewing in Dreams**

A different approach that attempts to explain why editing makes sense is the way people experience dreams. Daily experiences from the moment a person wakes up appear in sequence, but dreams "are much more fragmented, intersecting in much stranger and more abrupt ways than the images of waking reality – ways that approximate, at least, the interaction produced by cutting" (Murch, 1995, p. 58). Dreams and films are similar: in the theater, people submerge in a dream-like experience. Although some authors argue that film watching and dreaming have no comparison because "in dreams the central character is typically the self, whose acts and sufferings are of central concern. But film watching is notable for its capacity to suppress consciousness of the self in favour of the fiction" (Currie, 1995, p. 28).

---

8 A camera would pan from one location to the other scanning all the information around. With editing or by shooting each setting independently, we can follow what the eyes see in reality. Blinking is what makes people perceive two different settings in one location.
Visualization is key

From the beginning of film editing, filmmakers found that viewers could interpret edited material and understand disruptions in time and place. This discovery led to an important part in pre-production of films: a shooting list. Understanding that films can be shot discontinuously and be assembled in editing according to the story is key in pre-production stage. In fact, good pre-production involves the accurate pre-visualization process that will allow editors to assemble the story according to the script.

In the process of shooting a story, each shot is done separately. The camera stops rolling with each take. However, each shot needs to contribute to the overall meaning behind the scene and ultimately the story. No shot in a film is capable of maintaining itself unless it is connected to other shots. “Film is a medium that manipulates images in order to generate ideas, hence making visual images into important bearers of generalizations as well as of details” (Harrington, 1973, p. 24). Editing makes the viewer pay attention to the dialectical effect of film, where the sum of the parts becomes greater and different from the units.

Even when all shots have to be recorded considering the story, during the production process the script is broken down in discontinuity. The order in which all shots are recorded will no longer follow the storyline. “but [will be guided] by convenience and efficiency” (Zettl, 2000, p. 488). Actors in films cannot play a continuous scene. From the time when a shooting schedule is put together, the actor’s work is discontinuous. The actor becomes a “will-less automata” (Pudovkin, 1935, p. 33)

---

9 The conventions that apply to film editing are used in television programs as well, with the exception of live programs.
10 A take is “one version of a shot” (Katz, 1991, p. 362). The take is an uninterrupted recording of a scene or action.
following directions according to the director’s instructions. The choice to emphasize
certain expressions or distance the camera from a reaction is not at the hands of the actor.
What the viewer sees as performance is a collection of “editing pieces” (Pudovkin, 1935,
p. 35) that are put together enhancing the actors capability to perform. The story becomes
a whole once again, once the editing process begins.

Rhetorical Effect

The process of assembling shots is a process that recreates reality. As Russian
filmmaker Pudovkin noted, “a film is not shot, but built” (Harrington, 1973, 130). Editing
does not follow a pattern and in many occasions a change in the position of shots may
affect the overall significance. Harrington (1973) provides the following example:

Consider these three shots: a plate heaped with steaming, appetizing food; a little
girl, about six or seven, wearing a filthy dress and staring at the camera with an
expressionless face; and the same girl with a smile. If a filmmaker first shows the
expressionless girl followed by the food and then the smiling face, the viewers
assume that the hungry girl has been offered the food and is now happy. Reverse
the order: smiling face, food, expressionless face. The filmmaker has now
depicted disappointment and despair (p. 24).

The order of the shots affects the narrative; meaning depends on the organization
of shots. This is when editing exercises its rhetorical power. The combination of shots is
what affects the viewer. The editor has the responsibility to re-create a story. In the
process, part of the information is lost. The editor has a continuous debate in terms of

---

11 Early exponents of this alternative are Dziga Vertov, Sergei Eisenstein, and Rudolph Arnheim (Prince,
1999). The theory of Russian montage began to take shape in Kuleshov’s film workshops. According to
Levacn (1974) “Over half the Soviet directors since 1920 had been [Kuleshov’s] pupils, including most
notably Pudovkin, Eisenstein, Barnet...[among others]” (p. 1).
what is necessary and what becomes unnecessary. "Throughout the editing process there is a constant tension between maintaining the forward impetus of the film and providing enough contextual information so that the central narrative or argument continues to make sense" (MacDougall, 1999, p. 299). For this purpose, the editor selects what is best for the audience to see, and the order of the shots that will convey meaning in the most effective way possible.

The Use of a Close-Up

In his early research of the rhetorical advantage of American films, Kuleshov found that American films used close-ups to emphasize key moments in the film. In his study, Kuleshov explained, "the close-up, the compositional expression of only the most important and necessary, proved to have a decided influence on our future work in montage" (Levaco, 1974, p. 191). The closer the camera to the subject, the closer the viewer will be to that subject. A close-up shows a point of view that emphasizes an important part of the scene. The viewer is forced to pay attention to detail. Films in general use close-ups to emphasize a determinant moment. However, when the close-up shows a facial expression, the viewer interprets the performer's emotions as well. The use of a close-up has the purpose of bringing the person's emotions to the viewer. "Deep feeling, emotion, is usually best expressed through the eyes, and the closer the shot, the more clearly the emotion can be seen and felt by the viewer" (Dmytryk, 1984, p. 25).

According to Messaris (1994), "facial expression in movies has made audiences more sensitive to [the representation of non-visual subjective reality] even in their everyday lives, than they would otherwise be" (p. 16). With films and constant exposure to television programs, viewers have learned to read and interpret expressions. Statistics
show that facial expressions carry more weight when in comes to interpreting non-verbal cues. Meyrowitz (1985) recalls the results of a study conducted by anthropologist Albert Mehrabian’s in which, "studies of nonverbal behavior suggest that the relative weight people give to messages in face-to-face encounters is 7% to the verbal, 38% to vocal inflection, and 55% to facial expression. If these figures are accurate, more than 90% of the meaning of a message is derived from expressions rather than 'communications" (p.100).

The success of the Kuleshov Experiment depends on how the viewer reads the expression of the man in the close-up. Since this kind of shot brings attention to the actor's emotions, meaning derives from what the expression communicates to the viewer.

Importance Of Visual Communication

Studies support the idea that receiving messages is an unavoidable activity that shapes people's lives. Chesebro and Bertelsen (1996) explained,

Increasingly, we live, work, and play in environments created, sustained, and altered by and through communication. Our daily existence – from the moment we get up, as we work, during our leisure hours, and until we retire – is an unending series of messages, information bits, symbols, signs, warnings, commands, images, strategies, and artifacts (p.30).

People live in constant exposure to visual images. According to Gombrich (1996) “Ours is a visual age" (p. 41). The importance of visual communication resides in its property to transcend the barriers of spoken language. “The very basic requirement for communication between individuals is their need to speak in the same language. Using a
visual medium is choosing to communicate through pictures and ultimately the visual language used must be compatible with human perception” (Ward. 1996. p. 8).

The advantage of visual language over verbal communication is that the former “integrates words, images and shapes into a single communication unit” (Horn. 1998. p. 8). The use of a common language is no longer necessary for individuals of different backgrounds to communicate since symbols are universally accepted and understood. As Horn (1998) explains, visual language “is being born of people’s need, worldwide, to deal with complex ideas that are difficult to express in text alone” (p. 5).

Visual images have the capacity to convey meaning almost instantly. The information that can be extracted from one visual image can take long written descriptions. For example, a close-up of a person can be immediately perceived and analyzed. Different viewers can interpret the information based on what they are seeing and add different descriptions based on their observations. Some interpretations can describe the emotions portrayed, the surrounding that affect the close up, the effect of colors used, facial characteristics, time and place, age of the individual, racial or ethnical assumptions. All these considerations would take long descriptions in written language, but a short glance at a picture can convey all these characteristics in the viewer.

The inverse can happen when a written or oral message is translated into a visual image. If the message says “a man” with no other description, it is up to the listener or reader to formulate his or her own view of man. The visual representation of a man is most likely to be different in the minds of every receiver of the message. It would be almost impossible to visually represent “a man” detached of characteristics.
The analogies between written and visual representations are numerous. Although it is important to recognize that a word is not equivalent to an image. According to Harrington (1973) an image can be compared to a paragraph. He explains. “A paragraph articulates an idea, then offers supportive evidence or arguments. Similarly, a shot in context assumes a general idea or mood and also offers many equivalents of simple declarative and descriptive sentences, providing the viewer with supportive information” (p. 10).

**Interpretation of Images**

The study of visual communication is important to understand “the meanings and effects produced by images” (Foss and Kanengieter, 1992, p. 314). The interpretation of imagery requires the development of three skills: “reading, writing, and evaluating visual images” (Foss and Kanengieter, 1992, p. 312). The history of mankind has been dependent on the growth of all forms of communication: among them is the development of visual language. The expansion of different mediums of mass communication has facilitated the global spreading of information. “Information can be thought of as anything that produces changes in consciousness—a perception, a sensation, an emotion, a memory, a thought” (Kubey and Csikszentmihalyi, 1990, p. 2).

Film and television in particular have increased people’s perception of visual language. This knowledge is important not only for the necessary communication processes but also creates awareness of the rhetorical effects of images. According to Messaris (1994) visual literacy improves cognition of spatial relationships in the real world and helps the viewer to recognize manipulation in advertising (p. 3).
When interpreting the meaning of the Kuleshov experiment viewers bring their previous knowledge of how the media communicate messages: independent shots are parts of a whole, the whole is a story. In formulating an explanation to the message in the Kuleshov experiment, participants make use of two theories: Gestalt and Schema. The theory of Gestalt applies to the creation of a story. Viewers do not interpret isolated shots, they tend to interpret two shots, and in some occasions, all six shots as a whole. Schema theory applies to the conclusion derived from the experiment. Participant’s experience with the media, interpersonal communication and the use of symbolism helps them explain what is the connection between the shots.

**Perception of Messages on Film and Television**

Perception is the sensorial response to an outer stimulus. Without sensorial stimulus, the mental functioning would be altered. According to Arnheim (1969) the process of thinking is key to the individual’s understanding of the messages given through the media. He added, “vision is the primary medium of thought” (p. 18). An explanation of how film makes sense may come from the idea that “the brain is constantly engaged in processing information that comes to it in the form of external stimuli” (Nowell-Smith, 2000, p. 11).

Television viewing allows a continuous sensorial interaction where the vision and hearing senses participate actively. Throughout the years, the human perception has become “purposive and selective” (Arnheim, 1969, p. 19). This process of discriminatory selection explains the variation of the human vision to focus at objects at a distance and back to an object near creating what in film and television is known as a long shot and a close-up. It also explains the difference between watching film and television, and how
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people can concentrate in a television program even when the eyes allow the viewer to perceive visual information outside from the television screen. This visual selectivity is what allows the viewer to immerse in a story presented on television. While some studies support the idea that television is a medium that does not allow viewer’s willing suspension of disbelief (Saltzstein, 1994) others claim that visual selectivity is key to understanding viewer’s involvement in messages through television.

It is necessary to differentiate the levels of concentration differ from one medium to another. The television medium is not demanding of continuous attention and concentration. According to Kubey and Csikszentmihalyi (1990), “in terms of concentration, television viewing is a low-involvement activity” (p. 135). The way our vision works provides an explanation of this phenomenon. When people read a book or watch a film, their eyes have to focus on that activity, not allowing the eyes to move in other directions. Our vision has to focus on a book while the eyes move, or on a movie theatre screen when watching films. Television has a smaller screen and it is “viewed with much less eye movement” (Kubey and Csikszentmihalyi, 1990, p. 136). The opportunity to move the eyes in various directions outside of the television screen is what limits concentration on the programs watched.

**Gestalt Theory**

Gestalt theory explains the integrated relationship of a whole and its parts. Gestalt psychologists have influenced perceptual analysis. According to Ward (1996) “these psychologists held the view that it is the overall form of an image that we respond to not the isolated visual elements it contains. In general, we do not attempt to perceive accurately every detail of the shapes and objects perceived but select only as much as will
enable us to identify what we see” (p. 10). This aspect of Gestalt psychology may come to contradict the purpose of showing lengthy close-ups in the Kuleshov Experiment. Participants have to find an interpretation to a long exposure of a close-up. The long exposure to the close-up may condition the viewer to pay attention to details and formulate a conclusion affected by all the visual characteristics of the individual rather than a quick reaction to the close up. Participants may analyze different characteristics of the person in the close up and come to think that details are more important than the overall effect of seeing a close up in a given context.

