



MULTIMEDIA RESEARCH

33 BROWNS LANE • BELLPORT, NY 11713 • (631) 286-8925

Formative Evaluation of *SciGirls* Pilot Videos



Report for
Twin Cities Public Television

by
Barbara N. Flagg, Director
with assistance of
Alice Bernard
Valerie Knight-Williams

Research Report No. 07-003
March 31, 2007

INTRODUCTION

To guide further development of video programs for Twin Cities Public Television's proposed *SciGirls* series, Multimedia Research surveyed and interviewed small focus groups of sixth grade girls about two pilot video segments of different lengths.

Videos. Each video follows a group of three girls (SciGirls) as they implement a mini-bioblitz in three types of wetlands. The three friends - Valencia, Sarah and Sophie - join their adult mentor, Ariana, on a road trip to identify and count species in wetlands. They canoe in a cypress swamp; they muck around in a salt marsh; and they plow through prickly shrubs and soggy bog in a pocosin forest. Their end goal is to build a web site to help kids understand the importance of protecting all wildlife.

Both pilot videos present similar science information, but the longer video (~18 mins) describes more background about the girls themselves and their relationships with each other as compared with the shorter video (~10 mins). The following lists some scenes that the longer video includes that the shorter video does not:

- a snake theme (one girls' fear of snakes is visited intermittently in the video along with spotting a snake in the cypress swamp);
- girls' actions integrated into the science investigation (having fun figuring out how to canoe in the cypress swamp and falling into mud in the salt marsh; explaining why they care about the environment and what kind of wetland they might be if they were a wetland);
- girls' actions not integrated into the science investigation (playing with makeup in the van; describing each others' strengths; dancing in a bedroom; giving a present of scarves from one girl to the others);
- some science content (viewing a beaver dam and discussing cypress buttress size; identifying sea lettuce, vulture, and dead man's fingers on a boat ride).

Research questions. The research questions addressed for each video explored video appeal, science content, the on-screen girls, and the adult mentor:

- Video appeal
 - Which video do viewers like best and why?
- Science content
 - What did viewers like and not like about the girls science activities?
 - What kind of understanding did viewers have about a bioblitz?
 - How much would viewer like to try their own mini-bioblitz?
- On-screen girls
 - What do viewers like and not like about the girls and their friendship?
 - What is the most interesting thing learned about the girls?
 - How well do viewers come to know the on-screen girls?
 - What else would viewers like to know about the girls?
 - Do viewers identify with the on-screen girls?
 - How important to viewers is learning about the girls?
 - What is the motivation to imitate the girls?

- How much would viewers like to join a SciGirls group?
- Adult mentor
 - What are viewers' reactions to the adult mentor concept?

Procedure. Focus groups met in Sacramento, CA, Miami, FL, and Long Island, NY, in small groups of 3-5 girls. Half of the focus groups viewed first a long video version (~18 mins) and half viewed first a short video version (~10 mins). At no time in the survey or discussion was the length of the videos mentioned by the moderating researcher. A survey and discussion followed each video showing.

Sample. A total of 28 sixth grade girls participated, including 32% minorities. Half of the sample (n=14) viewed the long video first, and half saw the short video first.

VIDEO APPEAL

Which video do viewers like best and why?

After viewing the first video (either long or short), respondents rated the show on five qualities as indicated in Table 1 below. The mean ratings for those who viewed the long video (L) did not differ statistically significantly from ratings of the short video (S). Respondents feel the shows present interesting science with a somewhat interesting story and somewhat interesting on-screen girls. They also thought they learned a good amount.

Table 1. Mean Ratings of Video Qualities for Long (L) and Short (S) Pilots

	1	2	3	4	5
Disliked the video				3.9 L	
				3.9 S	Liked the video
Boring story				3.8 L	
				3.8 S	Interesting story
Boring girls				3.8 L	
				3.8 S	Interesting girls
Boring science				4.4 L	
				4.2 S	Interesting science
Learned nothing				3.8 L	
				4.2 S	Learned a lot

Given the quantitative ratings after seeing one video, there is not much to differentiate the two shows. However, after seeing the second video (either short or long), respondents noted which segment they like best, and 89% voted for the longer segment, whether they saw it first or second.

