DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 114 901 CS 501 193

AUTHOR Hall, Robert N., Ed.

TITLE [Educating Speech Graduates and Undergraduates for Careers Other Than Teaching.]

INSTITUTION Association for Communication Administration, Falls Church, Va.

PUB DATE Jan 76

NOTE 72p.

JOURNAL CIT Bulletin of the Association of Departments and Administrators in Speech Communication; n15 Entire Issue Jan 76

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.76 HC-$3.32 Plus Postage

DESCRIPTORS *Career Opportunities; *Career Planning; Communication (Thought Transfer); Higher Education; Secondary Education; Speech; Speech Curriculum; *Speech Education; *Speech Instruction

ABSTRACT

The theme of this issue of "The ACA Bulletin" is the education of speech undergraduates and graduates for careers other than teaching. Included in this issue are such articles as "Employment of Speach Communication Graduates: A Review of Problems and Prospects" by Robert Hall; "Employer Images of Speech Communication Majors: A Question of Employability" by Robert Heath; "Managing the Impossible: So, You Want to be a Department Chairperson?" by Gerald Goldhaber; "Making Graduate Training Marketable: The Need for Inproved Teacher-Training in Speech Communication" by James Sayer, Lawerence Chase, and Norbert Mills; "Proposed Standards for High School Forensics Workshops: Functional Service for Student Participants" by James Sayer; "A Beginner's Guide to Funding Research, Creative Works, and Programs" by Bruce Gronbeck and Harriet Douthitt; and "Bringing Dinner Theatre to the College and Community" by Brice Wilkinson. (TS)

Bulletin of the Association of Departments and Administrators in Speech Communication

Issue #15 January, 1976

Notes from the President, *James H. McBath* 1
Three Members Elected to Executive Committee 2
Employment of Speech Communication Graduates: A Review of Problems and Prospects, *Robert N. Hall* 3
Employer Images of Speech Communication Majors: A Question of Employability, *Robert L. Heath* 14
Making Graduate Training Marketable: The Need for Improved Teacher-Training in Speech Communication, *James Sayer, Lawrence Chase,* and *Norbert Mills* 18
A "Communi-Site-Ed" Approach to Basic Speech, *Beatrice M. Romano* 21
Will Speech Communication Survive as a Discipline?, *Ronald L. Applbaum* 24
Managing the Impossible: So, You Want to Be a Department Chairperson?, *Gerald M. Goldhaber* 28
Operationalizing the Role and Function of the Division Chairperson in the Community College, *Mary T. Newman* 31
Proposed Standards for High School Forensics Workshops: Functional Service for Student Participants, *James Edward Sayer* 33
A Beginner's Guide to Funding Research, Creative Works, and Programs, *Bruce E. Gronbeck* and *Harriet Douthitt* 36
The Emergence of the Self-Paced Class: A Recent Innovation at the University of Southern California; "Free Choice," "Informed Choice," No Choice, *Michele McGlade* 45
Affirmative Action in Doctoral Programs: (What Is) The Real Story, *Michele McGlade* 46
Bringing Dinner Theatre to the College and Community, *Brice Wilkinson* 48
About the Authors 50

NOTES FROM THE PRESIDENT
James H. McBath

By all measures, this has been an auspicious year for ACA. Membership continues to grow; we are active and financially sound; our new name reflects more accurately the professional scope of our membership.

ACA's commissions and task forces continue to produce work of importance to the field: (1) The Commission on Departmental Data, directed by William Arnold, is now developing a quantitative profile of the field, indicating its size, practices, and conditions. Career trends and policies were examined and reported this year. (2) The Commission on Departmental Evaluation and Program Development, chaired by Stanford Gwin, has developed guidelines for evaluation of departments and programs at college-level institutions and is ready to nominate consultants for program evaluation. (3) The Task Force on Personnel Evaluation, headed by Dwight Freshley, has produced guidelines for workload equivalencies, departmental chairperson evaluation, and student evaluation of courses. The sub-committee on hiring, contract renewal and tenure will present its program at Houston. (4) The Commission on Status of the Field, headed by Jack Matthews,

is charged with developing a taxonomy of definitions and parameters of the field for use by educational agencies.

The summer seminar in Austin, Texas, "Implications of Current Trends for Speech Communication Planning," directed by David Smith, examined social, economic, and educational trends that influence departmental decision-making. The *BULLETIN*, edited by Robert N. Hall, appeared quarterly with information reports and papers on concerns of communication administrators. The newly-designed *BULLETIN* has become an important resource for the profession; its contents are cited increasingly in articles, books, and bibliographies.

Finally, the Executive Committee developed both copy and a proposal for a new careers brochure. The proposal, submitted to the SCA Administrative Committee at its October meeting, was rejected on the grounds of expense. Since the ACA Executive Committee believes that we cannot afford not to have an appealing careers brochure, we shall continue our efforts to produce one.

My term of office has benefited from a strong executive committee whose members are a fair cross-section of the schools that ACA serves. Several colleagues had special responsibilities. Hal Gulley often was consulted on projects and policies originated during his presidency. Anita Taylor, the vice-president, again has organized programs that excel among the convention's most appealing and useful offerings. Bob Hall, editor and ex-officio member of the committee, continues service of inestimable value to ACA and the profession. To all members of the executive committee I extend my thanks for their contributions to the advancement of our field.

THREE MEMBERS ELECTED TO EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

With a more than sixty percent ballot return, the membership elected three persons to the Executive Committee. Those elected were: William E. Arnold, Acting Dean, College of Fine Arts, Arizona State University, Tempe; Dwight L. Freshley, Chairperson, Department of Speech Communication, University of Georgia, Athens; and Roger E. Nebergall, Chairperson, Department of Speech Communication, University of Illinois, Urbana.

Retiring from the Committee after three years of service to the Association are Halbert E. Gulley, Northern Illinois University, and James H. McBath, University of Southern California. Both Professor Gulley and Professor McBath served as President of the ACA: Professor Gulley in 1974 and Professor McBath in 1975. The wisdom and leadership of both helped bring the ACA to a position of prominence within the profession. Because of their work, the ACA is on a sound footing and is moving ahead in dealing with the professional areas of our field.

The Executive Committee and the Staff Coordinator extend their sincere thanks for the contributions both made during their years of service.

Editor's Note --

When the SCA National Office, and, thus, the ACA Office, was moved from New York City to Northern Virginia, an entirely new support staff was hired. From among the staff, Michele McGlade was chosen to serve as Assistant to the Editor. As the months passed and pressures on the editor mounted, Ms. McGlade took on more and more responsibility. As will be seen in this issue, she prepared materials that were deemed to be of value to administrators. In addition, she reviewed all of the articles correcting grammar, spelling and, in some cases, doing the rewriting necessary to make an article publishable.

Ms. McGlade, a graduate of Bryn Mawr College with an English major, has resigned her position with the SCA to take a job more in keeping with her training. As she leaves, I want to publicly wish her well and to offer her a special thank you for being a real assistant. Her work has been r[illegible] ppreciated; her assistance will be truly missed.

EMPLOYMENT OF SPEECH COMMUNICATION GRADUATES: A REVIEW OF PROBLEMS AND PROSPECTS

Robert N. Hall

Five years ago, the Speech Communication Association Administrative Committee directed the author to publish annually a report that would review the activities of the SCA Placement Service. When the ACA was founded in 1971, the decision was made that the Placement report would be published by this Association. After all, it was reasoned, who should be more concerned about the job market than chairpersons. Knowing full well that that reasoning is not totally sound, the problems being encountered by students looking for employment are so great that it is worthwhile to review the situation again. When the first of these reports appeared three and one-half years ago,[1] the situation was indeed bleak. Since that time, little has changed.

Although in recent years we have seen estimates of the national supply and demand for holders of doctorates, no really significant studies have been made that deal with individual professions. Almost all of the studies have been on a national level. A 1973 Carnegie Commission report concludes that "there is likely to be a large surplus of Ph.D.'s in the 1970's, a surplus that will reach sizeable proportions by 1980, at least in relation to any reasonable projection of demand based on past patterns of employment of Ph.D.'s."[2] Other academic marketplace analysts have made the same prediction, noteworthy among them is Allan M. Cartter, the only person to project the situation that did develop in the late 1960's.[3]

In the decade of the 1960's, the increase in production of doctorates increased by 300%. Thi rate of increase was larger than the increase of bachelor degree awards. This should have been recognized as a bad omen; unfortunately, it was not. It was not until the current decade that academicians actually recognized that student enrollments were stabilizing and, in many cases, decreasing. This fact, along with governmental pressures for strict accountability and student-faculty ratios, should have brought professions to begin a careful analysis of their situations, of the placement of students, of faculty advising; again, it did not. Departments across the full spectrum of academia continued to add and/or expand graduate programs, new degree programs such as a doctor of arts were proposed. No one appeared to be concerned that young people, many with a doctorate, were unable to find employment.

The 1973 Carnegie Commission report indicated very clearly that the demand for new college faculty would soon be less than fifty percent of the projected supply.[4] When we add to that the "hold-over" surplus that is now developing and the number of faculty members forced into the job market by retrenching and abolished programs, we have what has to be a serious situation in academe. The problem is compounded by a recession that continues to make it look unlikely that any of this surplus can be absorbed by business and industry. According to Cartter it would take an annual growth rate of more than nine percent in the private sector of our economy to even begin to absorb the surplus of Ph.D.'s being produced.[5] No one anticipates that type of growth.

Because the federal government and such national education organizations as the ACE have consistently ignored or misunderstood speech communication,[6] it is difficult to see correctly how this profession stands in comparison to the aggregate reports. It is, however, difficult to dispute the national picture of the academic marketplace that continues to emerge from the studies being made. Again, Cartter makes the point most graphically when he writes: "Even if all junior colleges were converted to four-year colleges, every high school graduate went to college, and every new college teacher hired in the future possessed the Ph.D., by 1980 a smaller percentage of doctoral degree recipients would be likely to find academic positions than has been true for the preceding 25 years."[7]

If the job market seems bleak for doctoral students, it appears no brighter for the graduatin senior. In a report published in the <u>New York Times</u>, college placement officers contend that "again in 1976, job offers to graduates in engineering, accounting, business management and agriculture are expected to be plentiful. But seniors in the liberal arts and education face another [illegible]lt period."[8] One director of university placement was quoted as saying, "Compared to 10 [illegible]go, the job market for most seniors still looks rotten, but just now it seems no worse than during 1975."[9]

Because seniors without technical or business specialties faced so many problems in finding employment in recent years, the survey reported in the Times asked the companies covered what the liberal arts student could do to make him/her more employable. Those campanies that responded indicated that these students "take a minor in a business subject and take a course in economics or statistics or computer science along with their general studies."[10] Of equal significance was the point "that the size or type of college that job-hunters attended or the grades they made were of less importance to employers this year than that person's qualities, such as maturity, initiative, enthusiasm and poise."[11] The report also indicates that going on for a master's degree would be of little value, except in those areas where the jobs are already plentiful.

Having painted a gloomy picture of the entire job market, it is time to look at the speech communication arts and sciences in particular.

Taking into account the traditional attitude taken by faculty advisors that the only thing a person can do with a speech major is train people to be teachers, we can only paint an exceptionally gloomy picture for undergraduate majors. With national trends accurately predicting continuing economic problems, the only way this profession can help its undergraduate majors is by a crash program of the re-education of faculty advisors. Advisors who have the courage and sense to send their students to other disciplines for cognate work and who, more importantly, can stop trying to create their own image in the students they advise. Speech communication majors could be qualified for virtually any non-academic, non-technical job provided they are informed that they can do something besides teach and provided they are advised to take their electives and their minor in useful areas. This in no way implies that the humanistic values cherished by this field and all of the other liberal arts are going to be compromised. If the student has been taught properly in the major courses, the values will be there. But what advantage is to be gained by producing majors who are unemployable? What student who has been trained to be "the good man speaking well" but who is unemployable is going to encourage others to major in this field? Of equal importance is the question, how long can this profession endure with a primary objective of self-containment?

A look at Table 1 will provide an illustration of the problem this profession faces. The data, taken from the SCA *Directory of Graduate Programs*,[12] shows that in 1968-69, the first year when the job crisis was recognized by this profession, there were 6,995 students in masters programs. By 1975-76, that figure has almost doubled. Taking into account the increase in departments reporting and the factor of error inherent in the survey, we still can draw the conclusion that one answer being utilized to solve the unemployment problem is to encourage students to go on to graduate school for a masters degree. But the data also shows that the total number of faculty members has been stabilized since 1971; thus, we can assume there is a decreasing opportunity for these graduate students to find employment teaching others to be teachers who in turn can teach others to be teachers.

During the academic year 1966-67, the SCA Placement Service had a total of 1,409 listings which appeared in its monthly "Bulletin.". By the 1971-72 academic year, the number of listings had decreased to 509.[13] Tables 2, 3 and 4 show that the listings dropped to a low of 467 in 1972-73 and have now begun to stabilize in the 500 to 600 range. At the same time, the number of positions requiring a Ph.D. is only a little over half of all positions listed. Of equal importance is the fact that in 1973-74 we graduated 553 Ph.D.'s.--a number that exceeded the total number of positions available. There is no reason to believe that when the 1977-78 edition of the *Graduate Directory* is prepared in November of this year, the same trend will not continue.

We have witnessed the same trend in the regional areas. Table 5 presents further evidence that the academic marketplace, although somewhat fluid, is decreasing. In other words, we have ample evidence that we can no longer find jobs in colleges and universities for all of the graduate students we are training. The information contained in Table 6 indicates that no specialty within the profession is exempt from the over-production problem. The unfortunate fact is that we have no data on the seniors; we can only surmise what is happening on the basis of national trends.

