CHAPTER	4
TITLE	Video for the Rest of Us? Toward Sustainable Processes for Incorporating Video into Multimedia Composition
AUTHORS	Peter J. Fadde Patricia Sullivan
OVERVIEW	Long the province of professional media producers, video production and publication suddenly seem to be available to virtually anybody. But the promise of video in composition comes with challenges, including how teachers with limited video abilities use video in their composition classes and grow a sustainable process of integrating video into multimedia composition. We offer a process for working with video in multimedia composition: ideate, locate, evaluate, and integrate. The complexity of teaching and creating video can be simplified, we argue, by focusing on one or a few components in a limited production process. To particularize the discussion, we consider new curricular tasks that scaffold video composition by providing a training wheels approach (e.g., Primary Access); a repository approach (e.g., An Adventure of the American Mind); and an imitation approach (e.g., following the formats of activism videos on YouTube). Our goal is to point toward sustainable processes for incorporating the powerful, but still difficult to manage, medium of video into multimedia composition—processes particularly useful to students and teachers with limited video experience.
TAGS	audio, collection, composition, copyright, distribution, ecology, evaluate, Fair Use, ideate, integrate, Internet, locate, multimedia, Patricia Sullivan, Peter Fadde, photo, PrimaryAccess, production, rhetoric*, self-publishing, social networking, software, sustain*, technical, technolog*, video, YouTube
AUTHOR BIOGRAPHIES	Peter J. Fadde is an assistant professor of Instructional Technology and Instructional Design in the College of Education and Human Services at Southern Illinois University. He teaches courses in instructional Internet applications, interactive multimedia, learning theory for instruction, instructional simulations and games, eLearning, and video production. Fadde's research interests center on training of expertise and expert performance, sustainable educational technology approaches, and the re-emergence of video in Web-based corporate communications and training. Fadde is co-coordinator (with Sebastian Loh) of the Collaboratory for Interactive Learning Research at SIU. Patricia Sullivan is a professor of English at Purdue University, where she directs the graduate program in rhetoric and composition and previously directed the program in technical writing. She teaches public rhetoric, research methodology, professional writing theory, computers and writing, and history of rhetoric. Sullivan was instrumental in starting Purdue's Professional Writing major and in crafting specialized areas of doctoral study at Purdue (Public Rhetoric; Rhetoric, Technology, and Digital Writing; Technical and Professional Writing). Sullivan's scholarly interests include gender and digital communication; the interplay of learned and public communication; disciplinary and institutional history/historiography; method, methodology, and notions of an academic field. Sullivan has published *Electronic Literacies in the Workplace* (with Jennie Dautermann, National Council of Teachers of English, 1996); *Opening Spaces: Writing Technologies and Critical Research Practices* (with James Porter, Ablex, 1997); *Professional Writing Online* (with James Porter and Johndan Johnson-Eilola, AB Longman, 2001, 2004, and 2008); and *Labor, Writing Technologies, and the Shaping of Composition in the Academy* (Pamela Takayoshi, Hampton Press, 2007).
COPYRIGHT AND REPRODUCTION	Copyright is held jointly by the Press and the author(s). Ebooks and projects can be displayed or reproduced (with the exception of limited reproduction by indexing and abstracting services) only with prior permission of both parties. Readers may view the projects and download/print a copy of the ebooks found on this site for their personal

Video for the Rest of Us?
Toward Sustainable Processes for Incorporating Video into Multimedia Composition

Peter J. Fadde
Patricia Sullivan

The 2006 purchase of YouTube by Google for 1.8 billion dollars dramatizes the evolving relationship of video and the Internet. After many years of limited Web presence, video rather suddenly has become much more visible on the Internet. Formerly the domain of professional video producers, video now is produced and published by innumerable Internet users. As the reigning king of media, video represents an empowering new media literacy (Selfe, 2007) for writers, students, and teachers. This turn to video offers multimedia composers a double-edged sword, though: On one hand, the most powerful of communications media has become a potentially prominent tool in the multimedia composer's kit due to searchable video repositories, inexpensive video-editing software, video-friendly Web platforms, and better Internet transmission speeds. On the other hand, video resources—when compared to other media such as text and graphics—remain difficult to gather, edit, and ultimately forge into a composition that is technically, aesthetically, and ethically pleasing. The key issue this chapter addresses is how students, practitioners, and teachers can best take advantage of the rhetorical attributes of video, without having to master a full technological and disciplinary skill set. We propose that a tried-and-true video technique, *repurposing*,[1] used in an accessible multimedia platform (Microsoft PowerPoint), helps make video possible in the arena of multimedia composition, and that possibility is the focus of this chapter. We examine repurposing video content for inclusion in multimedia compositions and describe a component approach to composing with video. We suggest building a frame to provide scaffolding for sustainable processes that can be used by instructors or composition programs across software generations.