In response to a written survey question, viewers explained what they thought the main difference is between the two shows:

- Although length was not mentioned by the moderating researcher, 39% of viewers noted the difference in length between the two videos.
- 39% noted that the longer show includes more coverage about the girls. Those who saw the longer segment second were more likely to make this observation; for example,
The shorter one has less about the girls and seems out of proportion because there's so little about the girls and a lot about Ariana.
They talked more about the girls' personal lives in the [longer] first one.
In the second [longer] one, it showed a lot more friendships between the girls and how close they were to each other. It also explained more about their interests which I think was a great improvement.
They had a bond of friendship there, the second [longer] one was way better.
The second segment [longer] was when it described the personalities of the girls a little more.
- 36% pointed out that the longer show was more fun or funnier; e.g.,
They didn't show the girls goofing around a lot of the time [in the shorter show].
Some of the jokes were edited out [in the shorter show].
The first [longer show] was a lot more fun. I would watch SciGirls if the shows were more like the first one.
They cut out all the funny stuff [in the shorter show].
In the [longer show] we saw a funnier side of the SciGirls.
- 32% of viewers mentioned that the longer show gave more information. Those who saw the longer segment first were more likely to make this observation; for example,
In the first [longer] video, they didn't show as much exploration of the wetlands.
The first [longer] has more info.
They made the first [longer] more educational than the second [shorter] one.
I think the first [longer] one was more interesting and it had more info.
The second one [longer] is more in depth in the science (got to learn more).
The second one [longer] shows a little more information about animals.

All but three viewers liked the longer video best and provided in discussion the same range of response categories as in the written answers above:

- The longer show includes more about the girls; e.g.,
[In the shorter show] there is hardly anything about the girls but like in the [longer] one there is a lot more.
I like the [longer] one a lot better because it showed more about their friendships and about them being closer related and also more of what their interests are and what they like.
The first [shorter] one, they seemed like girls who were like me, but they weren't as much as all my friends were like me. And in the second [longer] movie, I've grown to like them more and thought that if I met them I would really become friends with them, because they were just so much like me.
You saw their everyday lives and their joy for the outside world. At first, [in the first shorter video] we didn't know Valencia didn't like snakes, and in the second [longer] one, she opened up.
I liked the second [longer] video best, partially because the first one [shorter] was mostly about the activity and what they were doing and mostly the science. The second [longer] segment talked more about them and showed a little more personality and their ideas about this all. The second [longer] one, you couldn't really tell it was longer, because it put in more information about the girls, and it showed, you know, their relationship towards each other, which is kind of what they needed to show, because if you are watching a show and you see these characters, you need to know more about the character and feel a little more attached to the person or you don't feel it at all. The second [longer] one showed more of their personality and how they were approaching what they were doing.

- The longer show is more fun or funnier; e.g.,
It was funnier and they were messing around a little bit more. The second one [shorter] was a little more educational, and they weren't playing around as much.
In the [shorter] one, they cut out the parts where they were laughing a lot, which makes you want to laugh too. The [longer] one made it boring because they didn't show them fooling around, and the little bit that they did was too short of a time.
I liked [the longer one] because it had more funny parts like when she fell down in the bog.
I liked when they showed more parts of the adventure, because in the [shorter] one they just showed them just rowing the boat, but this [longer] one with the funny part [girls canoeing into trees] would make more people watch it.
I liked the second [longer] one because we saw a funnier side to the adventure of the SciGirls. The girls fell down in the marshes, they got stuck in the swamp. Random things that happened were more fun, better.
- The longer show gave more information; e.g.,
You got to see how they could help the environment, and they explained more about the different animals and plants better and it was more funny. They got to show more of the stuff that they did at the different wetlands.
The first [longer] one gave a lot more information. I like the longer one with more information.
In the second one [shorter], they edited out the important stuff like the information on the plants and animals.