Now, the question is: What is this profession to do? In reviewing the references and the footnote citations in the McBath and Burhans book, *Communication Education for Careers*, many people have written about the need to re-evaluate our existing programs and our faculty advising techniques, but no significant action to do either of these has taken place.[14] It is worthwhile here to quote two pragmatic reasons from the McBath and Burhans book why this profession must change its attitudes:

First, the indifference of departments, individual professors, and faculty advisors to the career implications of their programs has contributed to the fact that for many students the process of planning one's academic experience to maximize its benefits (whether intellectual, spiritual, or occupational) is a chaotic process influenced more by chance than by rational choice. Students decide what courses to take, what fields to major in, and, eventually, what type of career to pursue on the basis of whim or rumor or happenstance rather than through a careful analysis of their own abilities and interests in relation to the demands and challenges of various careers.

The second pragmatic point to be made is a less noble one. If speech communication faculties are not persuaded by the argument that it is part of their professional responsibility to supply students with career information, some may be moved by the argument that it is *necessary* for them to do so. In the late 1950s and 1960s, with record college enrollments and the number of jobs for college graduates almost always exceeding the number of graduates looking for jobs, students and educators alike could placidly assume that when the time came employment would take care of itself.

The 1970s, however, present a different problem. With decreasing overall college enrollments, with diminishing job opportunities for graduates, with budgetary reductions, and with some departments experiencing a decline in the number of majors and other students they serve, increasing attention is being given to the need to actively recruit students. And one of the ways by which departments of speech communication can attract more students is to develop better answers to questions about the career relevance of the courses they teach and the degrees they offer.

These two authors can state that it may not be "noble" to suggest that our survival as a discipline depends somewhat on a commitment to our students, but survival is rarely called ignoble. Nor, for that matter, has the humane concern for mankind been classified as ignoble. There are, of course, those who will insist that speech communication is a social science, not a humanistic study. Well, let us hope that even those who reject the humanistic label will remember that up to ten years ago they were part of a humanistic liberal art. A mere change in philosophical outlook does not or should not change a basic human behavior pattern.

It is no longer a question of should speech communication departments get involved in career education; it is a question of when and how. The literature on "how" is growing daily.[16] In addition, the ACA has sponsored programs at its national convention in 1974 and 1975 on planning for non-academic careers. The SCA has sponsored convention workshops and caucuses on the problem. All of these programs have been reported in issues of this BULLETIN.[17]

So now the real question to employment problems and prospects is "when" will departments come out of the ivory tower to face reality. The academic marketplace is stagnant at best. Graduate faculties and faculties in general can no longer hide behind their research and their unemployed or underemployed students. The reality of the job situation is here, it has been here for at leas five years, and prospects are that it will remain here indefinitely. The main task that needs to be done is the re-education of the entire profession; a re-education that makes it possible to recognize non-academic employment as respectable. The problem of re-education is monumental but not insurmountable. But if we continue to ignore the national cues for change, the literature recommending methods to achieve change, and the data, limited as it may be, from the profession, we will eventually face a serious problem of survival as a discipline.

Perhaps the problem can be summed up by relating a recent discussion. The question being discussed was whether money should be allocated to publish a new careers in speech communication brochure or to expanding a scholarly journal. The argument was settled when one of the participants stated, "I'll be damned angry if one of my articles is rejected because of a lack of pages i[illegible] journal." The allocation went to the journal. Maybe the question of "when" will be a[illegible]d when the profession becomes more important than the individuals in it.

[1] See Robert N. Hall, "Facing Employment Problems," *BULLETIN of the ADASC*, October, 1972, pp. 7-12.

[2] *College Graduates and Jobs: Adjusting to a New Labor Market Situation*, a Report of the Carnegie Commission on Higher Education (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1973), p. 143.

[3] Allan M. Cartter and Robert C. Farrell, "Academic Labor Market Projections and the Draft," *The Economics and Financing of Higher Education in the United States* (Washington, D. C.: Joint Economic Committee, 1969); see also Cartter, "Scientific Manpower for 1970-1985," *Science*, 172 (April 1971); and Dael Wolfle and Charles V. Kidd, "The Future Market for Ph.D.'s," *AAUP Bulletin*, 58 (March 1972).

[4] *College Graduates and Jobs*, p. 147.

[5] Cartter, "Scientific Manpower," p. 15.

[6] Part of the problem has been a result of the taxonomy used in national surveys. Undoubtedly our field has been surveyed, but the figures cannot be extracted with any accuracy. The ACA, in an attempt to solve this taxonomy problem, has appointed a commission to study the problem and then recommend changes to the appropriate federal agencies.

[7] Cartter, *op. cit.*, p. 13.

[8] Seth S. King, "Job Prospects Improving for '76 College Seniors," *The New York Times*, December 14, 1975, p. 60.

[9] *Ibid.*

[10] *Ibid.* This fact should not be a surprise to the speech communication profession. The same type of diversity has been recommended by articles published in the ACA *BULLETIN*. See, for example, Raymond W. Buchanan and K. Phillip Taylor, "The Marketability of the Speech Communication Major," *BULLETIN of the ACA*, October, 1975; and Robert W. Heath, "Employer Images of Speech Communication Majors: A Question of Employability," *BULLETIN of the ACA*, January, 1976.

[11] King, "Job Prospects Improving for '76 College Seniors," p. 60.

[12] Robert N. Hall, ed., *Directory of Graduate Programs in the Speech Communication Arts and Sciences: 1975-76* (New York: Speech Communication Association, 1974), p. vii.

[13] Hall, "Facing Employment Problems," p. 7.

[14] See particularly the chapter entitled "Non-Academic Career Applications of Communication Education" in James H. McBath and David T. Burhans, Jr., *Communication Education for Careers* (Falls Church: Speech Communication Association and Urbana: ERIC Clearinghouse on Reading and Communication Skills, 1974).

[15] *Ibid.*, p. 42.

[16] *Ibid.*, pp. 42-106; see also articles on non-academic employment that have appeared in the *BULLETIN of the ADASC* or, after July, 1975, the *BULLETIN of the ACA*, issues #1, 7, 13, 14 and 15.

[17] See the *BULLETIN of the ADASC*, issue #12, April, 1975, as well as future issues.

TABLE 1

SUMMARY DATA FROM THE
SCA DIRECTORY OF GRADUATE PROGRAMS

	1968-69 Directory	1969-70 Directory	1971-72 Directory
THE DEPARTMENTS			
Departments represented	193	244	278
Institutions represented	160	190	203
Departments offering doctorate	57	75	87
Number of masters students	6,995	9,512	10,322
Number of doctoral students	1,867	2,449	2,322
Departmental faculty members	2,969	3,707	4,355
Faculty members holding doctorates	1,593	1,978	2,332
FEE/TUITION CHARGES			
Lowest charges	$ 9.00	27.50	39.00
Highest charges	1,650.00	2,300.00	2,500.00
Lowest charges by credit hour	5.00	7.00	9.00
Highest charges by credit hour	57.00	61.00	87.00
FINANCIAL AID OFFERED			
Lowest amount offered	100.00	110.00	50.00
Highest amount offered	8,168.00	7,500.00	7,500.00

FINANCIAL AID APPOINTMENTS

1967	1968	1969	1970	1971	1972
3,253	3,904	4,366	4,925	5,068	4,720

NUMBER OF DEGREES GRANTED IN:

	1967-1968	1969-1970
Masters	2,518	3,607
Doctorates	360	511

TABLE 1

SUMMARY DATA FROM THE
SCA DIRECTORY OF GRADUATE PROGRAMS

	1968-69 Directory	1969-70 Directory	1971-72 Directory	1973-74 Directory	1975-76 Directory
	193	244	278	289	288
	160	190	203	206	204
ate	57	75	87	93	89
	6,995	9,512	10,322	10,518	12,246
	1,867	2,449	2,322	2,388	2,647
s	2,969	3,707	4,355	4,370	4,352
torates	1,593	1,978	2,332	2,477	2,666
	$ 9.00	27.50	39.00	39.00	10.50
	1,650.00	2,300.00	2,500.00	2,600.00	3,119.00
ur	5.00	7.00	9.00	10.00	8.00
our	57.00	61.00	87.00	100.00	120.00
	100.00	110.00	50.00	100.00	50.00
	8,168.00	7,500.00	7,500.00	10,500.00	9,700.00

FINANCIAL AID APPOINTMENTS

1969	1970	1971	1972	1973	1974	1975
4,366	4,925	5,068	4,720	4,605	4,549	4,387

NUMBER OF DECREES GRANTED IN:

	1967-1968	1969-1970	1971-1972	1973-1974
	2,518	3,607	4,601	4,849
	360	511	559	553

TABLE 2

SPEECH COMMUNICATION ASSOCIATION
PLACEMENT SERVICE

Academic Year September 1, 1974 - August 31, 1975

LISTINGS RETRIEVAL FORM - TOTAL 592

0. New Listings 577 Relistings 15

1. STATES

4	Alabama
0	Alaska
13	Arizona
5	Arkansas
42	California
6	Colorado
5	Connecticut
0	Delaware
4	District of Columbia
12	Florida
17	Georgia
0	Guam
3	Hawaii
4	Idaho
40	Illinois
30	Indiana
27	Iowa
13	Kansas
11	Kentucky
15	Louisiana
3	Maine
5	Maryland
15	Massachusetts
14	Michigan
8	Minnesota
7	Mississippi
23	Missouri
3	Montana
3	Nebraska
1	Nevada
1	New Hampshire
6	New Jersey
2	New Mexico
47	New York
12	North Carolina
4	North Dakota
28	Ohio
8	Oklahoma
8	Oregon
21	Pennsylvania
2	Rhode Island
6	South Carolina
4	South Dakota
4	Tennessee
37	Texas
4	Utah
1	Vermont
11	Virginia
13	Washington
6	West Virginia
28	Wisconsin
2	Wyoming
3	Canada
1	Foreign

2. TYPE OF INSTITUTION

574	College or University
14	Community-Junior College
0	Secondary School
0	Elementary School
3	Repertory Theatre
1	Other

3. TYPE OF EMPLOYMENT

484	Regular
74	Temporary
2	Summer
6	Part-time
26	Graduate Assistantship

4. DEGREE DESIRED

20	No Degree; Professional Experience
36	BA-BS-BFA
211	MA-MS-MFA
325	PhD

5. RANK OFFERED

19	Not Applicable
26	Graduate Assistantship
8	Lecturer
[illegible]	Instructor
[illegible]	Assistant Professor
[illegible]	Associate Professor
12	Professor

6. SALARY OFFERED

8	$1000+
23	$2000+
3	$3000+
9	$4000+
6	$5000+
7	$6000+
10	$7000+
35	$8000+
73	$9000+
140	$10,000+
113	$11,000+
86	$12,000+
44	$13,000+
20	$14,000+
10	$15,000+
5	$16,000+
2	$17,000+
3	$18,000+
3	$19,000+
11	$20,000+
1	$21,000+
1	$22,000+
0	$23,000+
2	$24,000+
1	$25,000+
2	Up

7. TYPE OF POSITION

11	Administrative
19	Chairmanship
501	Instructional
24	Clinical
26	Graduate Assistantship
11	Other

8. PRIMARY TEACHING ASSIGNMENT

33	Rhetoric & Public Address
42	Debate
65	Fundamentals
27	General Theatre
40	Acting
17	Directing
9	History
67	Technical
58	Communication Theory
16	Interpretation
119	Radio-TV-Film
24	Pathology-Audiology
15	Speech Education
12	Speech Science
26	Graduate Assistantship
22	Other

SPEECH COMMUNICATION ASSOCIATION
PLACEMENT SERVICE

TABLE 3

Academic Year September 1973 thru August 1974.
LISTINGS RETRIEVAL FORM - TOTAL 521

0. New Listings 512 Relistings 9

1. STATES

9	Alabama	12	Kentucky	33	Ohio
0	Alaska	6	Louisiana	9	Oklahoma
10	Arizona	6	Maine	6	Oregon
8	Arkansas	10	Maryland	15	Pennsylvania
43	California	3	Massachusetts	5	Rhode Island
6	Colorado	20	Michigan	8	South Carolina
6	Connecticut	10	Minnesota	7	South Dakota
0	Delaware	5	Mississippi	9	Tennessee
1	District of Columbia	19	Missouri	14	Texas
14	Florida	3	Montana	4	Utah
7	Georgia	1	Nebraska	3	Vermont
0	Guam	1	Nevada	8	Virginia
2	Hawaii	4	New Hampshire	10	Washington
3	Idaho	18	New Jersey	6	West Virginia
32	Illinois	0	New Mexico	13	Wisconsin
20	Indiana	59	New York	2	Wyoming
13	Iowa	5	North Carolina	1	Canada
9	Kansas	3	North Dakota	0	Foreign

2. TYPE OF INSTITUTION

486	College or University
26	Community-Junior College
2	Secondary School
0	Elementary School
2	Repertory Theatre
5	Other

3. TYPE OF EMPLOYMENT

430	Regular
64	Temporary
0	Summer
3	Part-time
24	Graduate Assistantship

4. DEGREE DESIRED

4	No Degree; Professional Experience
28	BA-BS-BFA
189	MA-MS-MFA
300	PhD

5. RANK OFFERED

18	Not Applicable
24	Graduate Assistantship
3	Lecturer
178	Instructor
7	Assistant Professor
5	Associate Professor
6	Professor

6. SALARY OFFERED

6	\$1000+
17	\$2000+
5	\$3000+
7	\$4000+
6	\$5000+
1	\$6000+
6	\$7000+
50	\$8000+
95	\$9000+
112	\$10,000+
111	\$11,000+
46	\$12,000+
16	\$13,000+
8	\$14,000+
10	\$15,000+
4	\$16,000+
1	\$17,000+
5	\$18,000+
4	\$19,000+
4	\$20,000+
2	\$21,000+
3	\$22,000+
2	\$23,000+
---	\$24,000+
---	\$25,000+
---	Up