Schema Theory

People interpret what they see from an educated perspective that has been influenced by their own experiences and backgrounds. “Perception is making sense of an image - searching for the best interpretation of the available data. The mind sees patterns and searches for the best interpretation. A perceived object is therefore a hypothesis to be tested against a previous experience” (Ward, 1996, p. 9).

In film especially, viewers bring previous knowledge from their exposure to other films, television programs, or even their own daily experiences. In the interpretation of the Kuleshov Experiment there is a natural tendency to match the schemata of what they have seen before to what they are seeing in the information contained in the sequence of shots. For instance, the first part of replication of the Kuleshov experiment shows a little kid playing with a truck followed by the close up of a man. Previous experience in film or television programs situates viewers in a position in which they might predict that a third shot will link both characters. The idea that something is about to happen comes from previous exposure to the media. The viewer follows a schema seen before and concludes
that the child and the man are in the same space and at the same time and they will interact. "Schemas are frames of reference human beings use to make sense of their world, particularly the often repeated, mundane scenarios [people] encounter on a regular or semi-regular basis" (Larson, 2001, p. 4).

The concept of schemas applies to the Kuleshov Experiment. Participants bring prior knowledge of the interaction of two shots: one long shot followed by a close-up. Through their exposure to television and films, viewers conclude that a second shot is a consequence of the first. If a relation of consequence is not found, participants may find that because these shots are cut together, there must be some relationship between them, although they cannot recognize the association.

Strauss and Quinn (1997) give further explanation to the function of schemas. They postulate that schemas "are not distinct things but rather collections of elements that work together to process information at a given time. Cognitive scientists have traditionally used the term 'schema' to refer to generic knowledge of any sort, from parts to wholes, simple to complex, concrete to abstract" (p. 49). The way viewers interpret movies or television programs depend on their previous experiences with the media and their cultural or social experiences. The Kuleshov experiment would probably have different interpretations if tested in a population with no exposure or less exposure to the media.

Interpersonal relations, cultural and social interaction, and previous exposure to the media that involves a child and an adult, a dead man in a casket and a man who is apparently looking, and an object followed by a close up, have already educated the viewer. The result of this education varies according to each participant. The effects of
television and the impact that violence has on the viewer might explain why some participants assume that danger and death are present in the relation between the shots in the experiment.

**Cultivation Theories and Content**

Cultivation theory takes into consideration the amount of viewer's exposure to television. Frequent viewers learn to perceive the world as seen on TV. The systematic exposure to programs creates a world with repeated messages and portrayals that are soon perceived as realities. Studies by Gerbner, Gross, Morgan, and Signorielli support the idea that heavier viewers are affected by frequent TV messages and "repetitive storytelling serves the function of reinforcing certain cultural norms and values, and of maintaining the status quo" (Dobrow, 1990, p. 183).

Frequent viewers learn stereotypes and modify their beliefs based on the most common patterns seen on television. According to Morgan, Shanahan, and Harris (1990) the "amount of television viewing has been found to make an independent contribution to people's beliefs, assumptions, and values in a broad range of substantive areas, including images of violence, mistrust, sex-role and age-role stereotypes, the family, health, religion, science, political orientations, and many other issues" (p. 109).

Cultivation theory argues that the impact of television goes beyond entertaining and informing. However, the effects of frequent exposure have to take into consideration the content of diverse kinds of programming. Viewers watch stories on television. The content and not the exposure is what causes an effect on the viewer. Television is studied as a "central institution of cultural production, because it is the most pervasive source of standardized, market-driven, centrally produced cultural stories in this society" (Morgan, Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.
Shanahan. & Harris. 1990. p. 110). The pilot study conducted for this experiment indicated that certain viewers associated the shots used with violent situations. Exposure to the media will be taken in consideration when observing responses that link the shots in the experiment with violence.

A New Generation of Viewers

Generation X is the largest generation in America to date. With more than "30% of the total US population" (Ritchie. 1995. p. 19) this generation includes people who are born between the years 1961 and 1981\(^\text{12}\). This peer group confronted a major change in the family structure. Divorce rates between the years 1960 and 1980 reached unprecedented high numbers. Either with single mothers or with both parents, the usual structure of the family changed. Most children from Generation X did not spend enough time with their relatives.

Considering that "parents, peers, and television" (Mangleburg and Bristol. 1998. p. 7) are major sources of influence, peers of Generation X were mostly influenced by the latter. With the increase of both parents having to work outside the home, the media took the place of the caregiver (Ritchie. 1995). This generation is more visually oriented and experienced\(^\text{13}\) because of their early and continuous exposure to the media. Television viewing "requires the ability to use and interpret audio, visual and print systems all at once"... which assumes previous knowledge of ..."sound, nonverbal behavior, imagery, and linear progression" (Chesebro and Bertelsen. 1996. p. 139). According to Chesebro


\(^{13}\) The term experienced in this case applies to expertise in film and television visual conventions. For example, an experienced viewer understands that a dissolve is commonly used as a transition of time.
and Bertelsen (1996) all the messages we receive are used as "streams and cross-currents of meaning to define who we are, who others are, and what our environment is" (p. 30).

**Television Viewing Experience**

Regarding the influence of the media on behavior, studies support a symbiotic relationship: Society can be shaped according to the trends and the values that television programs portray; and the media reflect what already exists in society\(^\text{14}\). The messages seen and heard on television conform to people's daily experiences. The media reflect society by capturing the essence of a particular group. Society learns from the media and imitates behavior re-shaping its values. As Hansen and Hansen (1991) noted, "the media must reflect the audience's ideologies in order to catch its attention, but in turn, constant exposure to a message will redefine the audience's views to conform more closely with the media's message" (p. 11).

Television is a perspective on reality, but sometimes, it provides the viewer with the reality he or she wants to see\(^\text{15}\). Frequent watchers familiarize with the characters and personalities from TV programs and little by little become acquainted with these characters. As Goldhammer (1996) explained, "Our gods, heroes, and neighbors now live in the TV set and in the stereo system. We have an electronic media family that we can turn on or off. Our relationships with others have become projective illusions. We are more comfortable with Phil Donahue or Jay Leno than the person next door" (p. 32).

---

\(^{14}\) According to Kubey and Csikszentmihalyi (1990) viewers reinforce their ideas about their environment through their exposure with television.

\(^{15}\) Viewers fall for the idea that television will offer a distraction and entertainment. Television as a business sells products through advertising. It creates a consumer of products who believes he or she is being entertained. "Viewers...release themselves from the pressures of the workplace while simultaneously fostering acceptance of industry’s materialistic values via advertising, and thereby helping motivate viewers to return to the workplace the next day in order to earn the money necessary to buy the things advertised on television the night before" (Kubey and Csikszentmihalyi, 1990, p. 33).
Television might be considered a unilateral form of communication that excludes the viewer from participating in the process of sending a message back. As a communication medium, television transforms viewers into passive receiver of information, limiting their experience to accepting the message, but excluding them from being part of the communication process.

**The use of the VCR and the remote control**

The use of the VCR and remote control contributed to make this generation in control of what they see on television. Advertising executives and broadcasters are aware of the viewing patterns created by the use of the VCR and remote control. Viewers are in control of when and what they see. They can avoid commercials and have control over programming. "Broadcasters have changed programming strategies based on the impact of the VCR on audience behavior. This has led to a change in the way advertisers are using television as an advertising medium" (Klopfenstein, 1990, p. 45-46).

With the use of new technologies the relationship between the audience and the television medium changed. Before the introduction of the remote control, viewers were passive viewers of television. They would watch a channel without skipping commercials and without switching channels (Bellamy and Walker, 1996). Now television viewers actively participate by acquiring more channels through cable or satellite subscriptions, renting or buying videotapes, and using the remote control.

The VCR allows viewers to watch any program at any time, and as often as they like. The viewer can fast forward, rewind, freeze a frame, and more important avoid

---

16 Communication, in its basic form, travels from the sender to the receiver and vice versa. Mass communication through television reaches receivers but do not allow their feedback. Viewers might express their opinions through surveys of viewer's preferences, which are used mainly for television ratings. Other forms of feedback might consider viewer's phone calls and letters directed to the television station or network.
commercials. "The VCR emancipated the TV audience from being passive viewers to active users" (Lin. 1990. p. 75). The VCR provides with alternatives to select, alter the content, or even create a new program.

With the use of the remote control, viewers can switch from one channel to the other and watch different programs at the same time. According to Bellamy and Walker (1996) proficient users "can average over a hundred channel changes per hour" (p. vii). Viewer’s loyalty to programs and tolerance to commercials is difficult to maintain.

The VCR changed the way television is used and seen. Time-shifting allows viewers to record and play a program at his/her convenience. Videotapes give the viewer the freedom to watch recently released movies in their own homes and without commercials from television stations. The VCR allows skipping the introductory announcements on videotapes. It also allows viewers to stop the movie and continue watching at their own convenience.

The combination of VCR and camcorders allow the playback of home videos. Home videos are used to preserve important moments of family history. Recording home videos serves similar functions as taking family pictures. Vale (1990) explains the similarities pointing out that "As a social tool, the camcorder is certainly close to the still camera and the world of home snapshot photography, just as the videocassette – when used as a mode for the interpretation and home storage of recorded family history- bears some relation to the home photo album" (p. 196).

It is interesting to note that despite the influence of the media, what people preserve in home videos are images of great success, more than defeats. images of

---

17 The content can be altered by recording parts of a program and excluding others. In this sense, the VCR can be used to edit content. Different programs can be created by mixing shots or scenes from different sources. Juxtaposing different programs can be used for comparative analysis.
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children playing, family vacations, holidays, birthdays, all reflections of happiness and achievement (Vale, 1990). According to Armes (1988) "[V]ideo is a technology symptomatic of the public role given to images in a capitalist society: it records aspects of the surface of life, but it embellishes prettifies, as it records" (Vale, 1990, p. 198). These images are later seen on television. Home video images contradict the reality portrayed in movies and programs. Users of camcorders do not record their view of the world as seen on television. Even when videotaping experiences at work, the images reflect a positive environment, not the negative aspects. The use of the camcorder to prevail only positive aspects of life seems to indicate a "fear of both the intrusiveness of this technology on closely guarded realms of privacy18 and a further fear of the camcorder’s potential to perpetuate or revive unpleasant memories" (Vale, 1990, p. 200).

Advertising strategies are now “designed to minimize the effect of the [remote control] activity” (Bellamy & Walker, 1996, p. 7). The impact of the remote control has been effective for this generation of users because this peer group has more choices available19. Cable, satellite and Pay Per View provide a variety of choices that were not available to generations before.

New Technologies

This generation saw the proliferation of computer technology and as Turkle (1995) explained “the children of the early 1980s began to think of computers and computer toys as psychological objects because these machines combined mind activities (talking, singing, spelling, game playing, and doing math), an interactive style, and an opaque

---

18 Users of camcorders expressed that they would abstain to videotape funerals, home-produced pornography, someone sleeping or just awakening, and bathroom activities.
19 According to Bellamy and Walker (1996) the idea of the remote control existed since the early days of radio. This device was not successful due to its high price and awkwardness.
surface" (p. 25). The introduction of new technologies had an effect not only in children but young adults already at work that became acquainted with the capabilities and opportunities that computers had to offer.

In relation with visual education, this new media diversified the already vast combination of shapes, images and text. New generations of users had previous exposure to an active television screen with multiple information, especially sports programs. But the use of interactive media multiplied this potential adding the participation of the user. Computer users can participate in the creation of visual information combining symbols, text, and shapes in different arrangements. The computer is a medium that "invites users to actively construct, manipulate, and explore individual conceptualizations of reality" (Chesebro & Bertelsen. 1996. p. 147). Computer use provides an even wider variety of options. When surfing through the Internet, users can access diverse information just by pressing a button, just as they do with the remote control. Opportunities to shop, communicate, get information and entertainment are all available thanks to the introduction of the information superhighway. People are no longer viewers of programs, but users of information.