We situate technology-related sustainable processes as flexible, and also as situated within the larger discussion of sustainability. Since the United Nations' Brundtland Commission on the Environment and Development (1987), sustainability has often been defined as development that, first, meets the basic needs of all and, second, extends to all the opportunity to grow and evolve within a system. The Yale Center on Ecology and the Law (2005) has quantified the connections of people, ecology, technology, and public policy through their ESI metric (Environmental Sustainability Index). Central to this metric is the observation that improvements in ecological sustainability—particularly in the policy area—are more likely to improve when the metric is time-based. The metric both allows for and encourages improvement over time. This temporal move is important to our view: Because we

---

[1] Central to the expanded use of video in multimedia compositions is the notion of repurposing, as it provides shortcuts to quality and at the same time offers the possibility of focusing on the rhetoric of compositional choices. In the field of commercial video, repurposing often means "taking a given property developed in one media form and repackaging it for sale in all the other forms possible" (Klinger, 2006, pp. 8–9) or selecting "segments from various sources to form a new piece of video is called repurposing" (Ahanger & Little, 1999). Public television has practiced this type of repurposing by making broadcast programs available to schools and libraries in videocassette and DVD formats (Nugent, 2005).

deal with software that quickly becomes obsolete, we need to think about specific moves as transitory, and move toward more rhetorical approaches as the bases of our sustainability. We thus identify rhetorical issues (such as consideration of audience) and ethical issues (such as the proper use of copyright-protected material) that inevitably become intertwined with technical issues involved in multimedia composition.

HISTORICAL PERSPECTIVES

Toward Accessible Video Production and Distribution

The 21st century "everyman" approach to digital video popularly displayed in YouTube has been extended into mainstream television through such events as the 2006–2007 contests for consumers to create SuperBowl XLI commercials; the National Football League, Frito Lay, and Chevrolet all used consumer-conceived advertisements (Poniewozik, 2007). One of these amateur-conceived commercials—a Doritos ad depicting the romantic tale of chip-munching pedestrian and driver meeting by accident—was named Best Video Ad of 2007 by *USA Today* (Petrecca, 2007). Those involved in instructional design and corporate communications remember that video production in the 1970s, 1980s, and pre-Internet 1990s was the province of professional video producers. Both internal (e.g., explaining effects of a corporate merger, or training employees in new technology use) and external (e.g., marketing a new product line) video communications were likely to be commissioned, because videos were expensive to produce. To cut expenses, footage or segments were often reused in new programs for different purposes—the footage and segments were repurposed.

Corporate video production did not disappear when video proved to be difficult to disseminate through the Internet or be included in PowerPoint slideshows, but it was used more judiciously. Video remained important to training, and instructional design researchers continued to study how to educate effectively via video. As Stephen Alessi and Stanley Trollip (2001) noted in *Multimedia for Learning*:

> The use of video is attractive to most designers and users. However, unless footage already exists, it is usually expensive to produce. Professionally produced video can cost many thousands of dollars a minute, with the price depending on the complexity of the set, the use of actors, and so on. Because of video's high cost, you must know ahead of time how much you can afford. In addition, you should include the cost of editing and digitizing. (p. 461)

Allessi and Trollip advised producers of instructional multimedia to be sure that "video is appropriate given the program's goals" (p. 424), and offered guidelines for using video in training:

- Use video for important information.

- Use video for demonstrating and modeling.

- Keep video segments short.

- Consider the expense of video production.

The use of video in multimedia programs has changed somewhat since the 2001 publication of *Multimedia for Learning*, but much of its advice holds true. Alessi and Trollip's recommendations were primarily based on economic constraints, but even as video becomes easier and less expensive to use, multimedia writers should still heed Alessi and Trollip's

advice. (We might recall the early days of desktop publishing and Web site design, when non-professionals gained access to production tools formerly limited to professionals, which often led to overuse of aesthetically and rhetorically counterproductive "eye candy.")

Today, because video production and distribution capabilities are increasingly available to non-professionals, the role of the aesthetic gatekeeper is challenged. Alessi and Trollip (2001) warned, "because of our exposure to television and the cinema, we are accustomed to high-quality video. Anything else we tag as home-video quality with a somewhat pejorative connotation" (p. 538). Although this has historically been the case, we think among some audiences, particularly younger audiences, the "home-video quality" often carries rhetorical weight related to authenticity. In a trickle-up effect, this sense of production quality is also beginning to shift, even at venues of high-level production; network television executives are trolling YouTube to come up with a new generation of video producers capable of communicating with a new generation of media consumers (Clark, 2007). In communications, writing, teaching, and training contexts, the sharp multimedia composer can take advantage of a YouTube aesthetic by producing low-cost videos that are not only adequate but sometimes optimal for relating to a young audience. This acceptance, even elevation, of the amateur aesthetic has made it possible for even the inexperienced student to produce effective multimedia compositions using video—if the composition is rhetorically right (i.e., credible and meaningful to the target audience). The real breakthrough, however, has not been technological, but rather rhetorical. Low-cost tools and accessible means of distribution have shifted at least a portion of the video production model away from expensive, professionally produced, technically and aesthetically high-quality video in favor of video that is, above all else, authentic.

Video Composing and Composition Studies

In composition studies, particularly from the perspective of the computers and writing community, video and other mass media formats have a history in our classrooms. *College Composition and Communication* has published articles that focus on the use of popular culture (including and often featuring film, television, and other video) since the early 1950s. In 1952, for example, *College Composition and Communication* published a report of a workshop at the Conference on College Composition and Communication promoting newspapers, periodicals, and motion pictures as material for a communication course, which was followed in 1956 by a workshop on mass media as a subject of study ("Workshop Reports," 1952, 1955). These and other early arguments for the use of popular culture and the media of film and television centered on increasing student engagement in communication classes. By the second workshop, though, a survey of where mass media appeared in classes suggested that mass media was used in composition and rhetoric courses as well as in communication classes. These and other records of the 1950s and 1960s suggest that composition embraced film, television, and video as content for discussion and prompts for writing. These reports further suggest that many instructors used media as a way to engage students with writing.