7. TYPE OF POSITION

4	Administrative
14	Chairmanship
433	Instructional
34	Clinical
24	Graduate Assistantship
12	Other

8. PRIMARY TEACHING ASSIGNMENT

30	Rhetoric & Public Address
42	Debate
69	Fundamentals
21	General Theatre
20	Acting
5	Directing
4	History
59	Technical
69	Communication Theory
9	Interpretation
109	Radio-TV-Film
34	Pathology-Audiology
13	Speech Education
8	Speech Science
24	Graduate Assistantship
5	Other

TABLE 4

SPEECH COMMUNICATION ASSOCIATION
PLACEMENT SERVICE

Academic Year September, 1972 - August, 1973
LISTINGS RETRIEVAL FORM - TOTAL 467

0. New Listings 455   Relistings 12

1. STATES

12	Alabama	13	Kentucky	28	Ohio
0	Alaska	15	Louisiana	4	Oklahoma
3	Arizona	6	Maine	4	Oregon
3	Arkansas	8	Maryland	10	Pennsylvania
26	California	5	Massachusetts	2	Rhode Island
4	Colorado	17	Michigan	1	South Carolina
9	Connecticut	17	Minnesota	8	South Dakota
1	Delaware	5	Mississippi	7	Tennessee
1	District of Columbia	15	Missouri	34	Texas
14	Florida	2	Montana	1	Utah
7	Georgia	3	Nebraska	2	Vermont
1	Guam	0	Nevada	10	Virginia
2	Hawaii	2	New Hampshire	5	Washington
2	Idaho	15	New Jersey	5	West Virginia
32	Illinois	2	New Mexico	21	Wisconsin
13	Indiana	43	New York	3	Wyoming
12	Iowa	3	North Carolina	1	Canada
6	Kansas	4	North Dakota	0	Foreign

2. TYPE OF INSTITUTION

439	College or University
19	Community-Junior College
0	Secondary School
0	Elementary School
6	Repertory Theatre
3	Other

3. TYPE OF EMPLOYMENT

396	Regular
42	Temporary
6	Summer
5	Part-time
18	Graduate Assistantship

4. DEGREE DESIRED

19	No Degree; Professional Experience
19	BA-BS-BFA
201	MA-MS-MFA
228	PhD

5. RANK OFFERED

25	Not Applicable
18	Graduate Assistantship
3	Lecturer
198	Instructor
79	Assistant Professor
44	Associate Professor
0	Professor

6. SALARY OFFERED

7	$1000+
14	$2000+
4	$3000+
2	$4000+
6	$5000+
4	$6000+
19	$7000+
81	$8000+
79	$9000+
112	$10,000+
51	$11,000+
36	$12,000+
10	$13,000+
11	$14,000+
15	$15,000+
2	$16,000+
2	$17,000+
7	$18,000+
1	$19,000+
2	$20,000+
0	$21,000+
1	$22,000+
1	$23,000+
0	$24,000+
0	$25,000+
0	Up

7. TYPE OF POSITION

12	Administrative
17	Chairmanship
395	Instructional
14	Clinical
18	Graduate Assistantship
11	Other

8. PRIMARY TEACHING ASSIGNMENT

26	Rhetoric & Public Address
52	Debate
54	Fundamentals
25	General Theatre
12	Acting
15	Directing
12	History
72	Technical
43	Communication Theory
11	Interpretation
74	Radio-TV-Film
14	Pathology-Audiology
13	Speech Education
9	Speech Science
18	Graduate Assistantship
18	Other

15/16

TABLE 5 CONVENTION LISTINGS

SCA CONVENTION	San Francisco Dec. 27-30 1971	Chicago Dec. 27-30 1972	New York Nov. 8-11 1973	Chicago Dec. 27-30 1974
TYPES OF POSITIONS:				
Audiology & Pathology	8	8	5	10
Communication Theory	10	23	27	28
Graduate Assistantships	28	15	16	22
Elementary & Secondary	--	--	--	--
Oral Interpretation	7	8	8	5
Other	4	13	3	7
Rhetoric & Public Address	2	7	11	5
Debate	8	15	9	18
Fundamentals	24	39	16	23
Radio-TV-Film	29	40	34	53
Speech Education	7	8	6	10
Speech Science	4	4	3	3
Theatre	53	39	31	39
TOTAL	184	220	169	223

WESTERN CONVENTION	Fresno Nov. 22-24 1971	Honolulu Nov. 19-21 1972	Albuquerque Nov. 18-21 1973	Newport Beach Nov. 17-20 1975
TYPES OF POSITIONS:				
Audiology & Pathology	--		2	--
Communication Theory	1		3	1
Graduate Assistantships	3		2	--
Other	--	no	--	1
Rhetoric & Public Address	1	report	--	5
Debate	2		2	5
Fundamentals	1		6	1
Radio-TV-Film	1		3	2
Speech Education	--		1	4
Theatre	2		3	--
Interpretation	1		1	--
TOTAL	12		23	18

CENTRAL STATES CONVENTION	Chicago Apr. 7-8 1972	Minneapolis Apr. 5-7 1973	Milwaukee Apr. 4-6 1974	Chicago Apr. 2-4 1975
TYPES OF POSITIONS:				
Audiology & Pathology	1	4	1	
Communication Theory	10	7	15	
Graduate Assistantships	1	5	5	
Oral Interpretation	5	--	--	
Other	0	1	1	
Rhetoric & Public Address	3	5	1	no
Debate	14	--	1	report
Fundamentals	7	--	--	
Radio-TV-Film	10	6	9	
Speech Education	2	1	2	
Theatre	13	11	10	
TOTAL	66	40	45	

SOUTHERN CONVENTION	San Antonio Apr. 5-7 1972	Lexington Apr. 4-6 1973	Richmond Apr. 10-12 1974	Tallahassee Apr. 2-4 1975
TYPES OF POSITIONS:				
Audiology & Pathology	1	--	2	3
Communication Theory	1	1	3	2
Graduate Assistantships	4	2	8	--
Oral Interpretation	1	3	1	4
Other	2	1	3	--
Rhetoric & Public Address	4	2	1	--
Debate	5	2	7	3
Fundamentals	2	2	4	3
Radio-TV-Film	6	4	3	4
Speech Education	--	1	1	--
Theatre	3	2	2	6
TOTAL	29	20	34	25

EASTERN CONVENTION	Boston Mar. 23-25 1972	New York Mar. 8-10 1973	Washington Mar. 21-23 1974	New York Mar. 13-15 1975
TYPES OF POSITIONS:				
Audiology & Pathology	--	--	2	--
Communication Theory	6	1	1	2
Graduate Assistantships	4	3	9	2
Oral Interpretation	4	--	--	1
Other	1	--	2	1
Rhetoric & Public Address	2	1	2	--
Debate	3	--	1	--
Fundamentals	3	2	3	1
Radio-TV-Film	1	6	6	3
Speech Education	3	4	--	1
Speech Science	1	1	1	1
Theatre	6	7	3	4
TOTAL	36	31	30	16

TABLE 6

SUMMARY DATA

August 1, 1975

SCA Placement Availability Forms

AREA	Total Persons	Women	Total PhD	Women	Total MA	Women	Total BA or None	Women
Rhetoric & Public Address	39	14	25	7	14	7	0	0
Tech Theatre	30	8	1	0	29	8	0	0
Theatre, all other	96	25	36	6	59	18	1	1
Fundamentals	47	16	8	3	36	12	3	1
Communication	88	27	37	10	51	17	0	0
Radio-TV	48	8	16	0	30	8	2	0
Debate	16	4	3	0	11	4	2	0
Interpretation	21	8	8	3	13	5	0	0
Speech Education	17	6	10	2	6	4	1	0
Speech Pathology	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Speech Sciences	2	2	0	0	2	2	0	0
TOTALS	404	118	144	31	251	85	9	2

EMPLOYER IMAGES OF SPEECH COMMUNICATION MAJORS:
A QUESTION OF EMPLOYABILITY

Robert L. Heath

The labor market for many types of employees has become increasingly restricted during the past five years. This decline in employability, in part, reflects the state of the national economy and, in part, reflects the impact of more college graduates seeking proportionately fewer jobs requiring a college education. This labor market has been generally unwelcoming for students who mave majored in the humanities, fine arts, and social sciences. Regardless of the causative factors behind the unfavorable market, university and college educators must take these conditions into account when creating curriculum and when advising students concerning their career development. This conclusion is even true for times when the labor market is more favorable.

Several programs have been conducted at national and regional speech communication association conventions to create strategies for improving the employability of speech communication majors. At least one study has been initiated by the Speech Communication Association to study labor market suitability of speech communication graduates.

To understand the market climate for speech majors, the Department of Speech at the University of Houston conducted a survey to assess the marketability of speech communication graduates in the Greater Houston area. Hopefully, this report adds additional understanding and insight into the problems of producing well-educated majors with a blend of the humanities and social sciences in the liberal arts tradition at a time when such college graduates are becoming increasingly difficult to place in business and industry.

The motives for the study should not be misinterpreted. No interest exists for preparing speech communication majors for careers at the expense of maintaining a humanistic commitment to education of the total individual. The study does not reflect a desire of making such majors "trade" oriented. Instead, in addition to the objectives of achieving a humanistic education, the department has a commitment to help students maximize their employability. To meet this end, analysis must produce understanding of the constraints and conditions of employability.

Instead of relying upon questions such as, "Do you have a job for, and would you hire, speech communication majors?", the effort was to disclose employer perceptions of such majors as an employability index. No consideration was made of the availability of jobs; rather, the survey was conceived to reveal certain basic images held by members of industrial concerns toward speech graduates' employability. The fundamental assumption was that if speech communication majors appear employable to employers, they will be hired if jobs are available. Essentially, the survey sought to determine the competitive employability of speech majors and to disclose the skills needed to increase employability.

The survey was designed to determine whether potential employers accurately understood the skills and training characteristic of speech communication majors. If not, how could this and other departments more effectively inform potential employers of graduates' skills? How could majors be trained and advised to compete more adequately in the labor market by meeting employer expectations and needs?

The survey consisted of an explanatory cover letter and a two-page questionnaire. The questionnaire was divided into subsections, each of which was designed to focus upon some aspect of the total employment qualifications of the speech communication major. The letter was addressed by name to the director of personnel. The companies surveyed are too large and complex to survey those people in every division who interview and recommend new personnel. It was assumed that Directors of Personnel are knowledgeable and influence company-wide hiring policies in most major companies, especially when hiring non-technical employees. The survey was mailed to 146 companies in the Greater Houston area. Many of these companies are national or international in scope and operation. The questionnaire was also sent to local concerns such as banks and medical facilities which are sizable, hiring over 100 persons each.

Of the 146 questionnaires mailed, seventy-one were completed and returned. Fourteen different types of companies were reached by the questionnaire. By category of services performed, the following types of companies responded to the questionnaire:

(1)	Financial	22
(2)	Utilities	2
(3)	Energy	5
(4)	Engineering	15
(5)	Medical	6
(6)	Retail	9
(7)	Insurance	15
(8)	Research	1
(9)	Food Services	3
(10)	Transportation	1
(11)	Personnel	1
(12)	Plastics manufacturing	1
(13)	Consulting (engineering)	1

The responding companies cover a wide range of services and products. Because they are large, national and international, the findings of this study may be valuable to people in locations who intend to place graduates with such companies as Texaco, Gulf, Mobil, major utility companies, insurance, and other financial institutions.

These companies were asked to indicate the academic disciplines from which they drew most of their employees. The following categories were indicated:

(1)	Engineering	24
(2)	Business Administration	49
(3)	Social Sciences	4
(4)	Humanities	3
(5)	Fine Arts	1
(6)	Technology	1
(7)	Health Sciences	1
(8)	Natural Sciences	1
(9)	Hotel & Restaurant Management	1

Very few majors are hired from areas other than Business Administration and Engineering. As potential employers, the respondents can be characterized in two ways. They hire predominantly from areas where students are immediately qualified for a specific job. Qualified is a labor market concept referring to an applicant's having attained specific skills and theory with which he or she can perform a specific job with little or no immediate training. In contrast, employees may be qualifiable, which means that they have minimum skills but need considerable additional training to serve fully in the company. This study suggest that training in business administration is at least requisite for being qualifiable. This observation suggests that non-technical and non-business administration graduates would improve their qualifiability by familiarity with these disciplines. Such familiarity can, in most universities, be developed through skillful use of electives and by taking a realistic approach to acquiring employable skills and knowledge.

To acquire information to use in increasing the qualifiability of speech communication majors the respondents were asked to indicate the areas of study, auxiliary to general speech courses, which should be taken to increase employability. These areas were suggested:

(1)	Marketing	8
(2)	Business Administration	7
(3)	Psychology	4
(4)	Computer Science	2
(5)	Mathematics	2
(6)	Engineering	4
(7)	Personnel	2
(8)	Sociology	1
(9)	Technical Fields (unspecified)	2
(10)	Management	1
(11)	Accounting	3
(12)	Corporate Communication	1
(13)	Finance	1
(14)	Real Estate	1
(15)	Economics	3
(16)	Political Science	1

At least two observations can be made from this data. First, speech majors will improve their employability by having courses which make them more qualified to perform a definite job. Marketing, knowledge of administrative concepts, principles, and procedures, technical information, and breadth in the social sciences, depending upon the specific job, should increase employability Each career objective will demand a different set of courses aimed toward the acquisition of principles and skills characteristic of the job description. Secondly, the type of job and the type of business concern should be decided upon early in each student's academic development. Auxiliary courses, either concentrated in one area or strategically drawn from a variety of disciplines, should be aimed at increasing qualifiability. Prospective employers expected to find speech students studying subject matter in the social sciences and in business administration. In fact, background in these areas is expected.