The process of adjustment to new media technologies might take some time. The process of adaptation will affect some groups of people that may not have access to new technologies. The integration achieved by the television medium can be at risk. Most people can have access to at least a certain number of television channels. With new technologies, the options are numerous. However, many people do not have access to computers. Those feelings of "togetherness" (Meyrowitz. 1985) achieved by the

---

Footnote: Feelings of sharing and belonging come from the common experience of viewers of different backgrounds to watch television at the same time, having a common experience and knowledge. Television
television medium are not likely to happen. "The Internet cannot be defined as a mass medium" (Ryan & Wentworth, 1999, p. 97). If it is true that the Internet reaches a wide audience, each person has to access a page individually. The chances of having massive interest in a particular page and at the same time are likely to be difficult.

Generation X has an already established tendency to isolation that can be accentuated by the use of computers. According to Turkle the use of computers "can trap people into an infatuation with control, with building one's own private world". From this psychological perspective, individual constructions of messages and meanings tend to be idiosyncratic.... Such idiosyncratic interpretations of the world and its events are unlikely to sustain a culture's values and lifestyles from one generation to the next" (Chesebro and Bertelsen, 1996, p. 147). Computer use is another factor contributing to the formation of an active viewer. The viewer of Generation X knows how to control and create images. The results of the recreation of the experiment can be affected by this knowledge.

Hypotheses

This study predicts that generation X participants will react differently to the Kuleshov Experiment than the original audience. The body of literature explained in this chapter supports the idea that viewers might arrive at different conclusions. The next chapter explains the instrumentation and methods used for the analysis of data. The following hypotheses will be answered in chapter four:

H1: Participants may not find a connection between the shots in each part of the experiment. This question is the main hypothesis formulated for this study. Participants in
this study are different from the audience of the original Kuleshov experiment and may not arrive at the same results relating the shots.

H2: Generation X participants will arrive at different results regarding the association between the shots than older or younger participants. The argument related to Generation X is that this generation had more exposure to the media than other generations. This exposure may affect the way they respond to the stimulus. Also, younger participants may differ, again based on their exposure to the media.

H3: Gender will affect the connections found or creativity of the respondents. This hypothesis will look at differences related to sex of the respondent.

H4: Class where the survey was taken will not affect the connections found or creativity of the respondents. This hypothesis will attempt to determine the importance of visual literacy in education. The visual analysis to the responses seem to indicate that students in Television Production tend to observe more details in the stimulus than other students.

H5: Depictions of violence in the survey are related to hours watching television. This hypothesis will try to determine if there is a relation between heavy exposure to the media and violence. Following the analysis formulated by Gerbner and Signorelli (included in chapter two) this hypothesis will attempt to determine if heavy exposure to the media affects depictions of violence seen in the stimulus.

H6: Hours of media use will affect the results in terms of creativity, story telling, and finding connections. This hypothesis will attempt to determine if media use alone helps the viewer to become more creative.

H7: The first shot will derive more meaning, and will be more noticeable than the second shot (close-up). Following Eisenstein analysis, this hypothesis will try to determine if
participants are moved by the shot that remains constant (close-up) or by the one that changes (first shot). As explained in chapter two, it is assumed that the lack of action in the close up will lead viewers to pay more attention to the shot that varies.

H8: This quasi-experiment will be analyzed as a whole. Some participants will integrate all the shots and create a continuous story. According to Gestalt theory, viewers will see the overall effect of the shots and not each shot. This overall effect may allow participants to relate and integrate all the shots used into a story.

H9: Participants who recognize the person in the close-up will not find a connection between the shots. This hypothesis will try to determine if participants will suspend their disbelief and find an explanation for the shots even if they recognize a character in the stimulus. Willing suspension of disbelief, as explained in chapter two, is the ability of the viewer to voluntarily submerge into the reality portrayed in a film or story.

H10: The result of the original Kuleshov Experiment that “the man in the close up reacts differently to each situation” will not be concluded in this experiment. Participants will notice that the experiment repeats the same close up. This hypothesis assumes that because of their vast experience with the media, participants will notice the repetition of the close-up.
CHAPTER 3

METHODOLOGY

This section describes the elaboration of the video replicating the Kuleshov experiment, considering every aspect in detail. This will include the work done in pre-production, the steps taken to shoot the video, and a description of the visual content of each shot. The results of the Pilot Study explain the initial expectations formulated for this quasi-experiment. Included in this section is an explanation of the instrument, sample, and coding system used. Finally, a brief description of the statistical analysis used for each hypothesis is provided and further developed in chapter four.

Considerations for the Stimulus Design

How and when the Kuleshov’s experiment happened was not properly documented. This quasi-experiment follows the description provided by Levaco (1974):

[Kuleshov] found a long take in close-up of [a well-known actor] Mozhukhin’s expressionless neutral face. Kuleshov intercut it with various shots, the exact content of which he himself forgot in later years—shots, according to Pudovkin, of a bowl of steaming soup, a woman in a coffin, and a child playing with a toy bear—and projected these to an audience which marveled at the sensitivity of the actor’s range (p. 8).
This experiment tests a different generation from the original study conducted in Russia in 1919. Participants in this experiment have more exposure to the media and may have difficulty understanding the intention behind the experiment. Familiarity with the subject in the close-up, length of the shots, and lack of sound, may affect the results in the experiment. To maintain continuity and possibly to link the shots, all four shots were done keeping the same background. The length of the close up remains the same in all three parts shown on video. All four shots were replicated following Levaco’s description, with the exception of the woman in the coffin. Instead, a man appears in this shot. Also, the child plays with a truck instead of a bear.

**Emotionless close-up**

Photography has the ability to capture people’s emotions, especially in a close up. The expression in an actor’s face, muscular tension, attention to the eyes and lips, as well as the camera angle provides a language that the viewer understands. “The eyes are perhaps the most expressive feature of the human face, communicating silently what the mouth must do largely with words and sounds” (Katz, 1991, p. 123). The attempt of this experiment is to present an emotionless close up. If the viewer is not capable of seeing emotions in the actor’s face, then meaning will be provided by the viewer’s own interpretation of the interaction between the shots (Murch, 1995). This lack of emotion and clear intention might be confusing for the viewer. Harrington (1973) explained that film “depends on ‘statements’ that can be seen and, to a certain degree, verified (although the rhetoric of film depends on viewers accepting images as ‘true’)” (p. 23). The statement in this experiment is unclear, and the intention behind it might be to test participant’s ability to associate images or find that there is no connection. If viewers
recognize a familiar face, in this case. Dan Grimes' close up, they may not be able to suspend their disbelief. As explained before, willing suspension of disbelief is necessary to explain the relation between the first shot and the close-up in each case.

**Length of the shots**

Long shots are usually avoided in films and television programs. Filmmakers and television producers are afraid that viewers will be bored unless they see fast moving shots. David MacDougall explains "the fear is based on the supposed desire of viewers to move on to the next shot/point once they have grasped the preceding one and their boredom if this demand is not met" (Henderson and Martin, 1999, p. 243). This version of the Kuleshov Experiment combined long shots. The close up used for the experiment is ten seconds long. With the exception of the boy playing with a toy truck, all the shots were static. With no apparent action and long shots in duration, the assumption made was that participants would be bored to see each part of the experiment.

However, the long shots would force participants to think about the meaning of the experiment. A shorter close up, one lasting only a couple of seconds, would have been more appropriate if the intention were to make participants think that the close up was in fact a reaction. By using long shots, viewers have no other choice but to think of the close up, not as a reaction, but as an isolated shot. According to MacDougall (1999) during the editing process, editors face a dilemma about whether or not eliminating frames will help the presentation of a story. He explains, "Throughout the editing process there is a constant tension between maintaining the forward impetus of the film and providing enough contextual information so that the central narrative or argument

---

21 Mr. Grimes is manager of instructional production and engineering at University of Nevada, Las Vegas. Students who take classes in mass media or assist with UNLV's television productions may recognize him.
continues to make sense” (MacDougall. 1999, p. 299). Contrary to what editors try to achieve, which is to tell a story by juxtaposing shots as briefly but as effectively as possible, this experiment extends the normal exposure of the close up. This long exposure is an attempt to create an intellectual response and not the immediate assumption that the close up serves as a reaction.

**Effect of Sound**

Silence in the experiment forces viewers to think. Any sound would be an unnecessary distraction and may alter what participants see. For example, if the sound were continuous for all three parts of the experiment, viewers would most likely believe that all three parts were linked. If each part had sound, participants would assume that all three parts were independent from each other, and the two shots in each part have a connection. The choice of sound or music will create a context and affect the outcome. If each shot were recorded with natural sound, viewers would identify a disruption in continuity. They would identify the repetition of the close up and it may affect the result.

**Continuity in Background**

In order to maintain continuity, the same backgrounds were used. The length of the shots would help viewers to identify any discontinuity in the backgrounds. Also, any differences would alter the meaning perceived by the viewer and taken as part of the statement. Harrington (1973) wrote, “Filmmakers are very conscious of the way individuals express their inner selves by the way they structure and adorn their environment. Both major and minor details are usually more than mere decoration; they reveal aspects of character in a film” (p. 29). This is the main reason why the background in the recreation of the Kuleshov Experiment had to remain neutral. The background is
consistent in all four shots. Otherwise, it would influence the viewers' perception that the man in the close is at a different place. The lighting scheme is also consistent as much as possible to create the illusion of being at the same place and at the same time.

**Shot Analysis**

The following is a detailed description of the four shots used in the video:

**Shooting the Close-Up**

According to a drawing of the original experiment (Menendez, 1994, p.150). Mozhukhin was much older than the man whose close-up was taken. However, he looks old enough to be the father of the child who appears in one of the shots. The only instruction given to the actor (before the close-up was taken) was to appear emotionless.

The light inside the building was poor. The close-up could have been better with the appropriate fill light to illuminate the shadows under the actor’s eyes. The camera was placed at eye level close to the actor. He stood a few steps away from the wall to avoid a flat look. The background used is an off-white wall, which was considered to be neutral. This kind of surface was chosen to match the other shots, and make easier the association of one shot to the other.

In the editing process, one of the major concerns was the duration of each shot. For this particular shot, the decision to make shots equal in length was taken into consideration. “The viewers overall sense of a scene’s speed is affected by cutting rate as well as the degree and type of movement of objects within the frame” (Baird, 2000, pp. 8-9). The average viewer may be accustomed to a few seconds in a reaction shot. However, since only two shots are presented for each part, and most of the shots are motionless, the decision taken was to use ten seconds per reaction shot.
Shot of the Child Playing

This shot was made based on availability. One mother at a day care center volunteered to allow her child to be videotaped for this project. The instructions given to the child were to play with a toy of his preference and not to look at the camera. In spite of his young age, the little boy who appears in this shot, played with two toy trucks for a reasonable time. The light in this place matched the light used in the close-up. Both were fluorescent light. The f-stop in the daycare center was slightly higher: the light in the boy’s face looks even.

To put the camera at eye level required not using a tripod. The hand-held shot looked a little shaky. Using the tripod was better, but it was also different from the picture describing the experiment. In the drawing (Menendez 1994), the child playing appears to be at eye level. The camera was placed a few steps from the boy and he preferred to play against the wall. The background was an off-white wall that matched the close-up shot. The boy looks much younger than the girl in the picture. This might be irrelevant considering that he delivered a good performance.

One of the early assumptions in the original Kuleshov Experiment was that the man was the child’s father. This assumption might be a little different in this new experiment considering that the man and the child have different racial characteristics. The boy’s activity allowed using a longer shot than most of the others. His shot was twelve seconds long.

The Bowl of Soup

The main difficulty was the light. The main source of light was natural light coming from a window. Other sources did not provide sufficient light to shoot. The
example of the experiment shows a bowl of steaming soup with a spoon on a table, which was recreated. The camera was placed at a high angle in relation to the plate of soup and near enough to have a close-up without using the zoom lens. The background is a wooden table. Since this is a static shot, no more than eight seconds were used in post-production. For the viewer's standards, this might be a little too long.