As Paul Briand suggested in 1970, multi-media use helped students become "turned on." Now, in the 21st century, the technical abilities needed to merge writing with video to build multimedia compositions are more accessible, and many of us have considerable experience with digital writing and its distribution via the Internet. Further, we know that many students publish their multimedia projects online on YouTube, MySpace, and Facebook.

Multiple avenues of self-publishing multimedia compositions in popular and searchable spaces opens a new public to students; they no longer have to write letters to the editor if we want them to publish activist texts. Take, as one example, videos on YouTube about Hurricane Katrina (there were almost 8000 posted by March of 2007). These run the gamut of

responses—personal to professional, amateur-quality to high-quality—and include slideshows, interviews, memoirs, tirades, calls to activism, copies of television news segments, satire, music, and despair. One homemade video posted by Chelsea 13 (http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=8Vg_9EQYZxA; Ross, 2006) addresses relief efforts still needed, and urges viewers to contribute to Amnesty International. It is moving, repurposed, and typical of what a first-year composition student might produce as a multimedia composition. It has the possibility of reaching hundreds, even thousands of viewers, and offers the further possibility of moving them to act.

Although multimedia composition assignments obviously do not need to involve civic engagement, as the Hurricane Katrina video suggests, YouTube constructs a new (and youth-oriented) public available to those writing teachers who view civic education as a key component of their composition instruction. Because mass media has contributed to the public's elusiveness, civic engagement is more complicated and multi-faceted these days; that is, in our contemporary media culture, it is difficult to identify a "public," and it is difficult to speak to that public in a mass media context. Susan Wells (1996) articulated this difficulty: "Rhetoricians and compositionists have turned toward the public, for the best of reasons. But we have some problems locating the public—knowing exactly where we should turn. . . Our encounters with even a local civic space. . . are discontinuous and associated with crises" (p. 325).

Some in composition studies have long suspected that technology is important to locating a public culture for composition: note Edward Corbett's (1967) praise for Marshall McLuhan's insight into the technological culture of the 1960s, calling for *Understanding Media* to be required for teachers of composition. Today, understanding media includes social computing technologies as constructions of important civic forums. Yes, technology has and continues to offer composition studies public forums that require text-based writing—email, discussion lists and other forums, Web pages, blogs—and has amped up the possibilities for linking composition classes and public discussion with the emergence of social networking sites (e.g., Facebook and MySpace). We see video-inclusive multimedia compositions poised to further bring writing into these emerging public forums—social computing that builds community by making and sharing videos. Video publishing on social networking sites, including YouTube, provides students with models of and a target audience for socially engaged multimedia compositions.

The Rhetorical Potential of Video Composing

Given the rhetorical potential of using video in multimedia compositions to reach broader publics than the classroom, how might we proceed, particularly if we are new to using video? With video production and publication capabilities increasingly available, we want to tap into the rhetorical power of video. However, a sustained rather than a merely fashionable use of video in multimedia composition teaching and practice requires that video be used within our accepted pedagogies and curricula. Composition teachers must see the value, the appropriateness, the context, and the feasibility of incorporating video in composition. We hope to have addressed issues of value and appropriateness; we now focus on issues of how to feasibly fit video into the context of composition studies.

One way to incorporate video is to embrace the repurposing of existing media, as we have described. Although the use of copyrighted materials is controversial, multimedia composition in formal school settings is clearly covered by educational Fair Use exemptions (see Appendix 1). Along with repurposing, we suggest that teachers can simplify and shape the use of video by cutting out some parts of the production process. If, for example, the class is interested in creating a montage of images (as many of the Katrina videos do), the teacher might cut out

part of the *location* process by supplying pointers to hundreds of pre-selected video clips and digital still images so that students do not have to spend a large portion of their time collecting materials, but rather focus on choosing and sequencing materials. Teachers can thus shape processes to focus student work on what is needed for quality engagement. The rest of this chapter addresses the question of how to proceed when students are new to writing with video by developing a general—and, we hope, sustainable—process for integrating video into the writing of multimedia compositions: ideate, locate, evaluate, and integrate. We describe three potential responses to incorporating a new approach into a composition classroom:

1) Start by teaching some general concepts inside a confined environment, taking an initial, supported learning approach like the one taken in PrimaryAccess, a Web site that lets young students use historical photos to create mini-documentaries.

2) Build a collection of video, audio, and photo materials that students will choose from to shortcut the process of gathering video and other multimedia materials. If we develop a corpus for a particular assignment, or use a database of materials such as the Library of Congress' Adventure of the American Mind, we can boost the performance of students with little video experience.

3) Help students to analyze and experiment with the approaches of simple but well-crafted videos they may find on Google Video or YouTube.

TOWARD A SUSTAINABLE PROCESS: IDEATE, LOCATE, EVALUATE, INTEGRATE

If teachers are going to edit their current pedagogies to include video-based (or video-enriched) multimedia composition, they need to have confidence that they can keep the focus on the writing dimensions of the multimedia project. There are many permutations in ideating, locating, evaluating, and integrating multimedia—all of which are amplified when dealing with video. The considerations and decisions involved are often technology-based, as we discuss below, but ultimately tap into the traditional concerns of writing, rhetoric, and instructional design: What is the purpose? Who is the intended audience? What are the resources and constraints of the producer? The audience? What moves need to be made to persuade the intended audience? To inform that audience?

A sustainable process for incorporating video into multimedia compositions raises these questions and can be consolidated around the four stages. Although these stages work in very much the same way for all types of repurposed multimedia elements (e.g., graphics, photographs, music), we focus here on video, because video production has become increasingly available to students and other non-professionals, because it draws upon other media, and because it can be particularly challenging to work with. Our emphasis is on simplifying the complexity of video to generate a more sustainable learning environment (Gresham, 1999).

