

# Hey! What About People? A 20 year study to separate engineer from operator.

## 0. INTRODUCTION

As audio professionals we are bombarded with information daily pertaining to one aspect or another of our physical world and the effects it has on our business. This over that equals something else which if multiplied by a fixed number of so and so's would give you X.

The fellowship and information exchange we share as a technical society is impressive. Should world leaders take note and apply such techniques globally, we would have a cleaner and more secure planet.

Being a society of equipment engineers and operators it is safe to assume that we are all fond of machines, of one type or another. How well does a machine operate, sound, look, and interface with other machines are questions which we can answer to the most finite of details, and take pride in doing so.

The one area of machine interface that our society tends to pass over is that of interfacing the machine human to another of like. This most complex of formulas should provide a group of engineers with a relentless challenge.

## 1. SYSTEM ERROR

Our Society groups two different types of people and training, (however similar), into one category, Recording Engineer. The error in this formula has been the demise of many a recording studio, and or record project.

## 2. STUDIO FORMULA

Unit Name	Unit Symbol
recording studio .....	RS
equipment engineer .....	E
equipment operator .....	O
equipment interface .....	I
people interface .....	P

$$\begin{aligned} E/I + O/P &= +RS \\ E/I + P &= -RS \\ O/I + P &= -RS \end{aligned}$$

Time has repeatedly proven this formula correct. We have exchanged information on the E level since the early part of the twentieth century. However we have had little information coming down line from and for the O element.

### 2.1 DETAIL

If O is out of balance with P then no matter how well E over I figure, the project is destined to failure.

If E is out of balance with I, then E is not truly an E and should be removed from RS.

E need not balance well with P as long as there is a common denominator between E and O.

O need not balance well with I. As long as there is some balance of O over I, it will keep E from canceling out O.

The better that E can figure into P, and O into I, the better chance of survivorship for RS.

E and O are unstable figured equally over I & P. With all the engineering data, and recording personalities available, to intermix both elements equally into either E or O creates an extremely volatile situation within either E or O.

### 2.2 EXAMPLE

If you pose the same problem to E/O/RS they will respond with three different, as well as correct, answers.

Problem:	
In a phrase, name the difference between cassette machines 1 & 2.	
Answers:	
E +4 to -10 operating level.	
O 2 head to 3 head.	
RS \$500.00	

## 3 CONCLUSION

O must be able to read a situation in session and work with E to handle it smoothly in order to provide P with end results of a satisfying and professional nature. This in turn gives RS better results from its system, which creates cash flow allowing E, O, and RS to grow and provide even a greater level of service to P.

Is this not our goal?

## 4. ACKNOWLEDGMENT

This study began in 1970. Thanks to Donny & Tony Scliarrota of Quantum Recording in Los Angeles for showing me the P element. To Chips who proves that a balanced intermix is possible, L. G. Cable "Quack" Ph.D for helping me to understand the E element, and to Kevin Boyd of Klubb Key's recording company in Seattle for the ability to balance RS.

Scott Spain