Aside from the demographic data concerning the types of companies and the areas of hiring, the survey sought to disclose the images held by potential employers of speech communication majors. Specifically, the effort was made to determine employer perception of the skills and theory acquired by speech majors. These responses were:

1. Speech majors study to improve their diction, articulation, and pronunciation.

   great deal ← 19.4% - 38.8% - 31.9% - 5.5% - 4.1% → very little

2. Speech majors study the psychological and sociological aspects of communication.

   great deal ← 33.3% - 33.3% - 27.7% - 4.1% - 1.3% → very little

3. Speech majors study the principles of persuasion.

   great deal ← 29.1% - 43.0% - 18.0% - 8.3% - 1.3% → very little

4. Speech majors study communication problems as they exist in business and industry.

   great deal ← 25.5% - 41.6% - 18.0% - 9.7% - 5.5% → very little

The extent to which employers' images of speech communication major training accurately reflects the curriculum studied depends upon the department. Some general observations are warranted, however. An image of speech students practicing voice skills still prevails; additionally, this is not a very marketable skill. Employers may expect more knowledge in organizational and business communication principles than is provided by most departments. Only recently has there been a trend in this area of training.

The questionnaire sought to determine what jobs speech communication majors were qualified to fill. According to the perception of the skills and knowledge possessed by speech communication majors, they most likely would end up in personnel development. Prospective employers believed that speech majors could train other employees in platform speaking (90.2%), inter-office communication (77.7%), interpersonal communication (80.5%), and assisting other personnel in orally presenting bids (56.9%). Other contributions were likely to be made in training fellow employees in meeting management (41.6%), conducting workshops on telephone courtesy and protocol (62.5%), conducting workshops on sales techniques (52.7%), and preparing company personnel for press conferences (51.3%).

Contributions could also be made in company image-building campaigns (48.6%). Respondents believed (63.8%) that majors could conduct company-oriented programs for public school students.

Nearly half (44.4%) of the respondents believed that speech majors could analyze communication breakdown within the company. Nearly a third (30.5%) saw speech majors as serving as parliamentarians for company meetings. Although the respondents might acknowledge that speech majors possessed communication skills, they were not viewed as being equipped to interview prospective employees (26.3%). Probably lacking was the technical information to evaluate employee qualification.

To determine which skills employees perceive speech majors as possessing, the respondents were asked to rank on a scale (one to five, with five indicating high potential) the departments or skill areas in which speech communication majors could most effectively perform. Respondents were asked to assess the potential of success in several skill areas or departments. The following responses were made:

(1)	Public relations	4.45	(9)	Analytical	2.10
(2)	Sales	4.08	(10)	Purchasing	2.10
(3)	Customer relations	4.08	(11)	Production	2.00
(4)	Training	3.98	(12)	Statistical	1.43
(5)	Personnel relations	3.78	(13)	Shipping	1.31
(6)	Marketing	3.43	(14)	Technical design	1.25
(7)	Personnel development	3.33	(15)	Engineering	1.05
(8)	Managerial	3.08			

Speech communication majors were perceived as having high employment potential in departments or skill areas most dependent upon communication skills. Relations with customers through sales and public relations constitute the highest total package of employable skills. Personnel relations and development was the second major employment category. The basic technical, analytical, production, and distribution functions of the company were not particularly appropriate for speech majors. Generally, these latter jobs are the most stable and secure job areas. Personnel and sales are often the least stable.

Conclusions

1. Speech communication majors who seek employment with major corporations compete with graduates who have technical/engineering training or training in business administration. The more training applicants have in such areas, the more qualified they are. To be competitive, speech communication majors must be qualified when possible or at least qualifiable. This means that they must be perceived by employers as being trainable with a minimum of time and cost.

2. University study in certain disciplines specifically designed to increase qualifiability was suggested by the data. These suggested that auxiliary areas of study also reflect employer perceptions of how speech majors most adequately will fit into the company. Major auxiliary fields were marketing, psychology, economics, accounting, and technical studies. Traditional auxiliary study in the humanities and fine arts may defeat efforts to become qualifiable. Study in some social sciences, especially psychology and economics, is helpful. Study in business administration is invaluable. Study in this area should be channeled into marketing, accounting, or personnel development. Career development for speech majors needs to be built around communication skills and principles, but potential employers generally see these as presentational rather than as content-oriented areas of study which can be used and applied to solve company problems leading to increased productivity, morale, and profitability. In addition to communication skills and principles, auxiliary classes must be selected with a particular job category in mind. The aim is to qualify for definite jobs and careers.

3. To be employable, speech communication majors may have to overcome traditional stereotypes. They are still viewed as studying voice and diction and platform presentation. Images of useless skills must be displaced by an increased awareness of well-designed academic programs which lead to career development in skills and principles which can increase employee productivity and morale.

4. The theoretical aspects of communication study have not been fully perceived and appreciated by prospective employers. Training in organizational communication, group and interpersonal and persuasion is valuable and marketable in the labor market. Employers do not fully realize and appreciate the impact of these areas.

5. As well as being trained in theoretical aspects of communication, the speech communication major must have presentational skills. These skills included presentational abilities, group leadership and participation effectiveness, and the design, development, and execution of persuasive messages.

Majors need diagnostic skills. They need to be able to use their understanding of theory to discover communication problems.

They need treatment skills. They need to know remedies and means for using remedies to help others avoid and overcome communication problems.

They need to understand communication from a business point-of-view. Most traditional training has been based on the good-man-speaking-well paradigm. A new paradigm must include the communication manager seeing, diagnosing, and treating communication problems and developing communication skills in others who are participating in the corporation setting.

The balance should not completely swing away from developing the oral, presentational skills of our majors. They must be effective communicators. Too much theory without presentational skills will leave our majors in the same shape others find themselves. Engineers and business administration majors traditionally need communication skills training. Technical expertise is important, but without presentational skills, technical information may not have much impact. The further one is from the center of production the more important communication presentational skills become for success, achievement, and advancement.

6. The training function which speech communication majors can perform is readily apparent. This conclusion, acknowledged by respondents in this study, is reinforced by other studies. The Department of Industrial Administration at Iowa State University compared alumni with graduating seniors. The comparison disclosed that "alumni rated coursework in English and speech significantly higher than did the graduating seniors."[1] Francis W. Weeks discovered that job descriptions in more than thirty business fields contained specific communication requirements.[2] And Frank R. Hunsicker concludes that despite a trend toward expecting management-level proficiency in written and oral communication many people reach that organizational level without those competencies.[3] All three studies reinforce the findings in this study that speech communication majors can provide valuable skills training for business personnel.

The picture for speech communication major employment is not bleak. But certain adaptations must be made to maximize the employability of majors generally considered to be liberal arts majors with few qualifiable skills.

---

[1]Barbara A. Magill, Robert R. Murphey, and Lilian O. Feinberg, "Industrial Administration Survey Shows Need for Communication Study," *The American Business Communication Bulletin*, 38 (June 1975), 31-33.

[2]Francis W. Weeks, "Communication Competencies Listed in Job Descriptions," *The American Business Communication Bulletin*, 37 (December 1974), 22-34.

[3]Frank R. Hunsicker, "Are We Educating Our Managers to Communicate?", *The American Business Communication Bulletin*, 37 (December 1974), 10-15.

MAKING GRADUATE TRAINING MARKETABLE:
THE NEED FOR IMPROVED TEACHER-TRAINING IN SPEECH COMMUNICATION

James Sayer, Lawrence Chase,
and Norbert Mills

As Charles Kidd has noted, and as anyone familiar with the employment situation for college graduates can attest, "the current and prospective job market for those with advanced degrees has become markedly less favorable."[1] The oversupply of trained college personnel is a problem now, but the projections for the future are even worse--especially for those who wish to pursue teaching careers. The Department of Labor envisions an oversupply of teachers until at least 1985; the National Education Association has asserted that "by 1980 only one out of every five Ph.D.'s graduating annually can expect to find university jobs."[2] The job market for teachers is poor now, and it appears that the situation will not be improved in the near future.

It is incumbent upon those of us in education, therefore, to analyze our graduate teacher-training programs, to make needed modifications, and to work assiduously to increase the marketability of our graduates. Careful inspection of current speech communication graduate programs clearly indicates that our students are not as marketable as they might be. We must assess our program deficiencies, thus, and move quickly to eliminate them.

The Problem with Graduate Education Structure

In proceeding with the assessment, one is struck immediately by the problem posed by the very structure of our graduate education system. First, it should be observed that the vast majority of our graduate students have teaching as their career goal, a fact noted by Stephen Spurr in 1970:

> . . .college and university teaching is the major goal of Ph.D. recipients in all but a few fields. . ..In a very real sense, therefore, all of the graduate degree programs in the liberal arts are teacher-training programs in fact if not in design.[3]

The extent of this goal-commitment was provided by Cartter "in observing that the academic marketplace traditionally absorbs more than ninety percent of doctorate holders."[4] Most of our graduate students, then, desire teaching positions after degree completion, and this goal is most pronounced within the speech communication discipline.

The structure of our graduate degree system, especially at the Ph.D. level, is research/scholarship-oriented, not teacher-training-oriented. The research intent of the Ph.D. has been noted by the North Central Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools in 1970:

> The program involves attainment of independent and comprehensive scholarship in a selected field. Mastery of a substantial body of knowledge is combined with training in research. . .the Ph.D. is primarily a research degree. . .[5]

It is interesting that North Central does not mention anything about teacher preparation in its doctoral degree guidelines.

The problem with our graduate degree system is obvious: the structure is not goal-appropriate for the vast majority of our students. Most of our graduates aspire to teaching careers, but our system of graduate education is designed for the production of research-scholars, an inconsistency that has caused Herbert Packer to complain that

> . . .graduate education has almost nothing to do with preparation for teaching. The so-called "pure" disciplines do almost nothing to prepare their students for the principal activity in which they engage.[6]

Packer's indictment was aimed at contemporary graduate education in general. Unfortunately, it also applies specifically to speech communication.

This inconsistency can prove to be harmful in that it produces confusion within academia, a factor lamented by the Carnegie Commission on Higher Education:

> We now select and train a student to do research; then employ him to teach; and then promote him on the basis of his research. This both confuses him and subverts the teaching process.[7]

Not only does our graduate degree system operate incompatibly with the goals of our students, but it also leads to the hampering of teaching effectiveness once the student completes a degree program. The inappropriate structure vis-à-vis student goals spills over into the system's graduate program application.

The Problem with Graduate Education Application

Since the basic structure of graduate education is research-oriented in its design, it is not surprising that its students receive little, if any, teacher-training. Specifically, we do ~~not~~ guarantee any type of teaching experience to graduate students; we do not provide structured training in that one area wherein most of our graduates plan to make their professional careers.

It is true, of course, that many students are given graduate teaching assistantships and fellowships, but these financial appointments do not meet the need for teacher education. It must be recognized that there exists a philosophical and practical dichotomy between teacher-training and teaching assistantships. The latter are not designed to improve the quality of teaching but exist to provide instruction in lower-division courses that maximize undergraduate student enrollment in departmental offerings. The teaching assistantship is designed to release regular faculty for upper division or graduate teaching, not for the improvement of the assistant's teaching capabilities. In addition, it must also be recognized that these assistantships are viewed as a method of bringing students into a graduate program. The teaching is something done to justify receiving an assistantship; it is not viewed as a means of developing teacher ability.

Within the assistantship system, very little training in teaching methodology is provided. Very few graduate programs contain any sort of concentrated teacher-training for their students; very few provide close supervision of those teaching activities necessitated by the granting of fellowships and assistantships. Individuals who receive assistantships are generally left to fend for themselves in the classroom, and, unfortunately, competency in future teaching is left almost exclusively to this "sink or swim" method. It is even more unfortunate that we have no idea towar[d] what point these students may be swimming.

It can be said, of course, that our graduate programs are consistent. We have a system designed for research that produces teachers; the application of our programs provides minimal directed teacher-training. When the job market was such that all the graduate students could find suitable employment, there was no compulsion to change this goal-inappropriate system. The situation has changed, however, and if we are to meet the demands of the future, we must change both the structure and application of our graduate education system.

Looking to the Future

There will be a demand for more teachers in the future, especially at the small four-year liberal arts college and junior/community college level. Such a need was perceived by the Carnegi[e] Corporation in 1970:

> At the same time [as the Ph.D. surplus], there is a growing market for people trained primarily as teachers rather than researchers in the rapidly expanding community colleges and four-year state colleges, which already enroll well over fifty percent of all undergraduates.[8]

Our students do not now receive the type of teacher-training envisioned by the Carnegie Corporation. They receive training only by hit-or-miss indirection. To meet the need for teachers trained to be teachers, we must modify our graduate programs now to increase program relevance and student marketability.

Such modification may include the following suggested avenues of teacher preparation:

One: the provision for closely supervised teacher-training at the graduate level. Programs should include courses on methodology, materials acquisition and presentation, and learning development theories. All graduate student teaching should be closely monitored with sufficient procedures established to allow and encourage methodology contact between the students and the teaching faculty;

Two: an increase in the availability of educational materials and resource personnel for graduate student teaching experience. Students should be encouraged to use all available audio-visual materials to supplement their instruction, and the full educational resources of the department, including secretarial assistance, should be at their disposal; and

Three: the discipline of speech communication should encourage the development of professional teaching degrees and programs such as the Doctor of Arts degree.[9] Instead of watering-down existent research-oriented Ph.D. programs, speech communication should become a leader in the implementation of programs specifically designed to improve the quality of teaching.