Teachers and students new to video work need to begin by reducing the scope of the production process; we thus recommend a focus on repurposing existing video. Repurposing processes can be organized using a somewhat linear rubric if composers remember that sometimes work starts in different places, and often happens iteratively back and forth across the stages:

- **Ideate:** Students explore ideas for the project and complete a preliminary writing task such as a storyboard or a script.

- **Locate:** Students search for video clips appropriate for the chosen theme and audience.

- **Evaluate:** Students evaluate the video clips they have gathered for their ethical, rhetorical, aesthetic, and technical suitability for their projects.

- **Integrate:** Students insert video into their multimedia composition in rhetorically, ethically, aesthetically, and technically sound ways.

Appendix 2 highlights the challenges that accompany each stage (lest readers think the stages are as simple or as clearly delineated as they sound). Although the goals of each stage are straightforward, both the technical and rhetorical challenges are impressive, and these challenges force the stages to be more iterative than linear. For example, the goal of the first stage (ideation) is to explore issues and develop an executable idea for the project. But some students who know little about "writing" a video may need to spend time locating some typical video formats to imagine a workable structure for their project. Further, in the second stage, the goal is to locate video appropriate for the multimedia composition (evaluation) and capable of being downloaded and manipulated to fit into the multimedia composition format (integration). Conversely, evaluation of video materials depends on availability (location) as well as appropriateness. Considerations of integrating video material depend on what material can be located and deemed appropriate as well as legal to use (see Appendix 1).

As will be described in the assignment examples, teachers can elide or scaffold the multimedia composition process by supplying the labor and judgment involved in one or more of the stages. A teacher could, for instance, also have students focus on locating and evaluating materials, but scaffold the integration process by involving instructional support services in converting found video material to the desired digital file formats. In any case, these four stages of repurposing create a helpful heuristic for the classroom and for project processes.

Ideate

Ideating starts a project and resembles the typical invention activities writing teachers typically deploy, but with a twist. Because some of the argument is carried by yet-to-be-found multimedia elements, not all of the idea is written from the start. This means that students must flexibly imagine both the points they will make and also the shape that will be taken as they craft their multimedia compositions. Because the projects will develop as media is selected, teachers probably will decide that a project proposal or vision document is needed to manage that development. Some may want students to develop storyboards for the project—matching ideas, text, and imagined video/photos in a scene-by-scene fashion (Fadde, 2007). Others may want students to write a preliminary script and identify the types of media they will need to find. Student ability to envision the product rests in their skills at imagining their primary audience's rhetorical needs and their audience's likely technical expectations for a multimedia composition.

If students have trouble working from concept through to composition, ideation may also include deconstructing existing multimedia compositions. Examples of produced multimedia compositions may be drawn from YouTube or from cable television news features, which can be found on official sites such as CNN.com or on repository sites such as Blinkx. Students can discuss the target audience and rhetorical purpose of example pieces and then imagine the process of ideation in which the multimedia composer would have engaged.

Locate

In the past few years, video repositories have become searchable and browsable because the (previously Macromedia, now Adobe) Flash video format supports database organization and video streaming. These video repositories are typically open to the public (although some do allow for password-protected or social-network-oriented viewing) and assert limited responsibility for videos posted by users. For professional and corporate users, there are also commercial video repositories that sell professionally produced video segments to subscribers. Thus, locating usable video objects is much easier and smoother today, compared to even just 5 years ago. In the midst of myriad video objects, rhetorical choices become all the more central to the process of locating video content appropriate to the points students intend to make.

The most visible of the searchable video repositories, especially for students, is YouTube. However, there are other repositories—both free and fee-based—of searchable video on the Internet. As with research in more familiar text-based media, students should search a variety of sources to access a range of material. Further, students searching one repository will not always find appropriate material for their current projects; this limitation, ideally, allows them to question the repositories and to understand that repositories organize content in ways that disclose philosophical stances. Blinkx, for example, is a portal that accesses other repositories for a range of video content. Blinkx also contains a wider range of amateur-to-professional video clips than most, as is seen by searching Blinkx with the term "YouTube": it locates a Reuters produced news feature about Viacom suing YouTube over the posting of copyrighted videos in addition to other YouTube entries such as individuals' video comments on the lawsuit. But Blinkx also reveals what it thinks of the types of video content in its repository: the five groupings of sources (including logos of each video service that fits into each category) are News, Viral & Garage, Entertainment, Information, and Commercials. When you choose to search in "Viral and Garage," you search Web Video, Logs, Selfcast, YouTube, Revver, Google, Break.com, Trouble Homegrown, MySpace.com, and Podcasts.[2] By contrast, YouTube, an open repository to which anyone can post video is "populist" and interested in creating a social community of video uploaders and viewers. Each includes the number of times it has been viewed, the number of ratings, the number of times it was marked a favorite, and the comments viewers have made about it.

Part of location also looks ahead to integration. Many of the repositories have browse and search functions. With the proper techniques and software, video clips can be downloaded from many repositories, but the process is different for Mac and PC computers and often requires a good amount of experimentation or consultation with a knowledgeable technical support person. There are differences between video repositories in the technical quality of videos and also in the ease with which video can be downloaded. For example, Google Video has higher technical quality and easier download capability than YouTube, but has far fewer video clips.

