A promising article by Susanna Barber in the end is disappointing. In reviewing the empirical literature on news cameras in the courtroom, she looked at 19 studies examining the effects of cameras on judges, jurors, lawyers and witnesses. Alas, the studies don't prove very much. A person tends to report that the cameras didn't affect his conduct very much, but did affect the behaviour of other trial participants. None of the studies investigated establishes whether the outcome was affected by camera coverage. It is disappointing to find no reference in her bibliography later than 1983 and only two of those at that.

The most disappointing article is one by Ted Becker and Richard Scarce on teledemocracy, that is, the use of interactive television systems to distribute information to citizens and to receive feedback from them. There have been a number of tests of the concept in places as diverse as Sweden, Hawaii, Alaska and Washington state. But none of these is presented in enough detail to give us confidence in the authors' enthusiasm for town meetings by TV. For instance, about one Pennsylvania test they enthuse:

The innovative experiment in Reading continues. It is, and remains, proof positive that government-by-TV works for the citizens, for the government, for the media, for the society that cares to embrace it, and for everyone touched by it.

And what evidence are we offered to back this giddy assessment? The whole Reading experiment is dealt with in six paragraphs, one of which is the quote above. Obviously, a reviewer can't judge whether the fault is the authors. Perhaps space limitations imposed by the editors did this article in. But the result is a sales pitch for teledemocracy, not an analysis of the concept and the research illuminating it.

To summarize these volumes, progress there is in the communication sciences. But, the communication sciences are areas of human endeavour. That means progress is a fitful beast, one not easily harnessed to publishing schedules.

Reviewed by: Robert Lake
Mount Saint Vincent University

Current Research in Film: Audiences, Economics, and Law. Volume 3
Austin, Bruce A. (ed.)

The film research in this volume is current in two ways, for not only are these studies all of recent origin, but they also represent the growth of film research in the social science model. Its 13 reports use both quantitative and qualitative research methods rather than the literary or semiotic methods long employed in more common studies of narrative and representation in film content.
The series collects material which would scatter otherwise, and makes it available for use by teachers and students. While five articles have had limited dissemination previously in unpublished form, no earlier sources are indicated for the other eight.

None of the 13 articles deals directly with Canada or Canadian film. However, at least five articles reflect issues which help illuminate the Canadian situation. There are two articles on the effect of television on film in South Africa and South America. While those areas are very different from Canada, they share with Canada the common problem of coping with content and investment from the USA. Closer to the Canadian media situation are two articles dealing with the American film industry's influence upon the industries and audiences in Britain and France.

Paul Swann's article, "Hollywood in Britain: The Postwar Embargo on Exporting Feature Films to Britain," reviews the unsuccessful attempt of the British government to control the unfavorable trade balance in film, and to protect the British film production industry after the Second World War. These two problems persist to the present day in Britain, and are certainly relevant to ongoing problems in Canadian film. At the least, Britain's failure in 1947 and 1948 suggests policy approaches to be avoided in Canada in the years ahead. Edward Benson's article, "Leisure and Monopoly Capital: Concentration and Standardization in Franco-U.S. Trade in Film," traces the relationship between Hollywood and Paris from the 1930s to the 1970s. The recent decades have the greatest relevance to the Canadian situation. Benson finds little evidence to give him hope for reversal in the growing concentration in the French film industry and for the production and distribution of alternative content.

Benson's article is one of three in this volume written from a Marxist perspective, and represents the growing interest in Marxist analysis of film and other media in recent scholarship. The other two are Keyan and Ruth Tomaselli's article on the South African industry, and Thoms Guback's article on "Government Financial Support to the Film Industry in the United States." Guback has the economic background to use Marxist analysis meaningfully, rather than as an alternative critical vocabulary. He describes how the US government publicly supports, through the tax system, the profitability of "private enterprise" film producers and distributors. Investment tax credits under the US Revenue Act thereby protect the capital structure of the industry, and do so on purely economic grounds with no cultural rationalization or concern for art. While Canada may choose its own systems of subsidies, and its own rationales for providing them, it is instructive to observe the economic protection process in the USA. How these supports and indirect subsidies will work themselves out under possible future "free trade" agreements remains to be seen, but they are certainly of immediate as well as long term concern at this time.

There are seven different areas of film research treated in this book, with two or three articles in each area. The seven areas include examinations of (1) audience emotional response to film, (2) television's effect on film industries abroad, (3) cinema-
advertising, (4) government policy, (5) financial constraints on content, (6) non-theatrical film, and (7) case studies in litigation.

Mitchell Shapiro and Thompson Biggers' article on "Emotion-Eliciting Qualities in the Motion Picture Viewing Situation and Audience Evaluations" utilizes research measures previously developed to determine a three-factor theory of emotions. Using measures of pleasure, arousal, and control, their analysis of audience responses to a series of films proved largely consistent with previous media research. In comparing film and television, however, they weigh more heavily on arousal than pleasure in providing emotional satisfaction for the audience. Their work suggests further research on differences between reception of film and television, and also differences among styles, forms, and genres. The authors' discussion of their results is expressed in such guarded terms (e.g. "...the regression procedure suggests that emotional reaction to motion pictures is an important component of the audience reaction to that film") that one might be tempted to dismiss the study as stating the obvious, but it actually does continue to develop significant concepts and methods which other researchers can follow with confidence.

In the other article on emotional response, Austin and Gordon measure 20 attributes on films to better define genres and groups of genres in "Movie Genres: Toward a Conceptualized Model and Standardized Definitions." They first construct their own model or genre relationship, and then compare it with audience responses to a group of films. Their work provides "better understanding of what people mean when they refer to genre labels and how people arrange genres conceptually." It was a fruitful research study, though as is so often the case in social science research, the results must be hedged because of the nature and size of the sample.

The two articles on financial constraints on content both demonstrate with ample statistics that the unique audience-determined nature of film profitability drives Hollywood to caution and repetition rather than to risk and innovation. While the charts may not add much to our previous understanding of the process through other methods, such as interviews with industry personnel, they certainly confirm this aspect of the film business. Despite the dominance of the film industry by the "majors," the fact remains that--unlike the power such dominance gives corporations producing hard goods and essential services--their power cannot compel the audience to attend or pay for a single film.

In the other areas, there is one article on the problems of attempting to introduce advertising in theatrical exhibition. Another article traces the development of the amateur motion picture market before 1923. The final two articles present case studies in litigation. One deals with the libel case resulting from the exhibition of Costa-Gavras' "Missing," a film based on reality. The other discusses the unusual court-restricted exhibition situation for Wiseman's "Titticut Follies." Although to a traditional film critic these topics may seem of less importance than those dealing with
the content of film on the screen, each yields new insights into the nature of the in-
dustrial, legal, and social interactions in the mass medium of film, and of mass media in general. And that, of course, is the purpose of the series.

The articles are a very mixed group, and therefore of varying interest—depending on one’s scholarly and teaching concerns—and of varying quality—depending on one’s sensitivities to the methodological, conceptual, and expressive abilities of the authors. But every reader can find several articles of use to scholars in the social sciences, and their insights can enrich teaching and support continuing scholarship in their areas.
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