**Shooting the man in a casket**

The most difficult part was finding a place and a volunteer to participate in such a shot. Jim Phillips, general manager from *Valley Memorial Cremation & Burial*, allowed shooting at his store providing also the casket. The light in the place was even, with a little filtering of natural light coming from the corner of a window. The background in this place was a matching off-white wall. The camera was placed at eye level. Several takes were taken from different distances: the long shot was the most appropriate. This is also a static shot, no more than nine seconds were used in the final edited piece.

**Pilot Study**

Students in *Visual Communication* participated in the recreation of the experiment. A total of thirteen students, from 19 to 32 years old, responded to the survey instrument. The average age was 21. More females than males responded the survey. These are some examples:

**Part One**

This part examined the juxtaposition of the child playing and the close up of the man. Six students did not find a connection between the shots, three of them responded that the man was the father; three answers considered the possibility of a connection, also
malfunction of the monitor, and a man looking at a boy. The most interesting response was one of the respondents felt afraid for the kid. She thought that the man looked menacing, and the child could be endangered. This unique response may be attributed to the mean world syndrome, which explains that frequent viewers tend to see the world as a dangerous place.

Part Two

This part examined the reaction of the man to the bowl of soup. Five respondents found no connection between the two shots. One explained that the man was watching the soup. Three viewers considered the possibility of a connection but did not explain why or what was the connection. The other four respondents wrote that the man either made or was going to eat the soup.

Part Three

Three participants answered that there was no connection, and two wrote that there might be a connection. Two of the respondents did not see this part of the experiment. Only one of them identified the man as the same one on previous shots. An interesting response described that the man in the coffin was a mobster and the man in the close up was his brother. One person identified the two men as being the same person; probably the man in the close up was seeing his own funeral. The rest of the respondents answered that they were friends or relatives.

Survey Instrument Design

The instrument is three pages long divided by sections. The first section contains three demographic questions of age, gender and level of education. These are
independent variables. The second section asks respondents to use a sentence to describe their interpretation of the video. This section is divided in three parts matching the three parts shown in the video. Part one asks the following questions: What did you see? Who is the child? Who is the man? Is there any connection between them? Part two asks the following questions: What did you see? Who is the man? Is there any connection between the shots? Part three asks the following: What did you see? Who is the man in the coffin? Who is the other man? Is there any connection between them?

The third section asks respondents if they recognize the person in the close up, how many hours of television do they watch in an average week, how many films do they watch in an average week, and how many hours do they spend surfing the Internet in an average week. These questions in section three will indicate participant's involvement and exposure to the media and might be used as control variables. These questions were added after the prospectus meeting. These were not included in the pilot study. Sections two and three will be used as dependent variables. A space for comments is provided for any additional observation.

Interpretation of written answers

The instrument is an open-ended questionnaire that allows respondents to write their own answers. The purpose of the questionnaire is to measure if a new generation of viewers would arrive at the same results that the former Kuleshov Experiment did. They will express their own ideas as they respond to the stimulus. The open-ended questionnaire gives freedom to the participants to write their own responses. However, what they intend to say can be different from the interpretation given by the researcher.
Descriptions of the man in the close up, such as, he looks mean, bored, and others may need further explanation. If the person responds to the first part that the man looks mean but does not respond the same to subsequent parts, the assumption created is that the juxtaposition of the child followed by the man, gave the impression of meanness. Therefore, the respondent is somehow making a connection between the first two shots that is not present in subsequent parts. It is important to see if some parts are more effective than others. The description of the former Kuleshov experiment explains that the audience thought the actor in the close up delivered a different performance in each case. In this quasi-experiment, the same portion of the close up was juxtaposed next to the other shots.

Other questions ask the number of hours watching television, using the Internet, or going to the movies on an average week. The respondent’s recall of these activities may change. An immediate response may not necessarily reflect what the respondent does in an average week. For this purpose, a log created over time would be better. Also, number of hours watching television does not mean hours paying attention to a program. People can watch television while doing other activities, such as eating, or reading. Their level of involvement is not questioned in the Instrument. Assumptions and conclusions are made based on how the media influences viewers. No question will measure the respondent’s involvement in watching television.

Sample

Participants were students in communication studies at the University of Nevada, Las Vegas. Only one participant was not a student but a professor from the same department. Participants were selected on the basis of convenience. Their age range
varied from eighteen to fifty-eight years of age. Generation X is composed of individuals born between the years 1961 to 1981 (Ritchie, 1995). Since this quasi-experiment studies this particular peer group, any respondents older or younger will be included for a comparative analysis. Fifty eight percent of the respondents were females and forty-one percent were males. One hundred and thirty-one survey questionnaires were completed.

**Procedures**

Electronic messages were sent to different professors and graduate assistants in the communication department in order to receive authorization to run surveys in their classes. The following participated:

- November 11, 2000, Dr. J. Kilker’s *Mediated Communication* class with two participants.
- January 23, 2001, Dr. M. Halstuk’s *Journalism* class with ten participants.
- January 23, 2001, Dr. L. Mullen’s *Visual Literacy* class with thirty seven participants.
- January 24, 2001, Dr. G. Larson’s *Video Editing* class with thirteen participants.
- January 25, 2001, Dr. A. Ferri’s *Research Methods* class with twelve participants.
- January 25, 2001, Dr. G. Larson’s *News Production* class with three participants.
- January 31, 2001, Dr. P. Traudt’s *Television Production* class with fourteen participants.
- February 2, 2001, Ms. V. Oliver’s *Speech Communication* class with twenty two participants.
- February 2, 2001, Ms. M. Neat’s *Speech Communication* class with eighteen participants.
In some classes, professors gave a brief introduction and asked students to participate in the survey provided by the graduate student. Students received a brief explanation of the content of the Informed Consent. They were told that their participation was voluntary and anonymous. They were asked to keep a copy of the Informed Consent and sign another that would be returned later. Students received instructions to complete section one with demographics and to wait to see the video. They were told that the experiment consisted of three parts and time would be given to answer each part. It is important to observe that during the experiment, the majority of participants watched the close-up to the end. They might have been looking for more material to clarify the situation. In spite of the long shots\textsuperscript{22}, participants in most cases cooperated and gave answers to each question.

Instrumentation

Data was implemented to use a Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS 10.0 for Windows) on UNLV’s computer laboratories.

The following variables are nominal scales: Class where the instrument was taken; attitude towards completion of survey; description of the close up in part one; description of the boy in part one; description of close up in part two; description of soup in part two; description of close up in part three; description of man in the coffin in part three; and written comments added at the end of the survey. See Table 1 for an illustration of nominal variables and categories used.

\textsuperscript{22} During the application of the instrument, participants would laugh or make comments seconds after they saw the close up. Once they realized that there was no apparent movement or action, their reactions varied expressing a certain discomfort and confusion related to the intention behind the experiment. Many students would look at each other, apparently trying to find out what was happening. However, the majority of their answers indicate that once they had to write an answer, they thought of finding a meaning or an explanation for the experiment.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable Description</th>
<th>SPSS Data Name</th>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Category Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Class where the instrument was taken</td>
<td>CLASSTAK</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Mediated Communication students in Prof. Kilkers class</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Journalism in Prof. Halstuk's class</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Visual Literacy in Prof. Mullen's class</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Video Editing in Prof. Larson's class</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Research Methods in Prof. Ferri's class</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>News Production in Prof. Larson's class</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>TV Production in Prof. Traudt's class</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Speech Communication in Ms. Oliver’s class</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Speech Communication in Ms. Neat’s class</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitude towards completion of survey</td>
<td>ATTITUDE</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>full responses to every question</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>responded with less words</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>for satirical, negative answers,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>added jokes, creative, imaginative answers or stories.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>repetitive in all three parts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>not very interested in responding, few words.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Description of the close up in part one</td>
<td>XMAN</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>man or guy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>negative depictions such as kidnaper, stranger, perverse, pedophile, or mad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>foreigner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>white man or American</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>father</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>caregiver</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>&quot;I don't know&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>other answers (e.g. researcher, teacher, grad student, Jesus, someone's son)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>for those who recognized and mentioned Dan Grimes or could not remember his name but said he was a teacher in communication.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Table continues)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable Description</th>
<th>SPSS Data Name</th>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Category Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Description of the boy in part one</td>
<td>XBOY</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>boy, child, toddler, or kid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>African American or black</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>endangered child or victim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>cute, nice, or innocent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>&quot;I don't know&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>man's son</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>other (including somebody else's child.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Description of close up in part two</td>
<td>YMAN</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>man or guy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>same man in close up shown before</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>hungry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>homeless</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>negative description (e.g. weird, mad, strange)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>&quot;I don't know&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>other (e.g. researcher, someone's son, artist)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Dan Grimes or teacher in communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Description of soup in part two</td>
<td>YSOUP</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>soup</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>milk, wheat, or any other type of food</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>plate with no description of its content</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>&quot;I don't know&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>did not mention the soup</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>other descriptions (e.g. paint.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Description of close up in part three</td>
<td>ZMAN</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>man or guy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>same man in close up before</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>same as man in coffin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>brother, family or relative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>friend</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>negative depictions such as killer, murderer, assassin, or creepy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>&quot;I don't know&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Dan Grimes or teacher in communication</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Table continues)
The following were coded as dummy variables (or indicator variables): Gender; if participant found a connection between the two shots in part one; if participant found a connection between the two shots in part two; if participant found a connection between the two shots in part three; found that the three parts of the experiment are connected; created a story; kind of editing found in part one; kind of editing found in part two; kind of editing found in part three; physical description of characters in part one; family relationship described in part one; technical considerations described in part one; noticed colors in description of part one; descriptive of action in part one; racial differences found in part one; man looking at the boy; association of gender: not enough information to make a connection in part one; assigned names to characters (man and/or child in part

---

**Table 1. (continued)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable Description</th>
<th>SPSS DataName</th>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Category Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Description of man in the coffin in part three</td>
<td>ZCOFFIN</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>dead man</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>man resting, he is not dead</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>same man as the close up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>family, relative, friend of the man in the close up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>do not know, cannot tell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>other.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Written comments added at the end of the survey</td>
<td>COMMENTS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>weird</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>no comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>questioned the connection, could not find connection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>positive comments (interesting, good luck)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>question marks, added questions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>negative, offensive remarks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>other (e.g. survey or study is different.)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
one;) about to eat the soup in part two; observed the food's color; noticed the fork, plate, table in part two; he is looking at the soup in two; technical considerations described in part two; descriptive of action in part two; not enough information to make a connection in part two; they look similar (physically) in part three; they are the same person in part three; they are different in part three; one killed the other in part three; they are family in part three; they are friends in part three; descriptive of action in part three; technical considerations described in part three; descriptive of the coffin in part three; association based on gender in part three; not enough information to make a connection in part three; assigned names to any character in part three; and recognized the close-up. See Table 2 for an illustration of variables and categories used.