One viewer suggested that the longer video provided a better pace for learning:

If they show you something else, you can think over what you just saw. When they are showing them fooling around, you can think it over. If they keep showing you more and more information, and they do it really quickly, you don't get to really think about it and you kind of forget what they just said.

However, even those who liked the longer video better pointed out that some scenes could be omitted because they were not well integrated into the science adventure:

I don't get why they did the thing with the make-up. I didn't think that was science. That was like too much information. I didn't get it.
The makeup part – it could be included but didn't really go with it.
The dancing part was funny, but I didn't get why they had to do that.
The dancing, it was kind of random.
What was up with the scarves? What did that have to do with the science?
I didn't like the scarf piece.
I would make the longer one just a little bit shorter. I'd take out the scarf piece and the makeup in the car. I'd leave in the falling in the mud.

One viewer in each of three different groups liked the shorter video best:

I liked the second [shorter] one best, because, by grabbing different pieces of the editing, I think they didn't make it longer or shorter. They just started cutting between the scenes and they put different animals they saw. I liked it better.
In the first one [longer], some of the subjects came out of nowhere. The second [shorter] one made more sense. Like when the girl gave the two other girls scarves [in the longer one], that didn't make sense to me.
I liked the first [shorter] one because the second one was longer. I would pull out when they were just like talking, not in the wetlands. It's annoying, like when they're saying how they balance each other out and everything.

SCIENCE CONTENT

What did viewers like and not like about the girls' science activities?

After viewing the first show, viewers wrote about what they liked and did not like about the science activities. Respondents like that the girls traveled into the different wetlands and that they had fun. Viewers also like the investigative process. Some viewers wanted more science information.

What was liked about science activities:

- 46% enjoyed that the girls traveled out into the different habitats; e.g.,
They were able to visit different environments.
That they got to go and see different places.
That they showed them on their trip instead of just telling us about it.
That they got to go to three completely different areas and see the wildlife.
That they go out and learn a lot of stuff rather than just be a couch potato.
- 21% appreciated the fun that the girls had doing the activities. Those who saw the longer show were more likely to give this kind of answer; e.g.,
They had fun (joked around, laughed).
That they were having fun and learning a lot.
They were having fun and learning at the same time.
I liked seeing their reactions to the things they did.
- 21% noted aspects related to the science investigation process. Those who saw the shorter show were more likely to give this kind of answer; e.g.,
I like that they got to go to a museum and calculate their data.
I liked that they took notes and recorded the things they saw.
They talked more about what they did at the end of the show.
- 14% liked that the girls were trying to help the environment. All of these viewers had seen the short video; e.g.,
I liked that they are trying to do something for the environment.
They were helping preserve animals from extinction.
That they like doing things to save the environment.
- 14% liked the hands-on approach; e.g.,
How they looked at different animals' species that were uncommon.
How they got to interact with the animals.
I liked the idea of taking care of animals.

What was not liked about science activities

- 46% liked everything.
- 18% wanted more science information; e.g.,
It wasn't all that detailed about the wildlife.

They were mostly telling us what the animals were, not telling us the specific details about them.
They didn't allow the viewer to see what the bioblitz sheet looked like and how you use it.

- 11% did not like the uncomfortable quality of the activities; e.g.,
They had to pick up the animals.
That they actually get their hands dirty.
I did not like going and touching random plants.
They kept getting hurt.

What kind of understanding did viewers have about a bioblitz?