Overall, our discipline must commit itself to the educational philosophy espoused by Cornelius F. Butler of the United States Office of Education: an "increased awareness of the responsibility of the educational process toward each student's career development."[10] Our graduate programs do not serve this goal now; however, they must in the future if we are to make our graduate training marketable.

---

[1]Charles V. Kidd, "Graduate Education: The New Debate," *Change*, VI (May 1974), p. 43.

[2]Associated Press release, August 24, 1975.

[3]Stephen H. Spurr, *Academic Degree Structures: Innovative Approaches* (New York, 1970), p. 104.

[4]Allan M. Cartter, "All Sail and No Anchor," *American Scientist* (March-April, 1971), p. 180.

[5]"Guidelines for Institutions Offering Advanced Degree Programs," North Central Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools, December, 1970, p. 14.

[6]Herbert L. Packer, "Piling Higher and Deeper: The Shame of the Ph.D.," *Change* (November-December, 1970), p. 50.

[7]"College Degree Reforms Asked in Carnegie Report," *The New York Times*, November 24, 1970, p. 32.

[8]*Congressional Record*, July 6, 1970, p. 22895.

[9]See Charles U. Larson, "A Case for the Doctor of Arts in Speech Communication," *Central States Speech Journal*, XXIV (Spring 1973), pp. 60-64.

[10]Quoted in Patrick C. Kennicott and L. David Schuelke, eds., *Career Communication: Directions for the Seventies* (New York, 1972), p. 18.

Editors' Note: After the writing of the article by the three authors, the SCA published its "Guidelines for Speech Communication and Theatre Programs in Teacher Education." Readers are referred to the *Speech Teacher*, volume XXIV, November 1975, pp. 343-364.

The paper was prepared for the SCA National Convention, Houston, December 27-30, 1975.

A "COMMUNI-SITE-ED" APPROACH TO BASIC SPEECH

Beatrice M. Romano

Philip Werdell, cogent author on futurism in education, and co-inventor of the "facilitator" family of teaching and learning models, posits this characterization of the future of higher education: higher education "is best seen as an evolution of experimental forms attempting to support individual growth in order to create social understandings and skills necessary for democracy."[1] The statement places into perspective a core concern of speech teachers and researchers: how to make courses relevant. Always seeking ways to "touch" students affectively and cognitively college instructors are persistent in their quest for methods of teaching that will establish vital connections between cognition and behavior. In today's diverse society the content of speech must include another dimension: provision for preparing the student to communicate effectively while living democratically in an environment which is also pluralistic. Specifications of course objectives in college should seek not only to enable students to use their communication capacities skillfully, but to use them in ways that will retain individual freedoms in a society in which person-to-person relationships are primary and necessarily cooperative.

The principle of responsible, energetic expression of ideas is basic to American ideals. Yet, a paradox seems evident when reality is viewed against the backdrop of current methods of teaching speech. The student, heir apparent, so to speak, to society's achievements, is, unwittingly, the victim of a constantly inconstant society. The paradox lies in the fact that social and political change is initiated by "insiders" in the community while students, the "outsiders," watch freedom experienced and lived *for* them. Until the completion of his/her studies, the student is eclipsed, at least temporarily, into the role of "non-person." For this reason, *engaging in* communication rather than merely *studying about* communication should be the preferred practice rather than merely a hope for the truly democratic speech fundamentals class. Not to so "engage" students in communication is to risk grooming them for listener-assenter roles and not the role of initiator-participant in their society. The concern, then, is not so much with what is learned in the classroom as with what has not been learned outside it.

Furthermore, the paradox gives way to a dichotomy in education itself. Too often, the milieu of the classroom and the world beyond it seem to share little in common. The business of communicating effectively necessitates that certain speech desiderata not be overlooked. Speaking out on issues, investigating social and political problems, and pursuing self-initiated courses of action to remedy them--these are the basic speech needs of students who would regard their first course in speech as meaningful for them. To ignore these needs is virtual abridgement of the freedoms guaranteed to peoples of a free society, and, in no small degree, an abrogation of one of the first responsibilities of speech teachers.

I would like to share something of a speech course offered at Rockland Community College, a communi-site-ed course which, experiential in nature, is centered in the students' own local community. It endeavors to minimize the patent division between course content and experience, and designed for the fundamentals course since, except for those students whose major interest is speech communication, the first course in speech is likely to be the only speech course for which students will be enrolling. In this approach to speech communication the student's own community provides for him/her those communication channels that are more likely to enhance interpersonal communication. From this approach a twofold effect may be anticipated: improvement in the skills of communication, and, concurrently, a beneficial effect in the community. Students "speak to" their community as communication principles are learned; the community, in turn, listens to its constituents enabling them to develop skills.

The following outline traces the method which was used to teach young and older adults who had returned to college. The classroom served as the base of operations for speechmaking assignments, lectures, and a community outreach which required students to seek out a problem from their local community, to visualize a positive, viable solution for the problem, and then, to explore the problem by way of a problem-solving process with other members of the class. Finally, an appropriate plan of action had to be implemented. Students were told that just as the problem was to be initiated from a "real" source (i. e., within the community) so every possible resource was to be tapped for resolving the problem. The local media of print, press, radio and cable television, as well as the various agencies on county and town levels, were to be consulted. A three-month time limitation was imposed for the project's completion.

Class lectures were presented as needed during the regular two and one-half hour classes, and, as far as possible, were coordinated with the project proceedings. The class lecture on "interviewing," for instance, paralleled the interviewing phase of the project with class activities centering on role-playing the interview situation. Small and large groups discussed the techniques of questioning possibilities for utilization in the project. Class lectures subsumed such topics as theory of communication, communication models, nonverbal communication, ethical considerations in communication, problem-solving techniques, and listening. Required class speeches and individual speeches delivered for the project were spaced over prescribed periods, prepared and practiced during classes.

Students were requested to submit community problems at the second class meeting following orientation to the course. The merits of and objections to the problems were sifted out. Students felt that the steady rise of juvenile offenses had become threatening to their community. A determination of the problem was followed by threshing out tentative solutions. It was resolved that a request would be made to the Rockland County Legislature for the creation of a County Youth Commission to be comprised entirely of young people--fourteen to nineteen years of age--to serve as advisors to already existing adult youth agencies. Hopefully, the commission would serve as the "official voice" of the young people of Rockland County. Aware that no precedent existed for such a commission on the county level, the class felt strongly that the concept would condition a positive step toward the amelioration of youthful problems, and satisfy the desire of today's youth to be "involved" in their government.

At this point in the discussions, most of the students had had a fair taste of interaction and decision-making through parleys with their families, friends, and classmates. Somewhat enervated over setting up the groundwork for their cooperative venture, they nonetheless experienced genuine exhilaration at the prospect of becoming part of what they felt was an adventure in democratic participation.

Reactions to the idea of the class project ran the gamut from "It can't possibly be done--no one will listen" to "We can make it work." No student remained neutral. Preconceived notions about speech classes being "snap courses" precluded any possibility they would be disinterested. Some felt the project had no place in a speech course, in particular, the basic course. At first a few students were more numbed by than opposed to the prospect of executing the project. Emotional reactions notwithstanding, it was only a matter of time before every student agreed to give the project a try.

The modus operandi was planned. Categories of activities or "phases," as they were called, were then set up in designated time intervals. Project phases included: Exploration: *the problem-seeking phase;* Survey: *interviews of community residents;* Survey Report: *the written report of interviewee and interviewer reactions over the problem.* Every student participated in these three initial phases. At this juncture, students opted for one other task from the list of remaining phases: Research: *writing of a summary report of opinion and ideas sifted from the interviews,* used as basis for arriving at two or three tentative solutions for the problem; Type Out: *a reporting of the research committee's findings;* Press: *writing of releases for local radio, cable television, college radio, and local newspapers;* Arts: *producing collage, filmmaking, sculpting, staging plays, sketching cartoons, and exhibiting photographs* which helped to dramatize the problem. The college radio station WRCC aired a *panel discussion of the problem.* Local WRKL "Hotline" allowed *airing the problem* by a panel of students on the *local community radio station,* speaking directly with community residents. The CATV Debate Team *debated the problem* by way of *local television media.* Finally, the Presentation phase, consisting of the *formal presentation of the project proposal,* was made before the Rockland County Legislature, the legal body authorized to create such Commissions.

To complete participation in the project each student was asked to submit his personal reactions to the project and to the course. Here are some typical responses: "This course has made me not only learn to speak but to listen--listening is a very important part of communicating;" "When I make a speech I still get as nervous as I used to, but I learned the importance of how one should stand when speaking. I don't like speech classes at all, but I do think the problem situation is a good idea--you should always have it in your class;" "The class project really helped me overcome fear of speaking--if anything helped my composure, it was facing those cameras on cable TV;" "We all should have learned something from this project; one thing is you can clearly see all the problems that arise when a group such as ours disagrees and fights the issues as excuses not to get involved--the project, in the end went exceedingly well considering the problems which seemed endless;" "Completing each phase was fulfillment in itself;" "We learned th[illegible]m time to time you have to run up against a brick wall with public officials, but you ca[illegible]op striving."

It should be noted that the project idea was conceived as a starting point for experiencing communication on a reality level, and for facilitating a fresh awareness of the democratic processes available to students in their own environs. Therefore, a rather simplistic method of evaluation was employed. Students were graded by a cumulative point system for the major activities exclusive of the project, and for the project as well. If students satisfactorily: a) demonstrated enthusiasm over completion of their role in the project, b) demonstrated effect vis-à-vis group discussion over the problem, c) fulfilled their individual roles in the project, full credit was given. Almost every student showed genuine interest throughout, and with the exception of one or two, project phases were completed in the time allotted.

The actual creation of the commission came about through continued efforts of a small number of students who contributed further their time and energy in the weeks which followed.

I have attempted to describe a teaching approach which resulted in what I felt was a positive step toward closing the gap between the goals of speech education and the persistent call of speech teachers for relevance. The paradigm outlined above helped to link the resources of the classroom, students, media and library facilities, with the resources of the community, citizens, politicians, media, and county administrators. It expedited a learning connection perhaps previously overlooked in the teaching of speech education--the "communi-site-ed" approach to the first course.

Given unique opportunities for active involvement in the domain of students' real concerns, it is felt that this approach conditions students for the intelligent exercise of freedom and, as important, effective cultivation of communication principles. Students are able to find, more readily, a self identity among members of their peer group as participants in problem-solving activities. Students become more aware of the significance of the nonverbal code in communication They learn the importance of respecting differing points of view without arousing negative emotions in themselves or others. Also, they recognize that the factors of family, race and close-mindedness place certain constraints on one's ability to communicate. The use and abuse of "power" in communication relationships is more graphically understood.

Is this approach a practical one for the fundamentals course? To be sure, not every communit waits upon its student citizenry for the creation of a much-needed youth commission! But wouldn't most communities, recognizing their individual needs and requirements, delight in problem exploration and solution-finding by "its own," and with no added cost to the community?

If there is doubt regarding which areas would be fertile for task solution, we need only to look at current concerns of any given community. One class decided to request cosmetic improvemen of a sanitary landfill operation in the town in which they live. Their study of the problem indicated that members of their local town board had, some weeks before, already considered the proble and had voted to purchase trees and shrubbery to beautify the area. The class then agreed to reverse their "opposition" to the Board, and instead, arranged speaking engagements throughout the county to publicly praise the action taken.

Much still needs to be accomplished in the area of human rights, also. Local human rights agencies cry out for assistance in outlining and executing programs for the physically disabled. Students might wish to research specific areas of need, and speak to the appropriate legislative body to seek the reconstruction of all public entranceways in order to accomodate persons confined to wheelchairs.

Meeting some of the needs of older citizens in the community in terms of calling publicly for suitable housing for the aged might be a timely project on the town level.

Also, business and professional people should be approached to elicit some fields of concern which would require public relations effort not otherwise possible.

Going back to the newly-created Youth Commission in Rockland County, an organizational task force will be needed to "advertise" more widely the purpose and objectives of the commission so that it is able to begin to effectuate its programs as quickly as possible. Students in the fundamental speech course could assume such a role for their class project, utilizing the media to speal about the commission, and appearing before various groups as an information source to county residents.

Which problems would be ultimately considered would, of course, depend on a student's own interests and the particular needs existing in his or her own community. The extent to which we, as teachers, invite our students toward deeper awareness of what is happening around them, to that degree, will the speech fundamentals course--such as the one described--serve the requirements of the times in which we are living as well as encourage the student to better understand who and what he or she is in relation to the world he or she lives in.

If relevant education is determined by student interests as well as needs, "hand and glove" coexistence between classroom and the community-at-large deserves the most serious consideration as a viable route to the development of communication skills and the advancement of students' emotions and intellect. Stated another way, the classroom becomes an extension of the community, and the community, an extension of the classroom. Each, in effect, *is* the other.

Indeed, Werdell's "future" provides perspective for higher education. In prospect, it is the teacher's commitment to a more "involving" speech course for the student that will determine the eventual posture of speech in higher education.

[1] Philip Werdell, "Futurism and the Reform of Higher Education," in *Learning for Tomorrow: The Role of the Future in Education*, edited by Alvin Toffler (New York: Random House, 1974), p. 285.

WILL SPEECH COMMUNICATION SURVIVE AS A DISCIPLINE?

Ronald L. Applbaum

By the year 2000 the departments of speech communication may disintegrate under the centrifugal forces of specialization induced by the information explosion. Already, the outpouring of new information is creating a giant labyrinth of knowledge. Tunnels extend in all directions and few attempts are made to intersect them. It would appear we are doomed to wander aimlessly in that labyrinth until cornered and devoured by the academic minotaurs, who fail to see our purpose and function as distinct from others.