The second way of locating existing video material is ripping the video from sources such as videotape and DVD. Multimedia composers often want to rip content from copyrighted sources. Students also might record television programming to videotape, DVD, or DVR with

---

[2] Like all Web-based resources, the particular sites referred to here are likely to change or even disappear over time. Specific sites are therefore meant to be used as illustrative examples of the different types of video databases that students must learn to research, in the same way that they must learn to differentiate text-based databases, both commercial and non-commercial.

the intent of excerpting portions for inclusion in a multimedia composition. Legality depends on the context of the use and the publication. In an educational context, Fair Use (see Appendix 1) applies when excerpting copyrighted material for purposes of critique or parody. Although Fair Use guidelines are not legally binding, they provide accepted approaches for using copyright-protected work in a student- or teacher-produced multimedia composition used in the classroom. However, if students post school-based multimedia compositions on public venues like YouTube, educational sites like TeacherTube, or semi-public venues like Facebook, then the application of Fair Use guidelines is murky (see Westbrook, 2006). Nor is it clear what institutional responsibility a school or teacher has for a student publicly posting a school project covered by the Educational Fair Use exemption in the classroom setting.

Evaluate

Evaluating video segments involves three types of issues: ethical, technical, and rhetorical. Each found video clip should be evaluated in terms of its legality, its technical aspects, and its fit with the emerging argument planned for a multimedia composition. When students have located a set of potential video materials for their current projects, they then turn to this more exacting stage in the video-composition process.

Legal evaluation is somewhat of a moving target, because the laws keep changing as Internet innovators develop new ways to use and display copyrighted material. We suggest that multimedia composition projects include a discussion of educational Fair Use and the balanced rights of content creators and consumers. Although Fair Use addresses most uses of copyrighted materials in educational contexts, students should not assume that such exempted uses of copyright materials can be carried over to business or personal multimedia compositions. Because the primary goals of multimedia composing are to increase student media literacy and understanding of the rhetorical aspects of media, teachers should not feel restrained by copyright issues in the creation of in-class projects (because of educational Fair Use), but should help students learn why and how to determine the ethical and legal use of copyrighted materials outside of the safe haven of the classroom.

Technically, the evaluation questions concern whether the video can be harvested from its source in a workable format and what the final production quality of the video will be. Rhetorically, if students are creating multimedia compositions intended to persuade fellow students, then video clips downloaded from *YouTube* may be acceptable, even optimal choices. Indeed, the intended youth audience may assign more credibility to a less professionally produced video segment. However, if the audience for the student's multimedia composition is a local school board, then a clip from CNN may well have more credibility. Certainly, these decisions link the technical and the rhetorical.

Guidelines for finding, using, and citing print sources apply to video elements. Students need to decide which source materials to use and how much of the original video source to excerpt from a larger video segment. Evaluation considerations encourage students to push past the first video they locate and to search for reasonable segments for the audience they intend to reach (this may feel familiar, as many of us have experience with students doing research by searching Google, and then using and citing the first few sources on the search results list). Evaluation also asks students to identify inappropriate video clips for their audience (even if they are appealing to the student). This process can nudge students toward assembling a reasonable pool of clips. The rhetorical evaluation also brings up aesthetic issues, because, in our experience, these issues are intertwined for students. We have seen instances of audiences at odds over rhetorical versus aesthetic issues. For example, when a master's student writing a thesis in communication developed a multimedia DVD for the university's softball team, the photography member of his committee wanted the DVD edited to excise

low-quality video (e.g., clips where team members had their backs to the camera). The audience for the DVD (parents and fans of the team) then complained that this important material was not included. Professionally preferred standards and aesthetics can war with audience-preferred content.

Integrate

Integrating video into a multimedia composition involves issues related to locating and evaluating video. One key question that extends the questions posed in the earlier steps is how much of an original video to use in a multimedia composition. This consideration can provide an opportunity for a teacher to discuss appropriate use of source material regardless of the media format. Both Fair Use suggestions and principles of composition suggest quoting a limited portion of the source material rather than using the material in its entirety. The compositional issues in integrating multimedia elements, including video, focus on creating narrative meaning and rhetorical message by blending various media. Students need to consider the affordances of various media for conveying detailed information and emotional impact. That is, students must decide not only how much video to use, but also what other media modes can best help to compose a persuasive message.

Although media elements—especially video—are easier to locate and integrate into multimedia compositions than in the past, integration can still be a confusing and frustrating process. Teachers may require assistance from technical support staff (official or unofficial) to create a workflow. However, once a process for locating, evaluating, and integrating media is established, it can be applied fairly routinely. The payoff is that students develop skill and confidence in composing with multimedia. They become more knowledgeable as consumers of media and more empowered as producers of media.

MULTIMEDIA COMPOSITION

There are a variety of approaches to creating multimedia compositions that incorporate a range of media elements. One is to use a video-editing program—such as the iMovie (Mac) and Windows Moviemaker (PC) programs, now bundled with most computers—as an authoring tool. Another approach is to mix-and-match—using Microsoft PowerPoint for authoring and converting to video or Adobe Flash format for Internet distribution. As is often the case with technology, we are in a transitional stage. Video-editing programs can be clumsy for generating graphics and text. PowerPoint is clumsy for incorporating video. Flash-based authoring programs such as Adobe Captivate are evolving, and thus sometimes glitchy or otherwise unstable. The choice of multimedia authoring system should be based on the experience and skills of the teacher and the students, existing software and hardware resources, and the nature of the multimedia compositions. Video-editing software is appropriate to use as an authoring tool to create multimedia compositions when a substantial amount of the source material is video and/or the intended distribution is a "hard" video format such as DVD. In other situations, the compositional elements primarily consist of non-video media such as photographs (digital and analog) and graphics to be imported along with text to be added. Distribution will likely be via "soft" video on the Internet rather than to a DVD. Such compositions can often be authored in Microsoft PowerPoint and then saved as a video format for Web distribution.