In each program, a bioblitz is described as when “a large group of people go searching through a location to see how many plants and animal species there are.” Three viewers (11%) were unable to recall what a bioblitz is. Most others wrote acceptable ideas:

- 32% of viewers describe a bioblitz as involving counting; e.g.,
A group of people who look for how many species or just any animals living in a certain habitat.
It is when scientists go to a natural habitat and find out how many species there are.
It is a group or trip that you do to analyze how many different species are in a area.
It is a group of people that use devices to tell almost every single plant and animal, and then later see if what they do can increase or decrease the species.
A group of people that come together to observe an area and see how many animals and plants are in the area.
- 32% describe a bioblitz as involving identification or learning about different plants and animals. Most of these respondents saw the longer program; e.g.,
When you get a group and go into an environment and learn about the different species that live here.
A bioblitz is a group of people who go to a certain habitat and learn about the species that live there.
When a group goes out into a habitat and records what type of wildlife is there.
A kind of investigation where they see what kind of plants and animals are in different places.
- 21% were less explicit about their definition of a bioblitz; e.g.,
It is a group of people that go to different ecosystems to see animals and plants.
When people go research animals.
Exploring an area's wildlife.
A group of people who go and study similar and different areas.

Viewers were also asked what the girls learned from their mini-bioblitz activity. Five girls (18%) were unable to recall what the on-screen girls learned.

- 32% explicitly noted ‘wetlands’ and that the girls learned the differences among wetlands; e.g.,
They learned about the different wetlands and what wildlife is in them and what is happening there.
They learned each wetland was different in their own way.
They learned about how different the wetlands can be.
- 21% emphasized learning that many different species exist in a small environment; e.g.,
There are a lot of different species even in the smallest environment.
There can be many species in one environment.
They learned that there can be many types of wildlife in a small area.

- 18% suggested that different animals live in different places; e.g.,
Where different animals lived and where they can live.
They learned about how many different species of animals there were in the habitats and which animals could live in different habitats.
They learned what animals lived where, how many, and about other plants/animals.
- 11% said the girls learned about animals and plants.

How much would viewers like to try their own mini-bioblitz?

On a five-point scale, viewers rated how interested they are in trying their own mini-bioblitz in their neighborhood. With 5 meaning “very interested,” the mean rating is 3.6 for each show. Respondents are ‘somewhat’ interested in trying their own mini-bioblitz, whether they saw the longer video or the shorter video.

ON-SCREEN GIRLS

What do viewers like and not like about the on-screen girls and their friendship?

After viewing the first show, viewers wrote about what they liked and did not like about the girls and their friendship. Respondents like that the on-screen girls are different but are still friends, that their friendship is strong, that they care about the environment and that their friendship appears normal and fun. Those who saw the shorter video seem less satisfied about the friendship than those who saw the longer video.

What was liked about the girls and their friendship

- 36% of viewers liked that the on-screen girls are different but are still friends; e.g.,
That they all liked different things but they respected that, and when the one girl did not want to hold the snake, they accepted that.
I liked that they were all different and accepted that.
I liked how the 3 girls were different but were still great friends.
Even though they all liked different things, they were still friends.
- 32% appreciated the apparent strength of the girls’ friendship; e.g.,
They are really great friends and they have a great time together.
They cared about each other.
What I liked about their friendship was that they support each other.
All of the girls had a very strong friendship and always worked together. I also liked how the girls could always agree on what to do next.
- 32% liked that the on-screen girls all cared about the environment; e.g.,
They cared a lot about the environment.
They love the environment.
That they want to help a lot in the environment.

- 14% liked that the friendship seemed normal and fun; e.g.,
I liked that they can goof around while doing science and still be regular kids after all.
They acted like normal girls with great passions to learn (you could relate to them) and the friendship they had.
They had a lot in common and they laughed a lot together.

What was not liked about the girls and their friendship

Over half (57%) of viewers liked the presentation of the on-screen girls and their friendship. Those who saw the shorter video appeared less satisfied about the friendship than those who saw the longer video.

Those who saw the longer video said:

- When they were learning about nature they were kind of fooling around.
- I didn't like that they were so serious at some point then laughing the next.
- I did not like that their friendship wasn't very realistic because there was really nothing about how they were with each other outside of science, as in school.