Table 2: Dummy Variables and Categories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable Description</th>
<th>SPSS Data Name</th>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Considerations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>GENDER</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Males</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Females</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If participant found a connection between the shots in part one</td>
<td>XCONNECT</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If participant found a connection in part two</td>
<td>YCONNECT</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table continues
Table 2. (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable Description</th>
<th>SPSS Data Name</th>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Considerations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>If participant found a connection between the two shots in part three</td>
<td>ZCONNECT</td>
<td>0 no</td>
<td>1 yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Found three parts are connected</td>
<td>XYZCONNE</td>
<td>0 no</td>
<td>1 yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Created a story</td>
<td>XYZSTORY</td>
<td>0 no</td>
<td>1 yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kind of editing found in part one</td>
<td>XTYPEEDI</td>
<td>0 no</td>
<td>1 yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kind of editing found in part two</td>
<td>YTYPEEDI</td>
<td>0 no</td>
<td>1 yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kind of editing found in part three</td>
<td>ZTYPEEDI</td>
<td>0 no</td>
<td>1 yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical description of characters in part one</td>
<td>XDESPHYS</td>
<td>0 no</td>
<td>1 yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table continues*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable Description</th>
<th>SPSS Data Name</th>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Considerations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Family relationship described in part one</td>
<td>XDESFAMI</td>
<td>0 no</td>
<td>Includes any answers assuming that the man was the child’s father</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical considerations described in part one</td>
<td>XDESTech</td>
<td>0 no</td>
<td>Includes any answer using film or television related terminology (e.g. close-up, camera angle, lighting descriptions. man staring at the camera. attention to the background, any description of editing, etc.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noticed colors in description of part one</td>
<td>XCOLORS</td>
<td>0 no</td>
<td>Takes into consideration mentioning the man’s t-shirt, or the kid’s toys, background, hair color, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Descriptive of action in part one</td>
<td>XDESACTI</td>
<td>0 no</td>
<td>Takes into consideration if subjects noticed the child’s activity, e.g. playing with toys.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Racial differences found in part one</td>
<td>XDESRACE</td>
<td>0 no</td>
<td>Considers if the respondent noticed the racial differences between the man in the close up and the child</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Man looking at the boy</td>
<td>XLOOKING</td>
<td>0 no</td>
<td>Considers if the respondent assumed that the man was looking at the child. It does not consider if the respondent answered that the man was staring at the camera</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Association of gender</td>
<td>XGENDER</td>
<td>0 no</td>
<td>Respondent answered that the connection was based on gender (the man and the child are males)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assigned names to characters</td>
<td>XNAME</td>
<td>0 no</td>
<td>Respondent assigned a name to identify the man and or child (e.g. man is called “Bob,” child is Bob’s son.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table continues
Table 2. (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable Description</th>
<th>SPSS Data Name</th>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Considerations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not enough information to make a connection in part one</td>
<td>XINFORMA</td>
<td>0 no</td>
<td>Includes answers claiming that the video does not provide enough information to find a connection between the shots</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>About to eat the soup in part two</td>
<td>YEAT</td>
<td>0 no</td>
<td>N.A.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observed the food’s color</td>
<td>YCOLOR</td>
<td>0 no</td>
<td>Included any description of color in part two (some said specifically “a pea soup” which may indicate observing the food’s color)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noticed the fork, plate, table in part two</td>
<td>YPLATE</td>
<td>0 no</td>
<td>N.A.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>He is looking at the soup in two</td>
<td>YLOOKING</td>
<td>0 no</td>
<td>N.A.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical considerations described in part two</td>
<td>YTECHNIC</td>
<td>0 no</td>
<td>Includes any answer using film or television related terminology (e.g. close-up, camera angle, lighting descriptions, man staring at the camera, naming shots, attention to the background, any description of editing, etc.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Descriptive of action in part two</td>
<td>YDESACTI</td>
<td>0 no</td>
<td>Includes any answers describing that the man is about to eat, looking at, or made the soup</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table continues
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Table 2. (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable Description</th>
<th>SPSS Data Name</th>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Considerations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not enough information to make a connection in part two</td>
<td>YINFORMA</td>
<td>0 no 1 yes</td>
<td>Includes answers claiming that the video does not provide enough information to find a connection between the shots</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>They look similar (physically) in part three</td>
<td>ZSIMILAR</td>
<td>0 no 1 yes</td>
<td>N.A.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>They are the same person in part three</td>
<td>ZSAME</td>
<td>0 no 1 yes</td>
<td>Considers the assumption that the man in the coffin and the man in the close-up are the same person</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>They are different in part three</td>
<td>ZDIFFER</td>
<td>0 no 1 yes</td>
<td>Considers either that they look different or are two different men</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One killed the other in part three</td>
<td>ZKILL</td>
<td>0 no 1 yes</td>
<td>Considers responses assuming that the man in the close up killed the man in the coffin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>They are family in part three</td>
<td>ZFAMILY</td>
<td>0 no 1 yes</td>
<td>Includes answers that describe both men as brothers, father-son, or relatives.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>They are friends in part three</td>
<td>ZFRIENDS</td>
<td>0 no 1 yes</td>
<td>N.A.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Descriptive of action in part three</td>
<td>ZDESACTI</td>
<td>0 no 1 yes</td>
<td>Considers any action described such as the man in the close up is observing, has gone to a funeral, is watching a friend or relative, is mourning, etc.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table continues
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable Description</th>
<th>SPSS Data Name</th>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Considerations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Technical considerations described in part three</td>
<td>ZDESTECH</td>
<td>0 no 1 yes</td>
<td>Include any answer using film or television related terminology (e.g. close-up, camera angle, lighting descriptions, man staring at the camera, naming shots, attention to the background, any description of editing, etc.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Descriptive of the coffin</td>
<td>ZDESCOFF</td>
<td>0 no 1 yes</td>
<td>N.A.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Association based on gender in part three</td>
<td>ZGENDER</td>
<td>0 no 1 yes</td>
<td>Both are males</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not enough information to make a connection in part three</td>
<td>ZINFORMA</td>
<td>0 no 1 yes</td>
<td>Includes answers claiming that the video does not provide enough information to find a connection between the shots.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assigned names to any character in part three</td>
<td>ZNAME</td>
<td>0 no 1 yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recognized the close-up (Dan Grimes)</td>
<td>CLOSEUP</td>
<td>0 no 1 yes 9 did not answer (discriminated)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The following variables are ordinal scales: Age; level of education; and changed from x to y to z, which measures if there was a change in the responses, such as, more or less information and descriptions from part one to part three. Table 3 describes these variables and their categories.

Table 3. Ordinal Scale Variables and Categories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable Description</th>
<th>SPSS Data Name</th>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Category Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>AGE</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>18 years old</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>19 – 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>21 – 24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>25 – 28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>29 – 32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>33 – 36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>37 – 39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>40 or older</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>missing data, did not answer (discriminated)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of education</td>
<td>EDUCATIO</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>high school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>college</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>undergraduate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>graduate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>doctorate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>did not answer (discriminated)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changed from x to y to z</td>
<td>XYZCHANG</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>added more information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>consistent in all three parts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>less information or descriptions</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The following are interval variables: Number of words used in description of part one; number of words used in description of part two; number of words used in the description to part three; number of adjectives in part one; number of adjectives in part two; and number of adjectives in part three. Table 4 illustrates these variables and categories.

Table 4: Interval Variables and Categories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable Description</th>
<th>SPSS Data Name</th>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Category Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of words used in description of part one</td>
<td>XNUMBER</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1 – 5 words</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6 – 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11 – 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16 – 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>21 – 25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>26 – 30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>31 – 35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>36 or more words</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>did not answer</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Number of words used in description of part two | YNUMBER      | 1    | 1 – 5 words               |
|                                                 |              | 2    | 6 – 10                    |
|                                                 |              | 3    | 11 – 15                   |
|                                                 |              | 4    | 16 – 20                   |
|                                                 |              | 5    | 21 – 25                   |
|                                                 |              | 6    | 26 – 30                   |
|                                                 |              | 7    | 31 – 35                   |
|                                                 |              | 8    | 36 or more words          |
|                                                 |              | 9    | did not answer            |

Table continues
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable Description</th>
<th>SPSS Data Name</th>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Category Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of words used in the description to part three</td>
<td>ZNUMBER</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1 – 5 words</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6 – 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11 – 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16 – 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>21 – 25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>26 – 30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>31 – 35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>36 or more words</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>did not answer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of adjectives in part one</td>
<td>XADJECTI</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>one adjective or description used</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>two</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>three</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>four</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>five</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>no descriptions or adjectives used</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of adjectives in part two</td>
<td>YADJECTI</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>one adjective or description used</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>two</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>three</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>four</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>five</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>no descriptions or adjectives used</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of adjectives in part three</td>
<td>ZADJECTI</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>one adjective or description used</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>two</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>three</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>four</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>five</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>no descriptions or adjectives used</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The following are ratio variables: How many hours of TV?; how many films? and how many hours of Internet use?

Table 5. Ratio Variables and Categories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable Description</th>
<th>SPSS Data Name</th>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Category Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How many hours of TV watching per week?</td>
<td>TVHOURS</td>
<td>0-40</td>
<td>Coded according to respondent’s indication starting from zero to forty hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>99</td>
<td>Used for less than one hour of TV watching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How many films per week?</td>
<td>FILMS</td>
<td>0-6</td>
<td>Number of films watched from zero to six</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>99</td>
<td>Other responses including those who mentioned watching films on a monthly basis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How many hours of Internet use per week?</td>
<td>INTERNET</td>
<td>0-40</td>
<td>Coded according to respondent’s indication starting from zero to forty hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>99</td>
<td>Others mentioning less than one hour.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The following variables were added based on the available information and to facilitate answering the hypotheses: Scale of connection, a ratio variable that adds the connections found in part one, two and three; creativity (re-categorizes the variable ATTITUDE.) a dummy variable distinguishes responses that are more informational and creative than others; combining shots, a ratio variable used to determine if significance was found in relation to both shots or if the second shot was more influential; Generation

---

[23] In some cases respondents wrote more than one answer (e.g., 2 to 3 hours) the higher number was chosen as the answer. The same applies to number of hours using the Internet, and films watched in a week.
X, re-categorizes AGE of the respondent into a nominal variable; levels of observation, re-categorizes ATTITUDE into an ordinal level variable. (See Table 6.)

The visual observation to the answers led to questioning if students in a particular class (Television Production – Dr. Traudt) had arrived at different results observing more details and finding more connections than other classes, the variable (CLASSTAK) is recoded into separate dummy variables, considering one for each class, these are (KILKER), (HALSTUK), (MULLEN), (LARSONED), (FERRI), (LARSONNE), (OLIVER), and (NEAT). The variable (TRAUDT) is used as a reference and answers the fourth hypothesis questioned in this study.

To measure the influence of the media on negative perceptions of the man in the close up, three new variables were computed, these are NEGATIV1 recoding (XMAN) into positive and negative depictions, NEGATIV2 recoding (YMAN) into positive and negative depictions, NEGATIV3 recoding (ZMAN) into positive and negative depictions; the variable NEGATIVE adds all the negative depictions (NEGATIV1+NEGATIV2+NEGATIV3) into a ratio variable. See Table 6 for detailed information on these variables and categories.

The ratio variable INFORMAT is a ratio variable that adds the results given on (XINFORMA+YINFORMA+ZINFORMA.) This variable explains if the subjects needed more information to describe a connection between the shots. The dummy variable SAME2 is recoded from (YMAN) to group the responses recognizing that the man in the close up is the same man shown before in part one. The dummy variable SAME3 is recoded from (ZMAN) to group answers recognizing the same man in close up before. Table 6 illustrates these variables and categories.
Table 6. Variables and Categories Added Based on Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable Description</th>
<th>SPSS Data Name</th>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Category Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Scale of connection</td>
<td>CONNECT</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>finding no connection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Adds XCONNECT+ YCONNECT+ ZCONNECT)</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>connecting shots in one part</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>finding a connection between the shots in two parts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>connecting shots in three parts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creativity</td>
<td>CREATIVE</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>less creative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(re-categorizes the variable</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>very creative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATTITUDE)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(combines categories 2, 3, 5, and 6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EDIT</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>no description of the man in the close-up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(adds XEDIT + YEDIT + ZEDIT)</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>mention the man in the close up in one part</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>mention the man in the close up in two parts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>mention the man in the close up in three parts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generation X variable)</td>
<td>GENX</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>19 to 39 years old</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>18, or 40 and more.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Levels of observation</td>
<td>OBSERVAT</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>full responses, creative, imaginative (combines categories 1 and 4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(re-categorizes ATTITUDE)</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>less responsive, less observations (equal to 2 in ATTITUDE)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>into an ordinal level variable)</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>not very interested, negative, repetitive (combines categories 3, 5, and 6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative Answers in Part One (recoding variable XMAN)</td>
<td>NEGATIVE</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Positive depictions (categories 1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 8, and 9 from XMAN)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Negative depictions (category 2 from XMAN)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 6. (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable Description</th>
<th>SPSS Data Name</th>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Category Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Negative Answers in Part two (recoding variable YMAN)</td>
<td>NEGATIV2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Positive depictions (categories 1, 2, 7, and 9 from YMAN)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Negative depictions (categories 4, 5 from YMAN)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative Answers in Part three (recoding variable ZMAN)</td>
<td>NEGATIV3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Positive depictions (categories 1, 2, 4, 5, 8, and 9 from ZMAN)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Negative depictions (category 6 from ZMAN)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative Depictions (Adds NEGATIV1 + NEGATIV2 + NEGATIV3)</td>
<td>NEGATIVE</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>one negative depiction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>two negative depictions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>three negative depictions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall information provided (Adds XINFORMA + YINFORMA + ZINFORMA)</td>
<td>INFORMAT</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Respondent did not mention that more information is needed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Requested more information in one part</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Requested more information in two parts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Requested more information in three parts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identified same man from part two (recoded from YMAN)</td>
<td>SAME2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Did not that the man in the close up is the same who appeared before</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Identified the man in the close up as the same shown before</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identified same man from parts two and/or three (recoded from ZMAN)</td>
<td>SAME3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>No recognition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Recognized the man as the same who appeared in close ups before</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Statistical Analysis Plan