Video editing and creation is, in many cases, the province of a distinct course in multimedia production. The composition teacher is challenged with teaching practices of incorporating video without overwhelming the teaching of composition. We highlight the PowerPoint-based approach here because it can be added to existing units on composing slideshows for

presentation support (Fadde, 2008). Further, PowerPoint is ubiquitous in both academic and professional contexts, and will likely remain in popular use even as a variety of multimedia and Web-authoring applications emerge in the marketplace. As shown on increasingly popular sites such as SlideShare.net, PowerPoint-to-video can be a simple and effective communication format. The Hurricane Katrina Relief (Ross, 2006) multimedia composition by Chelsea 13 uses digital photographs in a slideshow format, which may have originally been produced in PowerPoint. That composition was converted to a video format and uploaded to YouTube, converting the PowerPoint-generated video file into a Web-ready Flash video file (.flv).

The alphabet soup of media file formats can become confusing, but understanding file formats is essential to developing a sustainable process for repurposing media elements found on the Internet or through other sources. As we have noted throughout, video is much easier to manage than before (when it was essentially the province of media professionals), and many students and teachers bring video skills to the composition classroom. But for the rest of us, video can be clumsy and confusing to work with. In some cases, developing a video composition process involves a teacher working with information technology support personnel in a computer lab or other on-campus instructional support space. In other cases, however, a teacher will need to access unofficial support (such as a knowledgeable colleague, student, or community professional) in building a sustainable video process. It's not necessary that teachers become experts on the process, but it is important for teachers to communicate the requirements of a multimedia composition process. Our goal here is to demystify issues involved to video composing. The sustainability challenge here is to be detailed enough for teachers to draw from our suggestions, while avoiding specific software recommendations that become quickly dated. Appendix 3 offers a sketchy but helpful introduction to general technical considerations and file format standards.

MULTIMEDIA COMPOSITION ASSIGNMENTS

We offer three approaches as examples of how teachers might orchestrate multimedia composing assignments that maximize student learning in the context of composition studies. These approaches attempt to increase the feasibility—and therefore sustainability—of video-inclusive multimedia composition assignments by repurposing rather than originating video footage and by focusing on individual components of the ideate-locate-evaluate-integrate process.

Start by teaching some general concepts inside a confined environment and take an approach similar to the one taken in PrimaryAccess. PrimaryAccess is a Web site that strictly controls multimedia composition so that students can learn the concepts at the same time they produce side-by-side images and text, is a means for teachers to focus and facilitate student efforts in multimedia composition. A teacher can create an initial multimedia writing assignment that provides students with a selection of digitized primary sources from the Civil War era and then have students choose a theme (e.g., slavery or military campaigns) to write and illustrate. A second multimedia writing assignment might make students responsible for locating images using the Adventure of the American Mind repository of Library of Congress digitized primary sources. In the initial PrimaryAccess assignment, students are provided text to edit and rearrange to match with the sequence of images selected. In the second assignment, students write their own narration—requiring research beyond the information in the PrimaryAccess or Adventure of the American Mind sites. Assignments such as these display a resource-rich scaffolding approach and are particularly useful in classes that build student multimedia sophistication, or in settings where there is limited time to devote to the project.

Craft video-production competitions and showcases; build a collection of video, audio, and photo materials that students will use to shortcut the process of gathering video and other multimedia materials. Another approach teachers can take to support and focus student work is through the construction of a local photo and video collection. This might be a "live" collection, to which students and instructors continuously contribute new footage, photos, and even multimedia compositions. A number of assignments might be crafted out of this collection, including products such as YouTube-style videos for entry in a contest, or a multimedia composition intended for play on a kiosk.

A competition-styled event where students compete to contribute to a living repository may be particularly attractive for students in majors where they will be expected to frequently craft and present slideshow presentations. Extending these skills to creating a video production using slideshow software is thus a valuable skillset. Assignments that support student contest entries might begin with a viewing and discussion of model videos. Crafting multimedia compositions intended for kiosk viewing is perhaps—unless it is limited to a set of issues, purposes, and occasions—the least constrained of the options and thus the most difficult to ideate, for the composition will only be bound by the student imagination. Again, the rhetorical challenge is to understand and reach a particular audience with a particular message.

Have students copy the approaches of well-crafted public message videos. A third approach is to have students locate multimedia elements (graphics, video, interviews, music) from various sources and create a "public rhetoric" multimedia composition on an important issue intended to affect the awareness, knowledge, and beliefs of a target audience. The teacher might direct students to use the Hurricane Katrina Relief video as their model video. Although the 2-minute movie by Chelsea 13 (Ross, 2006) is moving, it isn't moving because of its production quality; rather, it is moving because of the tragedy it responds to and the sentiment it conjures.

It is the teacher's role to balance the scaffolding and constraining of student creativity in selecting and arranging materials and topics for a multimedia composition assignment. We suggest offering or leading students to find a number of different compositional models and topics, and discussing their structure and rhetorical impact. It is also important, if you are using the assignment to probe public/civic rhetoric, that you stipulate that their multimedia compositions address important public issues. Teachers thus might ask the class to suggest one or two issues they might probe, so that the research needed to produce a quality composition might be shared and managed.