Those who saw the shorter video commented:

- They talked a lot.
- I did not like that they had one person talking the most.
- Even though they could agree, I thought that maybe the girls may be afraid to say what they think and may agree too much. They seemed a little too obsessed with science.
- Maybe they care too much about wildlife.
- I did not like that the girls only thought about wetlands.
- I didn't not like anything but I thought they could have the girls spend more time on different subjects.
- You never really got to see what they usually do together.
- That they weren't like best friends and have a bond there.

What is the most interesting thing learned about the girls?

In another written survey question, respondents described the most interesting thing they had learned about the girls. Viewers learned that the on-screen girls were different but also similar, that they had a certain personality traits or interests, and that they wanted to help the environment.

- 36% learned the girls were different but similar; e.g.,
That they are all different but share an interest in science.
That they were all unique in their own way and still they were the best of friends.
That they all liked different things but still had time for science.
They have other interests besides science.
- 25% mentioned some personality trait or interest of the girls; e.g.,
One was into astronomy.
They were very energetic and that was interesting.
That they liked animals.
- 21% of viewers noted that the girls wanted to help the environment; e.g.,
They had feelings for the environment and helping it.
I thought that how they were so interested on helping the environment.
They actually did something to improve the wildlife.

How well do viewers come to know the on-screen girls?

In post-viewing discussion, the viewers were shown a photo of the three SciGirls and asked to identify them by name. One-third of the girls could match a name to a photo. More importantly, the viewers easily recall the interests and personality traits of each of the on-screen girls.

Those who viewed the longer video recall that Sarah lives on a farm, likes riding horses, has a cat, likes hissing cockroaches, and makes scarves; that Sophie likes astronomy, math and ballet and has a turtle; that Valencia likes basketball and fungi but not snakes. They all love wildlife. The long video viewers remark about Sarah's personality that "Sarah can be really serious and kind or she can be all funny and goofy" and "she's really outgoing." The long video viewers note that the girls "laugh a lot" and "enjoy being together."

Those who viewed the shorter video remarked that Sarah rides a horse, likes kissing hissing cockroaches; that Sophie is a computer whiz and likes astronomy; that Valencia likes basketball and fungus and likes to write a lot of information down. They all like animals and were "eager to explore the environment."

Both groups recalled almost all the verbal information presented in the videos, and those who saw the longer video recalled the extra scenes that are not available in the shorter version. Clearly, the viewers were curious enough about the on-screen girls to remember most details about their interests and personalities.

What else would viewers like to know about the girls?

In the discussion period, the viewers report that they know "some things about the girls but not everything," but some pointed out that the video is too short to present "everything." The written survey asked what else the viewers wanted to know about the SciGirls:

- 32% want to know more about the girls' motivation for their interests in science; e.g.,
How they all became interested in the environment.
Do they like doing the things or did they just do it for money?
What got them interested in astronomy, animals, etc.?
How long have they had an interest in science and how they got interested in science?
- 25% are curious about the girls' other activities; e.g.,
If they ever hung around with each other at the mall or at school.
I would like to know if they do other things besides saving wetlands.
More about their hobbies and everyday life.
- 18%, mostly viewers of the short video, ask for more about their friendship; e.g.,
How long have they been friends for.
More best friends scenes.
I would like to know more about how they met and what happened with the website.

- 18% of viewers are satisfied with the information in the videos.
- 11% of viewers ask about family; e.g.,
Do they have brothers or sisters?
More about their family.

Do viewers identify with the on-screen girls?

On a five-point scale, viewers rated how similar the girls in the video are to them and their friends. With 5 meaning “very similar,” the mean rating is 3.3 overall, with no significant differences in mean ratings for the two programs. Respondents feel that the on-screen girls are ‘somewhat’ similar to them.

When viewers discussed the SciGirls, they could clearly designate ways in which they identified with the SciGirls in interests, in personality and in relationships. The different viewing groups all report similar observations; e.g.,

I really like ballet and Sophie, she likes ballet, and I also have a turtle, and I remember she had a turtle too. I think I can relate myself most to her because the way that she liked to learn is kind of the same way that I like to learn.