Considering these data, the first hypothesis related to the connections found is explained using frequencies. The second hypothesis, comparing the responses of members of Generation X with other participants either younger or older, is compared using T-test; the dependent variable is the level of connections found and the independent variable is Generation X. Anova is used for the third hypothesis to measure differences related to gender (independent variable) and creativity, scale of connection, and negative depictions (dependent variables.) The fourth hypothesis predicts a change in behavior related to the class where the survey was taken. Dr. Traudt’s class is used as a reference in a multiple regression analysis. The fifth hypothesis predicts if exposure to the media influences viewer’s perception of violence. Multiple regression is used to compare negative descriptions of the man in the close up (dependent variable) with hours watching television, films watched in an average week, and use of the Internet (independent variables.) Also, the overall negative depiction variable is used in Correlations analysis with the three variables measuring media exposure. Hypothesis 6 is tested using multiple regression considering the dependent variables: increase of creativity, scale of connections, and creation of stories, with the independent variables associated with media exposure. Hypothesis 7, describing shots, and Hypothesis 8, explaining the Gestalt effect, are explained using frequencies. Hypothesis 9, testing if the recognition of the man in the close up affects the connections found, is tested using multiple regression and frequencies. Hypothesis 10 recognizing the repetition of the close-up is explained with frequencies.
CHAPTER 4

RESULTS

Overview

Of the 131 surveys taken, 10% of the respondents were eighteen years old, 87%
were Generation X participants, between nineteen and thirty-nine years old, only 3%
were forty years old or older. The mode was found at 3 that represent the ages between
21 to 24 years old. The results indicate that 58% were females and 41% were males. The
statistics show that respondents watch an average of 11.41 hours of television, 2.05 films
in a week, and spend 4.98 hours surfing the Internet. The mode in each case was found at
10 hours of television per week, 2 films in a week, and 2 hours of Internet use.

The most common descriptions to each part were the following:
In part one showing a child and a man, the majority described that the child was involved
in an action or described that the child was playing with toys. Physical descriptions of the
man (e.g. beard, hair or eyes) were also described. Some respondents included technical
considerations, such as, camera angles, identified the use of a close up. Racial differences
were also noticed. Other responses described that the man was looking at the child, the
man and the child are family (usually father and son,) assigned names to the characters in
this part of the video (man and child,) while others explained that the video did not
provide enough information. Graphic 1 illustrates the most common responses.
Figure 1. Common Responses to Part One of the Experiment

In part two showing a bowl of soup and a man, the majority noticed the bowl, fork, and added some descriptions. Participants added some action to explain the shots, e.g. the man is about to eat, is observing the soup, or has finished eating. Technical considerations described camera angle, and use of close ups. Few respondents concluded that the video did not provide enough information, or that the man in the close up is looking at the soup. Graphic 2 illustrates the most common descriptions.

In part three showing a man in a casket and the close up of the man, the majority noticed that the men were different. However, a significant number of participants assumed that the man in the casket and the man in the close up were the same person. Participants included descriptions of action, mostly assuming that the man in the close up was mourning, watching, or visiting a friend or relative. A small number of participants
assumed that one killed the other. Technical considerations were also included. See Graphic 3 for an illustration of common responses.

Figure 2. Common Observations to Part Two of the Experiment

Figure 3. Common Responses to Part Three of the Experiment
The description of shots used in this experiment were: In the first part, the man in the close up is described as “a man” 17.6%, “a kidnapper” (negative depictions) 11.5%, “white man” 9.9%, the “child’s father” 9.2%, “caregiver” 8%, “Dan Grimes” 6.9%. “other” depictions 14.5%. The most common response was “I don’t know” chosen by 29.8% of the respondents. The boy was described as “boy, toddler, child” 34.4%, as “African American or black” 14.5%, as a kid in danger 0.8%, as “cute or innocent” 0.8%, the “man’s son” 5.3%, “other” descriptions 13.7%. The majority answer “I don’t know” corresponding to a 30.5%.

In the second part, the man was described as a “man or guy” 16.8%, followed by 16% “I don’t know,” “other” 12.2%, 6.1% who recognized him as “Dan Grimes,” 4.6% added negative descriptions, 3.1% assumed he was hungry. The most common descriptions were 41.2% who recognized him as the man in the previous close-up. The soup was recognized by the majority 43.5% as “soup.” 26.7% thought it was “milk, wheat or other types of food,” 26% described a “plate” with no description of food. 1.5% did not mention the food. “other” chosen by 1.5%, and “I don’t know” by 0.8%.

In part three the man in the close up was mostly recognized as “same man in the close-up before” by 32.8%, followed by “I don’t know” 22.1%, “brother and relative” 9.2%, “other” 9.2%, “same man in the coffin” 6.9%, “Dan Grimes” 6.1%, “man or guy” 6.1%, “friend” 3.8%, and negative depictions that vary from “killer, murderer, creepy” chosen by 3.8% or the respondents. The majority of participants (44.3%) wrote “I don’t know, cannot tell” to the description of the man in the coffin, followed by 18.3% who wrote “dead man.” 15.3% wrote “other.” 13.7% recognized him as “same man as in the
close up,” 6.9% thought he was “friend or relative” of the man in the close up, 1.5% said the man was “resting, he is not dead.”

Hypothoses

H1: Participants may not find a connection between the shots in the experiment. The results indicate that participants found more associations between the shots in part two and three in comparison to the first part. In part one, 71% of the respondents found no association between the shots. The mean was found at .28 and the standard deviation was .45. In part two, 62% of participants found no association between the shots. The mean was found at .38 with a standard deviation of .49. In part three, 51% found no connection between the shots in this part. The mean was found at .49 with a standard deviation of .50. The scale of connection, which combines the three parts of the experiment, shows that 37% of the respondents found no connection in any parts of the experiment. Twenty seven percent of all respondents found at least one part connected, followed by 21% who found two parts connected (see Table 7.) These results support the main hypothesis of this quasi-experiment: Only 15% of all participants agreed with the main assumption of the Kuleshov experiment and found an association in the three parts of the experiment.

H2: Generation X participants will arrive at different results than older or younger participants in relation to connecting the shots used in the experiment. The computed $t$ value exceeds the acceptable level in the comparison of participants who are members of Generation X and participants either younger or older, and the connections found $t (127)=.09$, $p<.930$ (see Table 8.) Therefore, the hypothesis is rejected.
Table 7: Frequencies for the Connections Found in the Experiment, Combination of Both Shots in the Observations of Each Part of the Experiment, Creation of a Story Linking All Three Parts of the Experiment, Identification of the Man in the Close-Up, Recognizing the Repetition of the Close-Up in Parts Two and Three.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No Connections Found</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>36.6</td>
<td>36.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Associating the Shots)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connection Found in One Part</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>26.7</td>
<td>63.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connection Found in Two Parts</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>21.4</td>
<td>84.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connection Found in Three Parts</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>15.3</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Combination of Shots</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>14.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Described Only One Shot)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both Shots Are Mentioned Only in One Part</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>15.3</td>
<td>29.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both Shots Are Mentioned in Two Parts</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>45.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both Shots Are Mentioned in All Three Parts</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>54.2</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did Not Create a Story Linking All Parts</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>71.0</td>
<td>71.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Created a Story Linking All Parts of the Experiment</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>29.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did Not Recognize the Man in the Close-Up</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>81.5</td>
<td>81.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recognized the Man in the Close-Up</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>18.5</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Same Close Up Shown Before (Part Two)</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>47.3</td>
<td>N.A.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Same Close-Up Shown Before (Part Three)</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>38.9</td>
<td>N.A.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Table 8: T-test Analysis for the Dependent Variable Level of Connections Found and the Independent Variable Generation X

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Sig. (2-tailed)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Scale of Connection</td>
<td>.088</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>.930</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the analysis, the mean differs slightly from 1.15 for Generation X and 1.13 for non-members of this generation (see Table 9.) We can conclude that Generation X and participants older or younger arrive at similar conclusions related to the connections observed in the experiment.

Table 9: Number of Participants, Mean Values, and Standard Deviation for Assorted Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Number of Participants</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Std. Error Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Generation X</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(19 to 39)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Generation X</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(18 or 40 and more)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

H3: Gender will affect the connections found, creativity of the respondents, and the negative perception of the man in the close up.

In the analysis of the interaction between the independent variable (gender) and the dependent variable connections found the computed $f$ ratio was 1.55, with 1 degree of
freedom, and was significant at the .215 level. As the criterion significance level is \( p \leq 0.05 \), the null hypothesis is accepted. There is no difference between gender and connections found by participants.

In the analysis of the interaction between the independent variable (gender) and the dependent variable creativity the computed \( f \) ratio was .08, with 1 degree of freedom, and was significant at the .780 level. As the criterion significance level is \( p \leq 0.05 \), the null hypothesis is accepted. There is no difference between gender and subject's creativity.

In the analysis of the interaction between the independent variable (gender) and the dependent variable negative depiction of the man in the close up the computed \( f \) ratio was .38, with 1 degree of freedom, and was significant at the .539 level. As the criterion significance level is \( p \leq 0.05 \), the null hypothesis is accepted. There is no difference between gender and the negative depictions described. Table 10 summarizes these results.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>( F )</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Scale of Connection</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.554</td>
<td>.215</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creativity</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.078</td>
<td>.780</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative Depiction in Close Up</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.379</td>
<td>.539</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\( p \leq 0.05 \).
H4: Class where the survey was taken will affect the connections found or creativity of the respondents.

The R-squared value indicates that 16.6% of the creation of a story comparing students of different classes can be explained by the control variables. The most significant categories in this analysis are Halstuk, Mullen, Oliver, and Neat. The unstandardized coefficient indicates that Professor Halstuk’s class created fewer stories in comparison to Professor Traudt’s students (b = -.571). This indicates that on average Prof. Halstuk’s students were .571 units less creative of stories than Professor Traudt’s class. Professor Mullen’s class created fewer stories in comparison to Prof. Traudt’s class (b=.247). The same is true for Ms. Neat’s class in which the unstandardized coefficient is -.460 and Ms. Oliver with -.344. Based on these results, support can be found for the hypothesis. Students in other classes created fewer stories to explain the experiment in comparison to Prof. Traudt’s class.

The result of the comparison of the connections found can be explained in 6.1% by the control variables. The unstandardized coefficient indicates that Professor Halstuk’s class found fewer connections among the shots used in the experiment in .914 units in comparison to Professor Traudt’s students (b = -.914). The significance levels of other classes in reference to Prof. Traudt’s class are not significant. Support for the hypothesis is valid in the comparison with Prof. Halstuk’s class.

The results related to creativity of the respondents are determined in 12.1% of the cases comparing students in different classes. The most significant categories in this analysis are Halstuk, Mullen, Oliver, and Neat. The unstandardized coefficient indicates that Professor Halstuk’s class was less creative in comparison to Professor Traudt’s
students \((b=-.008)\). Professor Mullen's class was less creative than Prof. Traudt's class \((b=-.010)\). Ms. Neat's class was on average .038 units less creative, and Ms. Oliver .122 units less creative than Prof. Traudt's students. Based on these results, support can be found for the hypothesis. Dr. Traudt's class had more creative responses in relation to other classes. Table 11 contains the results of multiple regression analysis.