SOME FINAL THOUGHTS

This chapter has attempted to entice more composition teachers to include video in the composition process. In part because of lessening technological constraints and in part because of the reduced gate-keeper role of professional video, the rhetorical power of video is available to more of us than ever before. Video is an important new media literacy worth the effort of establishing sustainable video-inclusive multimedia composition assignments. As we began writing this chapter, we desired to make the use of video in multimedia composition somewhat turnkey—hence our focus on repurposing video (rather than creating it from scratch), our description of structured stages for the processes of incorporating video, and our suggestions of ways to encourage creativity by focusing student video use. Although it does not really surprise us that our approaches fall short of a turnkey solution, we hope to have identified some more general, and therefore more sustainable, approaches. We have discussed some useful strategies for managing video and establishing approaches to support student gathering and repurposing. This sort of strategic approach builds flexible and sustainable processes for teachers to use in engaging students in multimedia composing.

REFERENCES

Ahanger, Gulrukh, & Little, Thomas D. C. (1999). Automatic digital video production concepts. In Borko Furht (Ed.), *Handbook of internet and multimedia systems and applications: Concepts, services and systems* (pp. 399–418). London: CRC Press.

Alessi, Stephen M., & Trollip, Stanley R. (2001). *Multimedia for learning: Methods and development*. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

Baja, Geetesh. (2004). PowerPoint and video—Part 1. *Indezine*. Retrieved February 20, 2007, from http://www.indezine.com/products/PowerPoint/ppvideo.html

Briand, Paul. (1970). Turned on: Multi-media and advanced composition. *College Composition and Communication, 21* (3), 267–269.

Clark, John. (2007, February 11). Web auteur takes the leap from *YouTube* to boob tube. *The New York Times*, p. 36AR.

Corbett, Edward P. J. (1967). What is being revived? CCCC: Retrospect and prospect. *College Composition and Communication, 18* (3), 166–172.

Educational fair use. *Education World*. Retrieved March 11, 2007, from http://www.education-world.com/a_curr/curr280b.shtml

Fadde, Peter J. (2007). Seeing is believing: Video mock-ups to evaluate and demonstrate multimedia design. *Tech Trends*, *51* (4), 32–38*.*

Fadde, Peter J. (2009). Turning PowerPoint presentations into Web multimedia. In James Porter, Patricia Sullivan, & Johndan Johnson-Eilola (Eds.), *Professional writing online* (3rd ed.). New York: Pearson Education.

Gresham, Morgan. (1999). The new frontier: Conquering the World Wide Web by mule. *Computers and Composition*, *16* (3), 395–407.

Klinger, Barbara. (2006). *Beyond the multiplex: Cinema, new technologies, and the home*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Nugent, Gwen C. (2005). Use and delivery of learning objects in K–12: The public television experience. *TechTrends, 49* (4), 61–66.

Petrecca, Laura. (December 31, 2007). From *ad*mirable to *ad*dlebrained. *USA Today*, pp. 1B–2B.

Poniewozik, James. (February 1, 2007). Super Bowl ads: Amateur hour. *Time/CNN*. Retrieved December 28, 2007, from http://www.time.com/time/magazine/article/0,9171,154805-1,00.html

Ross, C. V. (Chelsea13). (2006). Hurricane Katrina relief video. Retrieved February 15, 2007, from at http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=8Vg_9EQYZxA

Selfe, Cynthia L. (Ed.). (2007). *Multimedia composition: Resources for teachers.* Cresskill, NJ: Hampton Press.

United Nations. (1987). The concept of sustainable development. Our common future: Report of the world commission on environment and development. Retrieved June 1, 2007, from http://www.un-documents.net/ocf-02.htm#I

Wells, Susan. (1996). Rogue cops and health care: What do we want from public writing? *College Composition and Communication, 47* (3), 325–341.

Westbrook, Steve. (2006). Visual rhetoric in a culture of fear: Impediments to multimedia production. *College English, 68* (5), 457–480.

Workshop Reports of the 1952 Conference on College Composition and Communication. (1952). Newspapers, periodicals, and motion pictures as material for the communication course: The report of workshop No. 3. *College Composition and Communication, 3* (4), 7–9.

Workshop and Panel Reports of the 1956 Conference on College Composition and Communication. (1956). Mass media as subjects for study. *College Composition and Communication, 7* (3), 135–138.

Yale Center for Environmental Law and Policy. (2005). 2005 environmental sustainability index: Benchmarking national environmental stewardship. Retrieved June 1, 2007, from http://www.yale.edu/esi/

Appendix 1. An overview of educational fair use (adapted from Education World, 2007).

The Fair Use doctrine was created to allow the use of copyrighted works for criticism and commentary, parody, news reporting, research and scholarship, and classroom instruction. There are four factors involved in evaluating Fair Use. Under each factor, a particular use of copyrighted materials is more likely to be considered to be Fair Use if:

1. Purpose and character of the use:
   - Copyrighted works are altered significantly.
   - Copyrighted works are used for nonprofit or educational purposes.

2. Nature of the copyrighted work:
   - Copyrighted works are published.
   - Copyrighted works are out of print.
   - Copyrighted works are factual rather than fictional.

3. Amount and substantiality of the portion used in relation to the work as a whole:
   - A smaller percentage of the copyrighted work is used.
   - A less significant portion of the copyrighted work is used.

4. Effect of the use upon the potential market for or value of the copyrighted work:
   - Copyrighted works are used for another purpose or designed to appeal to a different audience.

Appendix 2. Goals and challenges of the four-stage process.