Sarah loves animals and so do I. Valencia is into sports and so am I.

Valencia plays basketball and so do I.

Just like her, I don’t like snakes.

They are all three into science and so am I.

I’d have to say that I love science and the way that they want everyone to learn about science. They want to teach more people about what they know, and I guess it’s like my personality in a way. I like teaching people different things.

I definitely can switch emotions very fast.

Just like them we are all very different but we still hang out together.

I have a group of three friends (they laugh together).

We laugh a lot. We are always laughing. Like last night we were together and we did that.

What I noticed is that we say ‘like’ a lot, but they say ‘like’ too much. One of the girls said it too much.

The viewers felt they were different from the SciGirls mostly in their specific interests. No group suggested that their friendship relationships differed from the SciGirls or that their personalities differed. However, each group questioned the feasibility of their carrying out a project similar to the SciGirls’ investigation; e.g.,

I don’t live on a farm.

I don’t like basketball that much.

I hate cockroaches.

They would pick up the animals and some of them were kind of disgusting to me.

They like touched everything and didn’t know what it was, and I wouldn’t do that. I would be like, what’s that? Can I touch it? They were just like grabbing everything.

I wouldn’t go out on a mini-bioblitz. I wouldn’t like to jump and do it – I’d hold back a little bit. I’d be scared.

I don’t really see doing a project, planning something like that, doing it. Everything is so big and the details of doing something like that.

I can’t see having the ability to do all that. I would like to, but it isn’t that realistic.

I wasn’t really sure they could actually do what they were doing. They just went with like the college person, Ariana or something, and they just went to those like forests and things, and they were

unaccompanied by a ranger or something, and I don't think they would let you go around by yourself in a place like that.
I don't understand how they had all that time to do that stuff. Like if anything like that would happen to me, I wouldn't be able to devote that much time to doing it.
Considering that they're about our age, they seem to have a lot of time on their hands – they can go about and do random things.

How important to viewers is learning about the girls?

The viewers felt that it's important to learn about the girls' personalities and friendship, because it makes the show more interesting and the information more credible, but some viewers suggested that information about the girls be integrated into the science storyline.

I think it is important because the show shouldn't be all about science. They should probably get more about the personalities and stuff.

It's important. You kinda need to know more about them, so you can get to know them more, so you enjoy the show more.

I think it's important because it adds a little bit of something different to the show, because science is great, but sometimes it can get boring, but when they add the personalities with it, it showed that since they were friends, it can be funny and it can be different.

I think it's important to know more about their personalities, because if you don't know who's teaching you the information, then you may not be willing to learn much and you won't be paying attention. I think they need to talk more about how they all got interested in science and more about themselves, so you have more of a relationship to them and you are more able to process the information.

I think it's important that they tell you about themselves because otherwise when they are talking you wouldn't understand why they said that so much.

It's kind of important, not really, but I'd rather learn about the science. We should know about their name, but then we get to learn about them as the show goes on.

I like learning about them as the story. I like finding out things about them as the show goes on, and if it helps make the show make more sense.

What is the motivation to imitate the girls?

All of the groups thought that doing a science investigation with their friends sounds like fun; e.g.,

M: I think it would be good because some of your friends might know more than you, and if you see like a poison oak, and you don't know it's poison oak, but one of your friends do, then you'll know. And it's always good that you're with your friends, so it makes you more active. C: I think it would be a lot of fun to go out. I think I would probably want somebody like Ariana with us, so that they can tell us what we can touch and not. I would probably want to do a wetlands, like where they saw all the fish and crabs to catch stuff, cause I love looking at all the animals. A: I agree with both of them. What M said, because you know some of your friends know more than you do, and it's better to be taught by your friends than somebody else, and they can teach you the information that they know. And like what C said, it's always better to have somebody that knows a lot more than you do and even more than your friends, like Ariana.