Unfortunately, we have not reached a consensus among ourselves regarding *our* specific purpose or function in the future. Perhaps this is a reflection of the present curricular framework. We master selected areas within our field, but rarely attempt to integrate our discipline, and judgments are confined to these areas. I see little in our actual behavior that indicates an imminent change in our fragmentation. Indeed, the harsh reality of our present dilemma is only blurred by an abundance of hypocrisy. There remains among a large percentage of scholars a verbal allegiance to the traditional concept of a well-rounded understanding of our field--at least on the undergraduate level. Yet, the distribution of requirements and proliferation of highly specialized courses constituting the new curricula make a mockery of the so-called general speech communication degree.

I have purposely set a pessimistic tone regarding the survival potential of our discipline with existing curricula. It is my belief that we will not survive long into the twenty-first century as a viable discipline, if we cannot provide a curricula that can deal with the communication complexities expected of the future and integrate the process of communication into holistic patterns.

When formulating ideas about the future of our discipline's curricula, one is tempted to repress the knowledge of our continuing failure in prophecy. There are some notable exceptions, but by and large, we have been wrong in our informed commentaries of the future. Perhaps, our most common error is that we see the future as a mere extension of the present. Forecasting tends to be conservative, in that it is based upon the extrapolation and generalization of the current analytic framework. Suppose, for a moment, that we had all the information on political, educational and economic systems of the twentieth century, it is still questionable whether we would have any information useful in freeing us from the bondage of the past, or for determining what will be useful in readically new circumstances. Since society and academia are changing at an accelerating rate, the most important part of a future curricular system is that it adapt, change, and help students to exist in a world increasingly dominated by the results of modern science.

(1) *If we are to develop a curricula for the future, what, then, are the elements that must be considered in its development?*

Those who study the behavior of human organizations stress the importance of defining organizational goals. Without clear objectives an institution cannot evaluate how well it is performing, decide how to allocate its resources wisely, plan for future growth, motivate its members or justify its existence to the larger public. Unfortunately, our academic discipline seems to exist at times without making an effort to clearly define its objectives in relationship to the total academic environment.

Speech communication departments cannot expect to have the continued support of students, institutions, and communities if they cannot explain clearly what their curriculum is supposed to accomplish. In deciding to allocate new resources--or indeed, how to distribute time and energies--departments can hardly establish coherent priorities without some sense of the ultimate purposes they hope their programs will achieve. At this point in time our discipline must make a fundamental decision as to the future purposes of speech communication and guarantee that that decision is reflected in our curricula. If the essential purpose will be vocational, then much of our curricula is wasteful irrelevance. If the basic purpose is something else, then whatever it is, we had better delineate it for students, institutions, and communities.

Today, within our departmental curricula, the more specialized and technical courses have increased in proportion and prestige, while courses which unify or synthesize our field have declined. When merged together, the newer, more specialized courses do not add up to coherent w[illegible] and the older, more holistic courses have given up on trying to pull knowledge together.

Today, students of speech communication spend little time in active communication training. Their time is consumed in passive learning of abstract ideas. The aim is not doing but knowing. The drive toward abstractions is reinforced by the increasing tendency of students to go on to graduate school. The structure of modern learning is rigidly departmentalized and rationalized. Upper class (junior and senior) programs are increasingly cast in the graduate mold. Thus, to an increasing extent, undergraduate education is practical only in the limited sense that it prepares one for graduate work. But what of the student who does not intend to pursue a career in speech communication?

The curriculum of the future ought to be grounded in the actual pluralism of the American people. "The one and the many," Aristotle taught, was one of the underlying universal problems of natural existence. Building a curriculum around such a fundamental and perennial theme will not, I think, subject us to fads or carry us away from the realities of daily life.

Alvin Toffler speaks of a "novelty ratio" as a measure of the newness of a product line, technology, plant, or administrative routine. New personnel, new leadership, altered clientele, new programs, altered resources, competitive pressures, new courses and curricula are agents of rising novelty ratios. All of these factors have given our discipline a particularly high novelty ratio during the last ten years.

With the growth in student enrollment over the last fifteen years, we have seen dramatic increases in speech communication courses. However, the next twenty-five years may appropriately bear the title 'expansion without growth.' Although predictions of future population trends are generally unreliable, the recent decline in the birth rate indicates that the 23 million 18-24-year olds present in the United States in 1970 will grow to only 28 million by the year 2000. Our expansion must focus upon created opportunity rather than on guaranteed increase in student numbers. It will necessitate a continued high novelty ratio. Growth in enrollment must be replaced by expansion of opportunity and a new combination of programs. The next 25 years will require integration of the special needs of both students and larger environments of business, industry, and governmental communities.

(2) *What special needs must tomorrow's curricula meet?*

Never in history has the opportunity for student choice been higher. This shift in character of the relationship between student and curriculum has occurred in tandem with the extension of educational opportunity to previously disenfranchised groups. However, the content of educational curriculum has not changed dramatically. What has profoundly changed is the student's freedom to create his or her own curriculum, move through it at his or her own pace, and do so with greater autonomy vis-à-vis faculty. This increase in student input to curricula decision-making has a direct impact on future curricula planning. The perceptions and forces on these decisions are myriad, including many which are extraneous to the educational process. The full range of considerations probably cannot be identified, but it is possible to speculate on some factors that could be significant. Assuming reasonable information and decisions based on anticipation of potential educational experiences, students can be expected to select:

1. Educational experiences that have immediate relevance for them.

2. A social climate that recognizes them as individuals and provides stimulating and supporting relationships.

3. Educational experiences that offer opportunity for them to develop their perceptions, skills, and abilities.

4. Educational experiences which provide for the discovery of knowledge and learning about the world through active involvement.

5. Educational experiences which are based upon the principle that individual growth needs are more important than the preservation of institutional models.

6. Academic programs in which they feel they have some reasonable involvement in the decisions that direct and shape their education, and a full partnership in the learning process.

Educational programs characterized by effective advisement, career information, and planning opportunities.

8. Educational programs which provide for experiential learning in the community in which the student integrates the academic experience with off-campus experiences.

9. Educational programs in which they have flexibility to select a number of courses of their own choosing from electives which are not predetermined by their major field of study.

10. Educational programs in which development of students is the central goal.

If students make these discriminating choices in substantial numbers, fundamental revision of the goals and the most basic processes of our curricula are inevitable. Such choices call into being a new set of assumptions about the discipline, its mission, and the methods that characterize it.

Higher education is a voluntary activity carried on in a marketplace of attractive alternatives. Nowhere else is the number of alternatives higher than it is in the field of adult education. The lifelong learning concept has been with us for some time. In this century, it has led to a vast array of educational opportunities in public and private secondary schools and colleges, in extension, in proprietary schools, and most recently in media programs carried on in the "university without walls" format. The decline in the number of young people of traditional college age has already sharpened the interest of collegiate institutions and universities in adults. In the future, higher education in America may become increasingly the education of adults. Many institutions see the adult as the source of enrollment relief, but it is unlikely that there will be enough adults willing and able to participate in these programs to fill all of them.

The adult requires a different kind of educational opportunity than the traditional student. University programs designed for the young student do not usually serve the adult well. The programs that survive will be highly adept at reading adult student needs and interests and catering to them.

Many adults elect to return to college to enter programs which provide cultural enrichment, professional development, insights into public affairs, or discussion of urban problems. Those who participate in adult education programs are usually people with some college experience, from white collar occupational groups, and from urban and suburban areas. Some also return for specific instruction offered in short-term formats, others seek a degree. Among those in pursuit of a degree, some will be learning for its own sake; for them, the degree is symbolic. What interests them may be a systematic, sequential, rigorous course of study that will challenge their abilities and enlarge their understanding of themselves and the world. In our universities, however, a greater number will be seeking a degree in a field related to their life goals, particularly a career. They seek learning which can further an existing career or provide entry level competence for a new career. Both of these groups are not preparing for some obscure, remote tomorrow; they have little time to wait; for them the future is now. They will select classes and curricula programs that meet specific needs.

The impact of the women's rights movement on higher education in the future may also be great. It has already pioneered a value system and several lifestyle models that bring women out of the home into more public life roles. The proportion of female students will probably creep up in the next few years as women seek professional outlets for their talents that require collegiate preparation. There are in the population a large number of women who no longer have small children in the home and who could devote a substantial amount of time to college work if the problems of economics, access, and interest can be solved.

Early retirement, both forced and voluntary, is also a growing reality which may leave individuals unimpaired in skills and abilities with no arena in which to apply them. The next crisis time for many people is that time immediately preceding retirement. They, too, are faced with a major life adjustment. Here, the concept of life enrichment is important. If latent desires for the time and opportunity to follow a strong interest can now be rekindled, the opportunity for highly satisfying intellectual achievement may be at hand.

The challenge of serving the adult student may be to identify educational needs and wishes for individuals or very small groups and develop a delivery system that is economically feasible. The only real path to improved cost effectiveness in the past has been through an increase in class size, or mass media. In the future, highly individualized programs which involve self-pa[illegible]echnology, volunteer service, peer interaction that is self-formulated and appraised, ma[illegible]ore feasible.

A more coherent educational philosophy ought to undergird a system of instruction intended to prepare all men and women for living in a world whose complexity is uncontestable. Colleges have proliferated vocational and specialized courses partly in response to these demands. But departmental curricula also has an obligation to provide all students, whatever the job aspiration, with general education--a map of the terrain. In any discipline the curriculum orientation, liberal or technical, can be a window to the world. The battle between liberal arts and vocational training will be meaningless in the future. We will need both, and we will need their interpretation in new and fresh ways in order to give all students the skills to cope with a complex and largely unpredictable future.

(3) *What curricular structure might one utilize to provide for our projected needs?*

We should design a curricular pattern that deals with the study of communication patterns, and communication dysfunctions prevalent in our society. The curriculum should acquaint the student with the kinds of behaviors that may facilitate or hinder communication in different contexts. In achieving this goal the curriculum should link the communication variables into a coherent system and should aid the student in seeing how the interaction of variables in various contexts are crucial to the maintenance of a viable communication system. It is my position that students well-grounded in a general understanding of how communication functions within a variety of specific systems will be able to survive in any agency or organization. The primary functions of future survival--planning, organizing, directing, and controlling--will depend on the students' ability to understand the nature of communication facilitators and inhibitors in their systems.

Communication curricula with a focus on specific contextual communication systems will help to accurately define our field of study to others and provide "practical" experiences for our students. We will be able to prepare students for positions in management, government, hospital and school administration, family counseling, sales, or in whatever system the student decides to specialize.

A curriculum offering a comprehensive study of specific contextual systems will not only not survive in the future decade, but can be a major contributor to those adult students who, at present, must endure the penalties of ineffective systems from which there seems to be no escape. I believe this orientation will aid all students in acquiring skills competencies necessary for coping with an ever-changing job market and provide the specialists needed to alter the existing systems for the benefit of the total environment.

(4) *How does a department or area implement this future curricular structure?*

First. Students would be provided with a solid understanding of communication variables. Within our present curricular programs many students believe that communication processes are totally different in various contexts. This myth is perpetuated by the segmenting of curricula into seemingly discrete parts or courses. Each context, however, requires slightly different skills or applications of basic communication principles. Students must possess an understanding of the variables common to *all* communication contexts before effectively managing the systems in which they will eventually operate.

Second. Once an understanding of basic communication principles exists, the students would be provided with an understanding of the nature and scope of communication systems in our society, such as, government, business, hospitals, law enforcement, education, and the like.

Third. After the student has a broad range of knowledge concerning communication systems, he/she should receive specialized training in a specific system(s) of interest, that is, each student would be provided with the knowledge, skills, to operate in a specific system such as law enforcement or hosptial administration.

Fourth. Students will be provided with work experience in their area of specialization c[illegible]ent with specialized course work.

The curricular changes suggested are not radical or impractical. They will, however, produce fundamental changes in existing programs. It is time we cease the present curricular change policies, that is, maintenance of the status quo with minor revision and prepare for more than the immediate future. We cannot stop the development of our speech communication labyrinth. Thus, we must intersect its paths and be prepared to lead our students through its corridors. When the student emerges from our labyrinth, he/she should be able to work constructively in the systems that comprise their society.

This paper was prepared for the SCA National Convention, Houston, December 27-30, 1975.

MANAGING THE IMPOSSIBLE: SO, YOU WANT TO BE A DEPARTMENT CHAIRPERSON?

Gerald M. Goldhaber

Groups and organizations seem to perform better than individuals in solving problems when different skills are needed, when several steps are required, when the problem has many parts, when solutions are difficult to verify, or if a great deal of information is required (Shaw, 1932; Faust, 1959; Rosenfeld, Goldhaber, Smith, 1975). A careful examination of the typical work-related behaviors in which most academic departments seems involved (writing research proposals, scheduling classes, developing curricula, identifying and enforcing appropriate and meaningful academic standards, evaluating colleagues for promotion and tenure) leads to the logical conclusion that an academic department is an organization.

As an organization, the department may be viewed within the framework of contemporary social systems theory (Katz and Kahn, 1966). *Inputs* (students, faculty, staff, budgets, equipment, supplies, space) are *transformed* by educational, research and service activities into *outputs* (educated graduates, research grants, books or articles, completed committee tasks or community projects). An academic department is an *open system* because of its constant interaction with its *environment* (other departments or colleges, the university administration, the community). The department will continue to survive as long as sufficient inputs can be generated from the environment. Survival is also maintained when some outputs are *fed back* into the department as new inputs (completion of a grant project results in additional grants, graduates recruit other graduates, a successful books results in another contract).