	Goal of Stage	Technical Challenges	Rhetorical Challenges	Iterative Challenges
Ideate	explore and develop an executable project idea	• create storyboard • find material to aid understanding of issues	• translate ideas into sequenced presentation • identify main audiences • identify points key to audiences • understand video formats to be used	• tendency of students to skip this step (due to desire to jump into technical production) • risk of selecting the first idea suggested (which later may prove to be too narrow)
Locate	find existing video materials for the project	• locate Web and other sources • identify exportable video • consider legal and ethical challenges related to using video	• identify points that need video elaboration or backing • consider legal and ethical challenges related to using video • assess aesthetic issues • evaluate credibility of videos found	• may find little usable material and need to refine planned argument • may find only one side of an issue represented in accessible video
Evaluate	decide which video materials to use and how to use them in the particular project	• consider level of expertise needed to work with materials found • assess how much work is needed to move each clip into the project's platform • select video materials of appropriate file format and resolution	• overcome desire to use first video found • identify video not appropriate to the audience or the message • assess effectiveness of video at making points • assess aesthetic issues • evaluate credibility of videos found	• might discover that project is not possible as conceived (due to video quality differences, aesthetic issues, quantity of material, credibility, etc.) • might realize that not enough material has been gathered
Integrate	insert video into project in both technically and rhetorically	• import materials into editing software; trim and compile clips • export edited video in an	• choose appropriate length and content of video "quotes" • attribute video sources	• may need to move back to evaluation if materials now prove problematic • may need to locate more clips if some

	sound ways	optimal file format for the multimedia composition platform • import video into composition and connect video to other aspects of the project • provide video replay controls (pause/play, fast-forward, volume)	• use video judiciously for impact, illustration, or demonstration.	prove to be inappropriate • may need to assess video in its entirety to identify weak points, or areas that need more development or support

Appendix 3. General technical processes used in repurposing

The options listed below provide a guide rather than a recipe for building a sustainable video repurposing process. Descriptions favor clarity over completeness. For more complete information on video issues there are numerous on-line sources to informally research video file formats and software add-ons (e.g., Baja, 2004).

Download Video Clip from Web site:

1) Drag video "window" from Web site to desktop. If the extension on the file name of the video clip that appears on your desk top is .mov (QuickTime) or .wmv (Windows Media) or .avi, then you have an editable (and PowerPoint linkable) video file. Or,

2) Open the video (double click). Save to desktop as QuickTime (.mov) or Windows Media (.wmv), or .avi format if possible. If you computer does not have these options then save as default format.

3) Save at highest resolution possible.

Download Video Clip from Video Repository:

1) Find and download a video download/conversion tool. Some are available as browser add-ons. Some are stand-alone applications. Many are available for PC, either free or minimal fee (e.g., $49). Only a few are Mac compatible. Download and conversion tools can be separate or combined. Or,

2) Access a download/conversion Web site. Copy-and-paste the URL of the target video clip. Download as .mov, .wmv, or .avi file format.

3) Save at highest resolution possible.

Download Video Clip from Video Sources (DVD, DVR, videotape):

1) Applications are available to rip video from DVDs, but the files are still large, the transfer times are long, and the results are inconsistent. The ripped file must usually be converted into .mov (QuickTime) or .wmv (Windows Media) format to import into PowerPoint or a video-editing program. Or,

2) DVD players, digital video recorders, and VCRs have analog Audio/Visual outputs (yellow for video and red/white for audio). Hardware "transcoders" ($100–200) can be take analog audio/video input and output via Firewire into a computer and video-editing program. This process of "digitizing" has been used for many years to transfer analog video to computers, and is sometimes still the easiest and most controllable way to import video from a DVD.

Import Video Clip to Video-editing Program:

1) Bundled video-editing programs, such as Apple iMovie or Windows MovieMaker, can be used for trimming video clips. Check what formats the video-editing program imports (e.g., QuickTime .mov files for iMovie).

2) If trimming a single clip, load clip into editing timeline and cut excess video. Export video clip back to the computer desktop in the optimal file format and resolution.

3) If compiling multiple clips, edit in timeline and export as single file.

Import Video Clips into PowerPoint:

1) If video clips are .wmv (Windows Media), then Insert > "Movie from File." A window optimized for the resolution of the video clip will open on the PowerPoint slide. The video window can be resized and moved on the PowerPoint slide. The video can be set to play automatically or with mouse click on the video window. Some versions of PowerPoint can embed some .mov (QuickTime) video in the same way.

2) Add video playback controls on the PowerPoint screen (Slide Show > Action Buttons > Movie). It is not possible to "mark" beginning and end points for a video clip—the file will play in its entirety or until the user selects to proceed to the next slide.

3) If the video clip is in a file format that the version of PowerPoint does not import, then place the video clip(s) in a folder with the PowerPoint and make a link to the clip from within PowerPoint. When the link is clicked in the PowerPoint, a new window will open to play the video.

The finished multimedia composition in PowerPoint can then be converted to other formats to improve distribution, especially over the Internet. A variety of software applications (including a number of inexpensive, dedicated applications in addition to full-featured applications such as Adobe Captivate and TechSmith Camtasia) can convert a PowerPoint composition to a Flash video. Benefits of the Flash format are smaller file size, consistent display across browsers and computer platforms (sometimes a problem with PowerPoint), and increased integrity of the multimedia composition (viewers can view it, but not edit it). The PowerPoint can also be saved as a Windows Media or QuickTime video file, both of which are much bigger than a Flash file, but can be uploaded to video repository Web sites—where it will be converted to Flash video.