Table 11: Regression Analysis of the Effect of Class Where the Survey Was Taken on the Dependent Variables Created a Story, Scale of Connection, and Creativity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Control Variables:</th>
<th>Created a Story</th>
<th>Scale of Connection</th>
<th>Creativity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>R Square = .166</td>
<td>R Square = .061</td>
<td>R Square = .121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Adj. R² = .112*</td>
<td>Adj. R² = -.001*</td>
<td>Adj. R² = .064*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 (constant) Model</td>
<td>.571</td>
<td>1.714</td>
<td>.929</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KILKER - Mediated Communication</td>
<td>.429</td>
<td>.286</td>
<td>.728 7.143E-02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HALSTUK - Journalism</td>
<td>-.571</td>
<td>-.914</td>
<td>-.529 .008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MULLEN - Visual Literacy</td>
<td>-.247</td>
<td>-.660</td>
<td>-.388 .010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LARSON - Video Editing</td>
<td>-.341</td>
<td>-.791</td>
<td>-.313 .087</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FERRI - Research Methods</td>
<td>-7.14E-02</td>
<td>-.798</td>
<td>-.179 .338</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OLIVER - Speech Communication</td>
<td>-.344</td>
<td>-.714</td>
<td>-.929 .002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEAT - Speech Communication</td>
<td>-.460</td>
<td>-.442</td>
<td>-.338 .038</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LARSON - News Production</td>
<td>-.571</td>
<td>-.492</td>
<td>-.262 .122</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(p<.05\). Note: Reference Category used was TRAUDT - Television Production

* The Adjusted \(R\)-squared values seem to indicate discrepancies in terms of the independent variables that are affecting the results. This difference indicates that other variables may have a greater impact on the dependable variables.
H5: Depictions of violence in the survey are related to exposure to the media.

The results of a multiple regression analysis indicate that 3.6% of the negative depictions have a relation with exposure to the media. This relation is not significant. Results can be found on Table 12.1. The Correlations Analysis (Table 12.2) suggests a slight relation between hours of television and Internet use $r(123)=.29$, $p<.01$, as well as hours of television and films watched on an average week $r(127)=.30$, $p<.01$. There is no significant relation between negative depictions and the use of the media. Support can be found for the null hypothesis.

Table 12.1: Regressions Predicting Influence of the Media on Negative Depictions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Control Variables:</th>
<th>Unstand. Regression Coefficient B</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 (constant) Model</td>
<td>7.773E-02</td>
<td>.341</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hours of TV per week</td>
<td>6.387E-03</td>
<td>.241</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Films Watch in a week</td>
<td>3.501E-02</td>
<td>.199</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internet Use in a Week</td>
<td>-5.48E-03</td>
<td>.497</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$p<.05$.
Table 12.2: Correlations Analysis of Negative Depictions and Media Use

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Hours of TV In a Week</th>
<th>Films Watched</th>
<th>Internet Use Per Week</th>
<th>Negative Depictions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>300**</td>
<td>0.292**</td>
<td>0.142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.106</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>0.300**</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>0.122</td>
<td>0.122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.187</td>
<td>.172</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>2.92**</td>
<td>0.122</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>-0.020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.187</td>
<td>.829</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>0.142</td>
<td>0.122</td>
<td>-0.020</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.106</td>
<td>.172</td>
<td>.829</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>131</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

H6: Hours of media use will affect the results in terms of creativity, story telling, and finding connections. This hypothesis will attempt to determine if media use alone helps the viewer to become more creative.

The results indicate that 1.7% of participant’s ability to create a story can be explained by media use. 2% of the scale of connections found are related to media exposure on an average week. 1.7% of creativity can be attributed to media exposure. None of these
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categories are significant. The hypothesis is rejected. A multiple regression table can be found on Table 13.

Table 13: Regressions Predicting Influence of the Media on Creativity, Scale of Connections, and Creation of Stories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Control Variables</th>
<th>Created a Story</th>
<th>Scale of Connection</th>
<th>Creativity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>R Square = .017</td>
<td>R Square = .021</td>
<td>R Square = .017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Adj. R = -.008*</td>
<td>Adj. R = -.004*</td>
<td>Adj. R = -.009*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>l (constant) Model</td>
<td>.334</td>
<td>1.112</td>
<td>.657</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hours of TV per week</td>
<td>-5.00E-03</td>
<td>5.626E-03</td>
<td>-6.02E-03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Films watched per week</td>
<td>-1.75E-02</td>
<td>-7.13E-02</td>
<td>-1.34E-02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internet Use Weekly</td>
<td>5.404E-03</td>
<td>1.786E-02</td>
<td>6.969E-03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.332</td>
<td>.645</td>
<td>.291</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.497</td>
<td>.245</td>
<td>.637</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.480</td>
<td>.326</td>
<td>.411</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

p<.05.

* The Adjusted R-squared values seem to indicate discrepancies in terms of the independent variables that are affecting the results. This difference indicates that other variables may have a greater impact on the dependable variables.

H7: The first shot will derive more meaning, and will be more noticeable than the second shot (close-up).

It was found that 54% of the subjects described both shots in their descriptions of what they saw. Sixteen percent described both shots in two parts, 15.3% described both shots in only one part, and only 14.5% observed only when shot in their description of what they had seen. The null hypothesis is supported and the hypothesis is rejected (see Table
The majority of the subjects described seeing both shots in most parts of the experiment.

**H8**: This quasi-experiment will be analyzed as a whole. Some participants will relate all the shots and create a continuous story (Gestalt Theory).

It was found that most participants did not relate all the parts used in the experiment to formulate a story. Only 29% attempted to find a connection between all the shots used in comparison with 71% who responded to each part without creating a context influenced by other shots. Table 7 contains frequencies related to the creation of a story using all the parts in the experiment. The hypothesis is rejected.

**H9**: Participants who recognize Dan Grimes in the close-up will not find a connection between the shots (suspension of disbelief.)

The results of the multiple regression analysis indicate that this relation is insignificant. Less than 0.7% of this recognition affects the connections found between the shots (see Table 14). The lack of significance can be attributed to the decrease in the sample. Only 18.5% of all participants recognize the man in the close up. The reduction in the sample may affect the results in the multiple regression analysis. (Results of frequencies found on Table 7.) The hypothesis is rejected.

**H10**: The result of the original Kuleshov Experiment that “the man in the close up reacts differently to each situation” will not be concluded in this experiment. Participants will notice that the experiment repeats the same close up.

In the second part of the experiment, 47.3% of the subjects identified the man in the close up as the same man shown in part one. In the third part of the experiment 38.9% recognized the person in the close up as the same man who appeared before (see table 7.
for frequencies). Given the fact that this was an open-ended survey, the assumption that other subjects may have noticed the repetition can be questioned. This results account only for those who specifically wrote that the man in the close up was the same man who appeared before. No responses suggest that participants noticed a change in the reaction shot. Therefore, support can be found for the hypothesis. Participants noticed the repetition of the close-up.

Table 14: Regression Predicting the Influence of Recognizing the Person in the Close Up on Finding Connections

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Control Variables:</th>
<th>Scale of Connections</th>
<th>Unstand. Regression Coefficient B</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 (constant) Model</td>
<td>R Square = .007</td>
<td>1.198</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recognized Man in Close Up</td>
<td>Adj. R = .000</td>
<td>-.240</td>
<td>.332</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

p≤.05.
CHAPTER 5

CONCLUSIONS

Discussion

The Kuleshov experiment, conducted by Lev Kuleshov in 1919, is one of the earliest theories in viewer’s perception of meaning through editing techniques. With the use of three different shots followed by the same close-up, this experiment concluded that audiences tend to draw conclusions regarding performance and context to explain what they see. According to Prince and Hensley (1992), Kuleshov’s findings “are repeatedly cited and acknowledged by the introductory texts in [film], where they are disseminated to succeeding generations of students” (p. 59). The experiment is usually mentioned to explain the power of the rearrangement of shots to create meaning; therefore, it is not the content of shots, but the order in which these are presented what produces significance in the viewer.

Prince and Henley (1992) explain that the experiment was not properly documented, however, “the [results are] often written about as if factual status has really been documented and is uncontested” (p. 59). This uncontested account of the experiment discusses the effects in terms of audience’s reactions to each part of the experiment, in which the viewer assumed that the actor in the close-up reacted differently to each part of the experiment, not noticing that Kuleshov juxtaposed the same shot. The argument
proposed in this thesis study is that a new generation of viewers exposed to a wider variety of visual messages will differ in their observation to the same experiment not associating the shots in the experiment, and perceiving the repetition of the close-up.

A video recreating the shots of the Kuleshov experiment was used as a stimulus and an instrument with open-ended questions was used to test participant responses. Subjects wrote their own interpretations to the three parts of the experiment. Other questions regarding media exposure and whether or not they could recognize the characters in the video helped to determine possible influences present in their observations and conclusions.

The first and last hypothesis raised in this study are directly associated with the findings of the original Kuleshov experiment. The first hypothesis, that a new generation of viewers would not find a connection between the shots on each part would be maintained. Most participants indicated that there was no connection between the shots used in each part. The body of literature developed for this study explains that viewers of Generation X, born between 1961 and 1981 (Ritchie, 1995), have vast exposure to visual messages. This familiarity with the function of visual messages along with personal experiences makes them aware of the disassociation of the shots in the experiment or so it was hypothesized. Participants compare their exposure to previous messages on television and personal experiences to explain what they see. This comparative analysis of an unfamiliar situation to a previous experience is explained by Schema theory (Ferri.

---

24 As explained in chapter three, the recreation of the experiment follows the description indicated by Levaco (1974): a child playing with a toy, a bowl of steaming soup, and a person in a coffin. These three shots were intercut with an expressionless close-up.

25 The experiment tested communication students who might be familiar with the meaning of words such as "scene" or "sequence." To prevent influencing participant observations and subjecting them into finding a connection between the shots, the instrument divided the experiment into parts.

---
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1995). Participants interpret stories seen on television and films not noticing individual shots. Television programs and film present a combination of shots, or scenes and sequences, that sends messages to the viewer. The Kuleshov experiment is different from these messages because it attempts to deliver a message using only two shots in each part.

The results of the last hypothesis found that participants were aware of the repetition of the close-up used after each part. Messaris (1994) mentioned the Kuleshov experiment as an example in which “context and facial expression” (p. 16) are combined to derive a meaning in the viewer. In his account of the experiment, Messaris (1994) explains, “viewers interpret the same facial expression differently depending on the shot it is juxtaposed with” (p. 16). None of the subjects exposed to this quasi experiment arrived at this conclusion; most viewers were capable of recognizing the use of the same shot. The assertion made by Messaris about the Kuleshov experiment is true in relation to the findings of the original experiment, but the argument raised for this study maintains that viewers of this generation need more information related to context.

The second hypothesis examining the responses between members of Generation X and others (either older or younger) found no significant differences. The assumption made was that this Generation had more exposure to television since childhood and this experience would make them arrive at different conclusions. Generation X grew up watching Sesame Street and MTV has been trained to a faster reception of visual information. According to Turkle (1995) “Media critics have suggested that quick cuts, rapid transitions, changing camera angles, all heighten stimulation through editing, a hyperactive style that is shared by Sesame Street and MTV” (p. 238). She later explains that fast pacing affects the way viewers see reality. “Real-life speed” (Turkle, 1995, p.
is different and slower than virtual reality. Generation X is particularly vulnerable to the construction of messages. The Kuleshov experiment has a slow pacing; most shots in the experiment were ten seconds long on average, which may have been different from the type of messages this generation is used to seeing. However, participants, both older and younger, seem to have the same reaction to the experiment than those who are described as members of Generation X. Generation X and other peer groups may not differ substantially as a result of their similar exposure to visual messages. Similarly, no difference in responses was found in relation to gender. Males and females expressed analogous opinions in terms of negative depictions, connections found, and creativity.