A department is composed of a number of subsystems (subgroups, cliques, committees), all of which are interdependent and interrelated. Further, a department has "a multiplicity of purposes, functions, and objectives, some of which are in conflict. The purpose of the administrator is to strive for an optimal balance among the subsystems." (Huse and Bowditch, 1973) How shall he or she achieve this optimal balance? In other words, how shall the chairperson manage the department?

Throughout the twentieth century a variety of management models have been offered, including those which control employee work output by strictly regulating their salary and other tangential rewards (Taylor, 1919), those which emphasize employee participation as a means of improving morale and thus production (Roethlisberger and Dickson, 1939), and those which stress trust and integrating employee and organizational goals (Miles, 1965). Although most contemporary writers (Fiedler, 1965, 1967; Morse and Lorsch, 1970) suggest that no one theory of management will suffice, that the managerial style must be tailored to fit the objectives and the personnel, a case could be argued that the academic department, similar to many research and development organizations, can best be managed with a participative decision-making model (PDM).

Proponents of this model (McGregor, 1960; Likert, 1961, 1967; Blake and Mouton, 1964; and others) advocate three main propositions which Redding (1973) summarized:

1. Managers should trust their subordinates to be more responsible in the performance of their jobs.
2. Managers should permit the subordinate to participate in the making of his own job.
3. Managers should replace much of the mechanistic structure characteristic of most institutions with an organic approach to organization.

Earlier (Goldhaber, 1974), I proposed that two ingredients discussed in most human resources models are *trust* and *integration*. I stated that "integration of individual and organizational goals will probably fail without a certain amount of trust among all concerned parties." This is most true in an academic department where the kinds of work done (teaching classes, writing course descriptions, conducting research projects, writing articles, participating in committee meetings, etc.) require an integrated approach but will fail dismally without interpersonal trust among all working parties. As with most organizations, it is the responsibility of the administrator (chairperson) to create an environment where trust and integration may thrive.

Often we study and admire theories without the awareness of how to operationalize them. My objective here is to present several practical suggestions and examples to help the chairperson implement the principles of trust and integration within a social systems framework. In all of these suggestions, the notion of interdependence is taken into account. That is, when we change one part of a system or subsystem, the impact of this change will eventually be felt throughout the organization, much like the ripple effect when a stone is thrown into a pond. Implementing these suggestions will improve your management style and increase your peace of mind.

1. During your first month as chairperson (or at the beginning of the academic year), meet with your faculty members individually to solicit their goals, expectations of you and the program, perceptions of your role. Also, share with them your goals, expectations of them, and your role in the department. Spend one-two hours with each faculty member, take profuse notes, send a typed copy to the faculty member for feedback, corrections and a signature. Repeat this process with many of your graduate and undergraduate majors. During this process pay particular attention to the advice of your tenured faculty whose experience can help you and whose alienation can hurt you.

2. Compile a summary of collective individual goals. Prepare a departmental composite, identifying priorities, sources of potential conflict among individuals and yourself. Circulate this document and collect reactions.

3. Assess your available resources (budget, equipment, space, students) and your environment (other departments, the university climate, the community); incorporate these data into the priorities established above, producing a master plan for the coming year. Circulate, collect reactions, and revise. Too often overlooked, the environment within which your department interacts should greatly influence this plan. For example, if your department is located in a university near a large metropolitan area adjacent to the Canadian border, your plan should probably take advantage of the natural resources resulting from these environmental factors. In this case, a program in organizational or cross-cultural communication may prosper significantly. On the other hand, environmental factors may place limits on your program. For example, if you have only ten faculty members, you may avoid attempting too many new innovative programs for fear of spreading yourself too thin.

4. If the academic plan allows, you may consider adopting some of the following: team-teaching, team proposal writing, peer-group evaluation of teaching, involvement in the basic course of most faculty (for team-building and recruitment), a basic core curriculum required of all students covering the central thrusts of the department.

5. Consistent with the accomplishment of your academic objectives, establish a set of by-laws and rigidly adhere to them.

6. Meet key administrators and faculty around your university to solicit their reactions, perceptions, expectations of your and your program. Share with them information about your program and identify common resources which can be shared (labs, rooms, equipment, people, courses, etc.) as you seek ways of increasing horizontal university contacts. Prepare a summary of these potential overlapping relationships and present your conclusions to your faculty. For example, if the management department offers a good course in survey research methods or the sociology department in small group behavior, or the psychology department in statistics, it will probably be better to send your students there than to develop competing courses yourself. If you have a piece of video equipment desired by another department, offer to let them use it when your students do not need it. If you want to develop a research proposal, seek cooperating and expert researchers in related departments.

7. Identify potential community-based resources (people, programs, organizations) which can assist your program. Form a community-advisory council and meet regularly with them to receive input about your curriculum and its relevance to community needs and job needs. With their help, survey the community to ascertain the kind and availability of jobs for graduates educated in your department. Invite these community leaders to your department seminars, parties and colloquia. Some may even be able to help teach applied courses or provide internship opportunities for your students.

8. Schedule an off-campus two-day retreat for your faculty, representatives of both graduate and undergraduate students, and interested community leaders. Generate a list of priorities, tasks, assignments, deadlines, needed resources, evaluation techniques, rewards.

Monitor and follow-up the priorities generated at the retreat. Avoid attempting too much work or you risk accomplishing nothing.

10. Establish committees consistent with your by-laws and academic plan. Be sure they meet regularly, have specific objectives and deadlines, report orally and in writing to the faculty, and are functioning properly.

11. Teach at least one undergraduate and one graduate course a year, hire a good administrative assistant, and spend much of your time making decisions and conducting necessary external public relations for your department. Be sure you have a time-management plan which allows you to devote appropriate time to decisions, issues, problems, and conflicts consistent with your academic plan and departmental objectives.

12. Maintain a high moral and ethical standard which sets a positive and appropriate climate for your department; without this climate, much of the above will probably fail.

REFERENCES

Blake, R. and J. Mouton. *The Managerial Grid.* Houston: Gulf Publishing Co., 1964.

Faust, W., "Group Versus Individual Problem Solving," *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology,* 59 (1959), 68-72.

Fiedler, F. "Engineer the Job to Fit the Manager," *Harvard Business Review,* 43 (1965), 115-22.

_________. *A Theory of Leadership Effectiveness.* New York: McGraw-Hill, 1967.

Goldhaber, G. *Organizational Communication.* Dubuque: William C. Brown Co., 1974.

Huse, E. and J. Bowditch. *Behavior in Organizations.* Reading, Massachusetts: Addison-Wesley, 1973.

Katz, D. and R. Kahn. *The Social Psychology of Organizations.* New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1966.

Likert, R. *New Patterns of Management.* New York: McGraw-Hill, 1961.

_________. *The Human Organization.* New York: McGraw-Hill, 1967.

McGregor, D. *Human Side of Enterprise.* New York: McGraw-Hill, 1960.

Miles, R. "Keeping Informed--Human Relations or Human Resources?" *Harvard Business Review,* 43 (1965), 148-163.

Morse, J. J. and J. Lorsch. "Beyond Theory Y," *Harvard Business Review,* 48 (1970), 146-155.

Redding, W. C. *Communication Within the Organization.* New York: *Industrial Communication Council,* 1973.

Roethlisberger, F. and W. Dickson. *Management and the Worker.* Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1939.

Rosenfeld, L., G. Goldhaber, and V. Smith. *Experiments in Human Communication.* New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, 1975.

Shaw, M. "A Comparison of Individuals and Small Groups in the Rational Solution of Complex Problems, *American Journal of Psychology,* 44 (1932), 491-504.

T F. *Principles of Scientific Management.* New York: Harper and Row, 1919.

OPERATIONALIZING THE ROLE AND FUNCTION OF THE DIVISION CHAIRPERSON IN THE COMMUNITY COLLEGE

Mary T. Newman

The community college has grown and become an important institution of higher education. Its unique functions must be understood before the role and function of the division chairperson within this institution can be understood. The community college may provide such educational specialties as remedial education, occupational education, and a two-year baccalaureate transfer program. These diversified programs are designed to meet the needs of the community college student whose profile may not look at all like that of an undergraduate student in a four-year college or university.

Because of this diversification of program, the community college chairperson must be more than a scholar in a subject area who may possess certain administrative skills. It is the purpose of this paper to operationalize the role and function of this community college division chairperson. The limited body of research in this area is taken into account, and recommendations are made as to how persons for this position might be selected and trained. The arguments concerning which is the better administrative unit, the department or the division, is outside the scope of this paper. Enough community colleges are arranged by division to make a study of the division chairperson a worthwhile one.

A division is defined by Pierce as "an academic entity into which are combined the subject matter disciplines of two or more related departments."[1] Its purpose is "to enhance interdisciplinary cooperation, cutting down on departmental warfare."[2] This may be expected to avoid polarizations and destructive competition,[3] and, thus, be less of an administrative encumberance.[4] This is particularly true since most community colleges have smaller student populations and fewer faculty members than do four-year colleges and universities.

Why must the person who administers the community college division be more than a subject matter specialist? In reviewing the literature, the characteristic behaviors needed by this person seem to be a list of things he or she must be able to do. Koehnline and Blocker list such duties as: represent the division, manage practical details, edit division work, develop curriculum and instruction, and deal with business and finance.[5] David Underwood, in "The Chairman as Academic Planner," claims that "clusters" of duties such as planning, organizing, evaluating, communicating, and controlling develop around the topics "curriculum," "faculty," and "resources."[6] Brann contends that the divisional system is more logical for community colleges, but bemoans the fact that there is a lack of qualified, dual-trained faculty members to draw from in selecting division chairpersons.[7]

If community colleges are organized according to division, and if it is difficult to find chairpersons trained in more than one academic subject area, perhaps another criteria for selecting these leaders is in order. Role is defined by Pierce as "the given societal context."[8] The role of division chairperson is developed through the patterns of behavior exhibited when carrying out the functions of this office. The functions have been described in the literature as "doing" kinds of things which can be evaluated by observation.

What does all this mean? If we can operationalize the role by describing the function of the division chairperson and evaluate it through observation of behavior, we can train a person to be a division chairperson no matter what the academic background. Or we can train division chairpersons without teaching backgrounds, if the things they *do* are unrelated to a specific academic background.

If role and function can be operationalized, learning objectives can be developed for those who aspire to the position of division chairperson. From the lists examined of what those in this position must *do*, more training in human relations, psychology, communication, and the social sciences seem to be in order. Some type of objectified screening device might be useful to keep out tyrants and lazybones.

If we accept the notions presented in this paper, our ways of interviewing, reviewing credentials, and selecting division chairpersons may change. We may begin to ask the candidate how well he or she can *do* those things that must be *done*, and how we can know this. We may begin to rewrite job descriptions, advertisements for positions open, and criteria for application. If we do [illegible] idea may catch on, and before we know it other administrative positions may be considered in[illegible]d to the role and function of the person in that position. Someone may even consider the teacher in this context. It may be an idea worth pursuing. And not only in community colleges.

1 Pierce, Harmon B., "The Role of Science Division Heads in Regionally Accredited Junior Colleges in the United States," unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Mississippi, 1971.

2 Brann, James, ed. *Academic as Department or Division Chairman: A Complex Role*, a collection of essays, p. 21.

3 *Ibid.*, p. 21.

4 Koehnline, William A., and Clyde E. Blocker, "Division Chairmen in Community Colleges,"

Academic. . ., p. 147.

5 *Ibid.*, pp. 148-149.

6 Underwood, David, "The Chairman as Academic Planner," *Academic. . .*, p. 155-157.

7 Brann, *op. cit.*, p. 21.

8 Pierce, *op. cit.*, p. 4.

PROPOSED STANDARDS FOR HIGH SCHOOL FORENSICS WORKSHOPS: FUNCTIONAL SERVICE FOR STUDENT PARTICIPANTS[1]

James Edward Sayer

At the 1972 Speech Communication Association Convention in Chicago, an action caucus was held to develop a statement of philosophy and objectives for the operation of high school forensics workshops.[2] The proposals and recommendations growing out of that discussion were finalized and published in the leading journal of forensic though,[3] but their impact upon the forensics community has been minimal, and the status quo has remained virtually unchanged. The recommendations of the 1972 conference were designed to foster further discussion, perhaps leading to the creation of a high school forensics workshop "code" similar to the existing AFA code for intercollegiate forensic activities. Unfortunately, the 1972 recommendations have received but benign neglect in the three years following their espousal.

However, it must be remembered that high school forensics workshops play an important part in the total educational forensics picture: they are national in both existence and scope; they are hosted by some of the nation's leading colleges and universities; they provide instruction to several thousand high school students yearly; and the annual support-costs run into thousands of dollars. Therefore, the examination of such workshops cannot and should not be easily pushed aside. Their existence requires continual study and appraisal.

Realizing, as does Donald G. Douglas of the University of Washington, that "forensic directors can no longer avoid taking into account the call for sweeping educational change in determining the specific programs for future forensic education,"[4] all administrators, regardless of bureaucratic level, must carefully examine their school's workshops in light of educational needs. The following material is offered as possible criteria for the makeup of such an examination.

The Philosophical Base

The philosophical underpinning of a high school forensics workshop must be the concept that the workshop exists as a service, a functional service, for the participating students. That is, decisions regarding staffing, costs, materials, curriculum--in short, all important policy decisions must be made with the students as the focal point of the decision-making process.

Of course, all workshop directors would give assent (lip service) to such a philosophical statement. However, when decisions are made on answers to such questions as "How do I find a job for this summer?" and "I wonder where I can pick up a few easy bucks?", there is a serious question as to the pedagogical intent of the workshop. Instead, workshops should be grounded upon such questions as:

(1) Is there a need for a workshop in this area?

(2) Can my school provide the necessary facilities to support a workshop?

(3) Can an adequate staff be assembled for the workshop?