Showing the reality of the girl group is important to having viewers identify with the activities:

I liked how they were really realistic and silly. They were like goofing off and also serious about learning more about the environment, and how they were funny when they would fall down and bump into things, because that's how kids are, they are clumsy and they are funny and that's more realistic and you need to make the show more realistic to make kids think about it more. You go; "oh, I can do that too, if they can do that!"

However, the groups voiced their hesitations and limitations as compared to what they saw in the video:

1. They do not know any scientists to help them.
2. They don't have much free time.
3. They don't feel that they have the capacity to carry out a project like the one shown.
4. They feel they don't know enough to do an investigation.
5. They don't like getting dirty or don't like the outdoors much.

How much would viewers like to join a SciGirls group?

On a five-point scale, viewers rated how much they would like to join a SciGirls group in their area. With 5 meaning "very much," the mean rating is 3.3 overall, with no significant differences in mean ratings for the two programs. Respondents are 'somewhat' interested in joining a SciGirls group.

ADULT MENTOR

What are viewers' reactions to the adult mentor concept?

When asked to write what they thought about the SciGirls adult mentor, viewers were quite positive about Ariana, describing her as "helpful" (25%), "nice" (25%), "cool" (14%), "good example/role model/mentor" (14%), and "interesting" (11%). Viewers felt Ariana explained things well (18%). A few respondents (11%) felt that Ariana was "too smart" or "too much of a brainiac."

The groups also discussed after viewing both videos why they liked or did not like having Ariana in the show. All groups agreed that Ariana was necessary in order for the SciGirls to learn and complete the science investigation, but some had reservations about the role Ariana played.

Three groups questioned whether or not the scene that focused on why Ariana became a scientist was necessary or interesting:

S: I thought they gave too much information about her at the end. I didn't think they needed to have all that. I didn't care too much about that. [Moderator: Why do you think they added that?] Well, to show how she became a scientist. But I didn't care so much about that. It was more about her than the girls.

M: Like she said, "My mom used to take me on walks with my brother." So what? E: I don't think it matters that much because she really isn't a main character. M: Yeah, you don't see her that much. E: She's there once, and then another time. S: I'm more interested in them, and how they got interested in this.

SJ: I thought her story was needed to know who she was, not some random lady that just showed up to help them. And I liked her story about how she got started when she was younger, and she saw the oil on the animals. I think that was really needed to know how she started. E: It should be more about the girls, and I think that maybe the story of why she wanted to become what she was, was a little

unneded. They didn't really need to have that in there. But still it was a good influence, like to show people this is what you can be doing when you get older. The part that was needed was why she wanted to do it, the oil spill, and stuff like that, but they didn't need to show how she went to the beach or wherever, when she was little and stuff like that. They need more of the girls' personal lives, rather than hers. B: Since it is SciGirls, mostly about the girls, not what SciGirls become when they get older. It's taking up space.

C: I thought it was better to have Ariana in the story, but that we didn't really need to know about her background, and we could know that she's always wanted to be into wetlands and stuff, but we didn't need to know so much about when she was a kid. You needed her; otherwise it would be like real like they were actually doing it alone, but you didn't really need to know about her family and background and stuff, because it was more about the girls than her. A: We know that she's interested in science, or else she wouldn't be doing what she's doing, and she doesn't have to say, "I was interested from 3rd grade on" we didn't need to know all that about her.

Two groups discussed whether her role should be smaller or somewhat different:

K: The only thing I noticed was that in the [short] video, it seemed like she was too much a part of the show. I thought a show about SciGirls would have more about the girls. The [longer] video was better though as she had a smaller part.

M: I want her in there but I don't. It's too much about her. She was too much of a teacher person. F: Maybe if they just had someone they could reference to. So if they need someone, they can go to her with specific questions, but she doesn't lead them so much. S: Yeah, more of a reference person. E: Yeah, she was too involved in every little thing that they did. F: I think she should be in there, because she needs to explain things but they need to lead her, not have her lead them.