The only hypothesis supported in this study found that students in a Television Production class were more creative, created more stories, and found more connections than other students. This quasi-experiment tested each individual but in a group class situation. Although no other participant would be influencing each other directly, the sole activity of having to write an interpretation collectively may have altered participant’s views. According to Croteau and Hoynes (1997) “Audiences are active in the sense that they interpret media messages socially” (p. 231). Audiences perceive the media differently in isolation than in a group. The recreation of the Kuleshov Experiment is an activity watched in a social context, the same as it was experienced decades ago. Accounts of the original experiment seem to indicate that Kuleshov heard the reaction of the public in general. There are no indications that each member in the audience gave individual responses to what they saw.

26 The variable “creative” measured the length of responses and detailed explanations, differently from the variable “created a story” which measured the elaboration of a story linking all the shots.
The introduction given by Dr. Paul Traudt before the survey was conducted may have influenced the responses of students in his class. Dr. Traudt gave a brief explanation to his students in which he remarked the importance of the experiment for the graduate student conducting the study. Also, he urged his students for their attention and full cooperation. This presentation may have conditioned students in this class to observe more details than other participants tested. It is also considered that because of their understanding of television conventions and filmic practice, these students were motivated to find a logical and more detailed observation to the stimulus.

The fifth hypothesis attempted to measure a relation between exposure to the media and depictions of violence. Gerbner’s cultivation theory argues, “that television frequently presents an unrealistic view of the world, particularly the world of violence and crime” (Jeffres, 1997, p. 87). In his study, Gerbner compared viewers according to their exposure to television programs, dividing viewers into “heavy and light viewers” (Jeffres, 1997, p. 86). Gerbner found a relation between heavy viewing and depictions of violence. He concluded, “that television viewing cultivated this distorted view of a ‘mean and scary world’” (Jeffres, 1997, p. 87). The examination of a relation between depictions of violence and exposure to television, films, and Internet use found no support. The relation found in this quasi-experiment was a relation between the different forms of media use. On average, participants with more use of one medium also tended to use other media more.

Hours of media use did not affect the results in terms of creativity, story telling, and finding connections. Participant’s exposure to the media seemed to have no influence.
on their responses. This may be interpreted as a positive quality. According to Horn (1998) “[television] had moved us into what was now being called a visual culture” (p. 5). Participants were more skeptical than the former audience of the Kuleshov experiment. Subjects’ experiences with the media have made them notice the apparent lack of connection between the shots. Although some participants provided with long, detailed responses to what they saw, most of their responses were descriptive of characteristics, not of content linking the shots.

Horn (1998) also points out the emergence of a new kind of language: “visual language” (p. 5). Computer use has increased this generation’s awareness of visual messages. Participants in this experiment communicate visually either receiving and interpreting or by creating visual messages. Exposure to television and films has educated the public to seek visual information along with aural explanations. Messaris (1994) explains the importance of spoken information and how viewers may have trouble understanding a message that lacks verbal information, he stated, “…a juxtaposition of images from which the viewer is supposed to infer a causal claim or other type of analytical statement – can be problematic even for experienced viewers (people who watch TV regularly) unless it is accompanied by narration or a caption that makes the point verbally” (p. 23). Participants in this quasi-experiment may have needed this additional information; images alone did not provide enough information to make them infer a relation.

The seventh hypothesis assumed that participants would make one shot in the experiment more relevant than the other. The observation of the first shot, which changes in the three parts, and the second shot, which repeats the close-up, was predicted to have
an effect in the viewer. Because of the lack of emotion in the actor's expression, the assumption was that the first shot would derive more meaning and would be more noticeable than the second shot (close-up). However, most participants noticed both shots and described both shots in detail.

Gestalt theory explains the tendency to group together elements into a whole structure (Horn, 1998). The application of this theory in this experiment predicted that participants would group the shots into a continuous story. No support was found for this hypothesis. The average participant did not describe a relation among all the shots in the experiment; very few described a connection relating all the shots. Gestalt theory assumes the grouping of elements that share something in common. Participants may not have seen common links between the shots used.

The ninth hypothesis used in this experiment predicted that those who could recognize a character portrayed in the video would not be willing to suspend their disbelief. Most participants did not recognize the characters in the stimulus. As explained before, the actor in the close-up works in the communication department in the production of television programs. Some respondents explained possible connections in spite of their familiarity with him, which implies they were capable of suspending their disbelief in order to interpret the stimulus.

---

27. Horn explains Gestalt theory in the context of units sharing similarities of shape, size, color, and other characteristics. He explains that viewers have a tendency to perceive images grouping those common characteristics.
Limitations

This study had some limitations and constraints that affected the outcome.

The definition of Generation X, as explained in the body of literature, represents the majority of subjects who participated in this quasi-experiment. This group is a reduced sample of the population that conforms Generation X and does not reflect the opinion of this peer group. Since all participants were students in the communication department, they are frequently exposed to examinations and surveys. This activity alone separates them from other members of Generation X. Students have an advantage over other members of the same peer group because of their constant rational activity. The conclusions described the behavior of a limited part of the population that conforms Generation X. Other members of this peer group (outside from a university campus) may have arrived at different or similar results.

Another important limitation that affected the results was the reduction in the sample size. The hypotheses testing Generation X in comparison to students older or younger, classes where the survey was taken, depictions of violence described in the instrument, descriptions linking all the shots creating a whole story (Gestalt theory), and the recognition of characters in the experiment, had an important reduction in sample size, which may have altered the finding of significance.

Future Research

The findings of this quasi-experiment contradicted the results described in most literature that cites the Kuleshov Effect as an explanation of viewer's perception of edited material. The way viewers react to the narrative created in film might be different now.

28 With the exception of one participant who is a professor in the same discipline.
than it was decades ago when the original experiment was exposed to an audience. Some consideration has to be given to the differences between the audience of 1919 and the current viewers of filmic messages in general. It is important to point out the lack of proper documentation regarding the results of the former experiment.

Future studies may consider the effect of sound incorporated in this experiment. The use of sound serves a function to complement the visual information provided. Since younger generations of viewers have grown receiving a combination of visual and aural messages seen on television and films, it would be interesting to see how music or verbal messages influence the mood and perception of the content of the shots. For example, the first two shots portraying a child playing and the close up of a man, can be accompanied by music in the background attempting to convey different effects in the viewer. Viewers may respond based on how their perception varies when the music changes their mood. In this case, the effect to be studied would not be how music changes the content of the shots presented, but how music changes participant’s perception of these shots.
APPENDIX I

INSTRUMENT, INFORMED CONSENT,
AND HUMAN SUBJECTS APPROVAL
THE KULESHOV EXPERIMENT

Please, answer the following questions:

Age: _______________________

Gender: [ ] Male [ ] Female

Level of education: [ ] High School
[ ] College
[ ] Undergraduate
[ ] Graduate
[ ] Doctorate

In a sentence, describe your interpretation:

PART 1

1. What did you see?

2. Who is the child?

3. Who is the man?

4. Is there any connection between them?
PART 2

1. What did you see?

2. Who is the man?

3. Is there any connection between the two shots?

PART 3

1. What did you see?

2. Who is the man in the coffin?

3. Who is the other man?

4. Is there any connection between them?
Do you recognize the person in the close-up?

Yes    No

How many hours of television do you watch in an average week?

________________________________________________________________________

How many films do you watch in an average week?

________________________________________________________________________

How many hours do you spend surfing the Internet in an average week?

________________________________________________________________________

Comments:

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

Thank you for your participation,
Giselle Touzard.
UNLV, Fall 2000.
INFORMED CONSENT
University of Nevada, Las Vegas

The Kuleshov Experiment

Thank you for your participation in this research study. I am Giselle Touzard, graduate student from the UNLV Department of Communication Studies. You are invited to participate in a survey testing viewer’s reaction to editing.

Procedures:
As a participant of this experiment, you will be asked to watch a video that consists of three parts. Each part is approximately 30 seconds long. After each part, you will be asked to write your response to what you have seen.

Benefits of Participation:
By participating, you will contribute to latest information related to viewer’s response to editing techniques. Considering that the original experiment was conducted in the early 1920s, your response will provide valuable information in the study of contemporary audience behavior.

Risks:
The risks involved in this study are minimal, and due to the nature of the questions you might feel minimal discomfort.

Contact:
If you have any questions about the study, you may contact me, Giselle Touzard at 895-1372. For questions regarding the rights of research participants, you may contact the UNLV office of Sponsored Programs at 895-1357.

Participation:
Your participation in this study is voluntary. You may refuse to participate in the study or any part of the study and you may withdraw at any time. A brief explanation will be given after the completion of the survey, if the professor in charge allows and provides the time. You are encouraged to ask questions related to the study. You will be given a copy of this form.

Confidentiality:
All information gathered in the survey will be kept completely confidential, and stored in a locked file cabinet located in room FDH 161. No reference will be made in written or oral materials, which could link you to this study.

By signing below, I acknowledge my receipt and understanding of this information regarding the study and agree to participate.

______________________________     _________________________
Participant’s Signature            Date

______________________________
Participant’s name (print)

______________________________     _________________________
Researcher’s Signature            Date
DATE: October 2, 2000

TO: Giselle Touzard
Communication
M/S 5007

FROM: Dr. William E. Schulze, Director
Office of Sponsored Programs (x1357)

RE: Status of Human Subject Protocol Entitled:
“The Kuleshov Experiment”

OSP #381s0900-094

This memorandum is official notification that the protocol for the project referenced above has been approved by the Office of Sponsored Programs. The approval is for a period of one year from the date of this notification and work on the project may proceed.

Should the use of human subjects described in this protocol continue beyond a year from the date of this notification, it will be necessary to request an extension.

If you have any questions or require assistance, please contact the Office of Sponsored Programs at 895-1357.

cc: OSP File
APPENDIX II

KUKESHOV EXPERIMENT

RENDERING AND PHOTOS
Figure 4. Kuleshov Experiment Rendering (Menendez, 1994).

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.
Application of the Kuleshov Experiment: Part One

Figure 5: A child playing with toys

Figure 6: A man
Application of the Kuleshov Experiment: Part Two

Figure 7: A plate with soup

Figure 8: A man
Figure 9: A man in a coffin

Figure 10: A man
APPENDIX III

AUTHORIZATION WAIVERS
"Kuleshov Experiment"
Thesis Research

I am participating in a video designed to be part of a thesis done by Giselle Touzard, student in the Graduate Program at University of Nevada, Las Vegas. I understand that I will not be compensated for my participation. Further, I grant Giselle Touzard permission to record my voice and likeness on videotape and I understand that the video will be aired as part of the student’s research study*. I agree that neither Giselle Touzard nor the University of Nevada, Las Vegas are responsible for any actions or events that may occur as a result of, or in association with, the videotaping or airing of this video.

Name __________________________
Telephone ______________________
Date ____________________________

Signature _______________________

*If the participant is a minor, the parent or legal guardian, has agreed to give his/her consent for the child’s participation in the making of this video.

Name of Parent or legal guardian ________________________________

Signature ________________________________
I am participating in a video designed to be part of a thesis done by Giselle Touzard, student in the Graduate Program at University of Nevada, Las Vegas. I understand that I will not be compensated for my participation. Further, I grant Giselle Touzard permission to record my voice and likeness on videotape and I understand that the video will be aired as part of the student’s research study*. I agree that neither Giselle Touzard nor the University of Nevada, Las Vegas are responsible for any actions or events that may occur as a result of, or in association with, the videotaping or airing of this video.

Name

Telephone

Date

Signature

*If the participant is a minor, the parent or legal guardian, has agreed to give his/her consent for the child’s participation in the making of this video.

Name of Parent
or legal guardian

Signature
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"Kuleshov Experiment"
Thesis Research

I am participating in a video designed to be part of a thesis done by Giselle Touzard, student in the Graduate Program at University of Nevada, Las Vegas. I understand that I will not be compensated for my participation. Further, I grant Giselle Touzard permission to record my voice and likeness on videotape and I understand that the video will be aired as part of the student’s research study*. I agree that neither Giselle Touzard nor the University of Nevada, Las Vegas are responsible for any actions or events that may occur as a result of, or in association with, the videotaping or airing of this video.

Name __________________________
Telephone ________________________
Date ________________

Signature ________________________

*If the participant is a minor, the parent or legal guardian, has agreed to give his/her consent for the child’s participation in the making of this video.

Name of Parent or legal guardian __________________________

Signature __________________________
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