Such questions provide the answers necessary for the determination of whether or not to begin/continue a workshop, and, most importantly, those types of questions are student-centered, resting upon the philosophy that forensics workshops should be functionally geared to student needs and interests. While it is true that summer workshops serve as an effective future-student recruitment device and as an additional source of income for workshop faculty, the rationale for the hosting of the workshop should not be based upon these fringe benefits. Workshops should be designed for the students to be served.

External Factors

After the establishment of the student-oriented philosophical base, there are four external factors that should be considered in the planning of a high school forensics workshop. As a group, these factors operate outside the actual functioning of the workshop itself but are critical to it.

First, the workshop must be pertinent to the overall educational experiences of the high school forensics student. It would be unfortunate if Pruett's discovery that seventeen percent (17%) of the 1970 University of Georgia workshop participants who did not feel the workshop helped in their overall educational development were generalizable to all high school forensic workshops.[5] The workshop must be relevant to the past and future forensic experiences of the students. Anderson and Matlon's national survey of high school programs revealed that "high school forensic programs are essentially contest oriented. . . .With few exceptions, high school forensic programs concentrate solely or primarily upon preparing students for formal contests or festivals."[6] Thus, to be relevant to the high school forensics program, the workshop will be competitive in nature--an important factor that has implications for internal factors within the functioning of the workshop.

Second, great care must be given to the selection of the staff who will teach at the workshop. As Sinzinger has noted, "the experience and competence of the staff will determine the quality of instruction and training provided by the institute."[7] Therefore, potential staff members must be scrutinized to determine their viability for workshop instructional purposes. The staff must be able to work with high school students and must be committed to the philosophical base of the primacy of serving the student participants. The 1972 recommendation that "the primary concern of the staff should be to serve students, not to obtain a summer position"[8] should serve as the guidepost for staff selection.

It must be remembered that either (a) being an intercollegiate debater, or (b) being an intercollegiate debate/forensics coach does not inherently qualify an individual for a *high school* forensics workshop staff position. The types of population being served are vastly different. It must also be remembered that a large, successful high school forensics program does not necessarily mean that that program's coach is an effective teacher. Sometimes programs grow and prosper despite the abilities of their coaches. In short, more careful staff selection must be made than at present to assure top-quality personnel for the benefit of the student participants.

Third, the cost to the student must be stringently monitored and controlled. All too often workshop directors have looked upon their programs as "fast buck" operations, wherein a minimum of effort will garner a sizeable amount of money. Over-staffing, unnecessary frills, mysterious surcharges, et al, add up to higher tuition and fees that must be borne by the students. Most workshop students have to make a significant sacrifice to attend institutes. They should be assured that everything for which they pay is necessary to their functional workshop training.

Matlon and Shoen have suggested that a thirteen-dollar per day cost to the student is the maximum amount that should be charged the student.[9] With that as a realistic guideline, the average two-week workshop should attempt to hold fees below $150, including all necessary charges for tuition, insurance, housing, meals, and materials.

Fourth, high school forensic workshops should be honestly and clearly described in all advertising and publicity packages and brochures. Sinzinger has suggested that such brochures should include a description of the program, the purpose of the program, the total cost, the areas of instruction, the staff, the method of training, and application procedures.[10] Certainly, this suggested list is quite sound in supplying the types of information that workshop publicity should include. Beyond that, brochures and publicity packages should be accurate in describing the construction and activities of the workshop. Purported benefits of workshop attendance should be carefully screened to assure realism and validity. High school forensics workshops have been notorious for spurious post hoc causal fallacies that assert workshop attendance has been the reason for later competitive success. As with coaching, some students do well in spite of workshop instruction.

In all cases, we must deliver that which we promise in our advertising. Workshop students often make personal and financial sacrifices to attend institutes; the institute should keep its promises or not make them at all.

Internal Factors

Having now described four critical external factors of high school forensics workshops, we may turn our attention to the internal operations of the workshops themselves. It is within this area, the internal factors, that most complaints about workshops arise, and it is within this a[illegible]at more effort needs to be channeled to assure functional service to the student partici-p[illegible] Again, four major factors warrant consideration.

First, it is imperative that high school forensic workshops de-emphasize the importance of "winning"--especially winning at all costs. While it is most certainly true that forensics is an inherently competitive activity with "winners" and "losers," we must take steps to put the competitive nature of the activity into better balance. Trophies, medals, and certificates are pleasant rewards for successful forensics involvement, but they are not the substantive benefits to be gained from such involvement. Years after the trophies have begun to tarnish and old debates begin to fade in memory, more lasting benefits should remain strong: increased communicative ability, improved powers of critical thinking, personality development, personal friendships--these are far more important than winning.

The recent concern over perversions of evidence, "trick" debate cases, and questionable ethical strategic ploys stem, in large part, from the all-encompassing desire to win, to be first, to be the champion. High school forensic workshops must teach the students that winning is important only if held in balance with long-term goals and ethical methods. To want to win requires that one also be able to lose. Unfortunately, workshops tend only to emphasize the former while castigating the latter, thereby providing an unrealistic and damaging view of forensic competition.

Second, high school forensic workshops should mandate the student research of evidence--at least as much as is feasible given the limitations of time and research facilities.[11] The dumping of hundreds of pieces of debate evidence upon the students by the workshop staff should be avoided Research that is mainly an exercise of cutting and pasting materials from handbooks and prepared evidence packages also must be avoided.

While the use of supportive documentation is an essential part of policy decision-making, it must be remembered that evidence is but a tool of the persuasive process, not its end. One must seriously question the value of giving each debate student one thousand pieces of evidence on the first day of the workshop--something that occurred at one workshop in the past. The student gains nothing from such a system: he does not improve his research skills; he does not benefit from the evidence since he is not able to place it in context. This type of so-called research should be halted.

Third, high school forensic workshops should operate to maximize individual instruction, a point affirmed by Matlon and Shoen: "Workshop faculties should be large enough to provide students with maximum individual attention. If wisely used, a student-faculty ratio of 10:1 is desirable."[12]

The factor of student-faculty contact is one that provides great problems for workshop directors. Often, a dilemma is created: to hold costs down, fewer staff are recruited which results in lessened individual contact. On the other hand, more individualized instruction may require more staff personnel which, in turn, means higher workshop costs to be borne by the students. Perhaps a viable mechanism for escaping this dilemma is the use of modular scheduling, a device that divides students into relatively small groups that operate on differing daily schedules. Thus, while one group has a free period for colleague discussion, another group has an intensive session with a staff member. Modular scheduling allows for increased personnel contact with students without having to increase the number of staff.

Fourth, great care should be given to the staff-student contact that is developed within the operations of the high school forensic workshop. Specifically, permanently assigning a group of students to one staff member throughout the course of the workshop should be discouraged, in that such assignment creates two severe problems. Permanent responsibility often creates the impression that "these are *my* students" for the staff member, leading to divisive and counterproductive personal competition between faculty and students. To assure his or her students' success, the staff member may overstep the bounds of functional instruction, actually becoming a workshop participant in researching evidence and writing debate cases. The purpose of the workshop is to aid the student, not to assuage the ego of every staff member.

Additionally, permanent assignment of staff denies the students the benefit of drawing upon the varied ideas and points of view available from all staff personnel. Workshop instruction should be a time of testing and experimentation of ideas and approaches, not just the one advanced by one controlling staff member. Only by rotating staff assignments will the students benefit from their intensive workshop experience.

Regardless of one's agreement or disagreement with the ideas offered here, it is hoped that the overriding philosophy will prevail: high school forensic workshops should provide functional service to the student participants. Accordingly, it is necessary to take steps to assure that this is being engendered by the numerous workshops in existence. It is an absolute necessity that workshops operate to serve the needs and interests of the students. Continual discussion and ap[illegible]l are necessary.

[1]Prepared for the Speech Communication Association Convention, December 27-30, 1975.

[2]"The Development of a Philosophy and Objective Statement for High School Workshops," J. E. Sayer and John W. Monsma, chairpersons.

[3]John W. Monsma and James E. Sayer, "Report of Action Caucus on High School Workshops," *Journal of the American Forensic Association*, X (Fall 1973), 111-113.

[4]Donald G. Douglas, "Toward a Philosophy of Forensic Education," *Journal of the American Forensic Association*, VIII (Summer 1971), 36.

[5]Robert Pruett, "The Student's Perception of the Effects of A Summer High School Debate Institute," *Journal of the American Forensic Association*, IX (Summer 1972), 280.

[6]Betty Anderson and Irene Matlon, "A Description of High School Forensic Programs: Report on a National Survey," *Journal of the American Forensic Association*, X (Winter 1974), 125.

[7]Richard A. Sinzinger, "Selecting A Forensics Institute: Pitfalls and Benefits," *Journal of the American Forensic Association*, IX (Spring 1973), 465.

[8]Monsma and Sayer, p. 113.

[9]Ronald J. Matlon and Richard L. Shoen, "Administration of Summer High School Debate Workshops: A National Poll," *Journal of the American Forensic Association*, X (Spring 1974), 221.

[10]Sinzinger, p. 464

[11]This is consonant with the recommendation of the 1972 conference. See Monsma and Sayer, p. 113.

[12]Matlon and Shoen, p. 222.

A BEGINNER'S GUIDE TO FUNDING RESEARCH, CREATIVE WORKS, AND PROGRAMS

Bruce E. Gronbeck and Harriet Douthitt

Applying for money to forward research, creative, curricular, and programming interests is like any other persuasive process. A person continually must work with a series of assumptions about the audience, the funding agencies. One must assume that funding agencies are composed of over-worked, impatient bureaucrats, people often disappointed by unfulfilled promises, often general readers rather than disciplinary specialists, and often faced with many, many more proposals than they ever can grant or even read thoroughly. Funding agencies are made up of middlemen, caught between the petitioners and the holders-of power-and-money (trustees, stockholders, other bureaucrats, and legislative committee personnel). A person wishing "outside" money for work,[1] therefore, faces a skeptical and even hostile audience; any applicant begins the persuasive process as a person with low trustworthiness and little chance for success.

Any reasonably well trained rhetor, however, relishes the challenge of an obstinate audience, especially when even the possibility of successful persuasion means that a person will have the time and resources available to both personally satisfy an ambition and contribute generally to knowledge, art, and human understanding. This essay, therefore, while recognizing the difficulties of these tasks, is predicated upon the assumption that the results of funding are worth the struggle.

Because many never have attempted to secure external monies, we seek in this article to offer general suggestions and guidelines for those undertaking grantsmanship for the first time. The seasoned applicant will probably only find a source or two not previously examined. But, for the beginner, we describe a five-step application process, with advice general enough to be serviceable for most interests; as we will note later, different funding agencies have varied requirements, but they can be explored by individuals after an understanding of the overall process is secured. Following a discussion of the five-step process are appendices listing utilitarian publications and sources of information.

Step 1: Selection of a Project

The advice, "first select a project," seems naively insulting, perhaps, for of course one first decides what to do. On the contrary, many beginners make one of two mistakes at the onset: (1) Some simply search through research announcements until they find an organization with a lot of money, and then try to fit a project to that organization's interests. (2) Others have in mind only a topic--say, male-female power relationships in communication--and then go hunting for organizations who fund communication projects. If a person only is on a financial fishing expedition or only has a vague topic in mind, he or she probably will get into intellectual and moral trouble. If one lets the funding agencies completely control ideas or if one is not particularly committed to a specific, tightly conceived project, either one will become an intellectual slave to someone else's perceptions of the world or else one may him- or herself unable to generate the enthusiasm and hard work necessary to follow through on a proposal and project.

So, know precisely what you want to do: Do you seek money for exploratory research into a new idea or concept? Are you seeking to implement into a curriculum a theory or pedagogy? Are you attempting to prepare materials--print or non-print--for fellow scholars, for students of a particular level, for a general audience? Are you setting up a continuing program, say, an archive on feminist discourse, or do you envision a piece of research or creative work which essentially is "one shot?" If the proposal does have aspects of continuance, are you situated in a school which will be willing to support it once it is launched? Do you have the substantive and methodological background as well as an administrative track-record to convince the hardened middlemen that you will follow through and complete what you start? Such questions as these probe your intellectual and emotional readiness for proposal-writing.

Outline your project carefully, then proceed to step two.

Step 2: In-House Discussions[2]

Before moving ideas outside your institution or school, be sure to talk with administrative personnel potentially affected and useful to you. A departmental executive officer, for example, should be appraised of your intentions, should you be asking for release time in the future, should you be committing departmental facilities, or should you be proposing to augment those facilities. The principal, superintendent, dean, vice-president for research, or office of research should also be approached. These people often have had several successful ventures into grantsmanship under their belts, and usually can offer helpful suggestions on proposal-writing, advice on sources of money, and specific guidelines on what you may and may not promise a funding agency in terms of facilities, long-range institutional commitments, etc.

Step 3: The Search for Appropriate Funding Agencies

One normally talks about two or three kinds of funding agencies: (1) governmental units, (2) philanthropic agenices or foundations, and, sometimes, (3) professional societies and university-based programs.[3] The National Endowment for the Humanities, the Ford Foundation, and the American Bar Association would be examples of each, respectively. Understanding the categories is important because of variations in application procedures, timetables, home-institutional support required, professional requirements, and the like. The federal Office of Education,

for example, will sometimes make long-term program commitments (say, to support a Community College Traineeship program for five years), while a private foundation may be less likely to; a person applying to the American Council of Learned Societies will have a greater chance for success if his or her professional organization is a member of ACLS than if it is not (and the Speech Communication Association currently is not); application forms for most governmental agencies are long, complex, but at least somewhat standardized, while those of philanthropic agencies often are short, of little guidance, and obstruse, and some may even require that you make a personal appearance before their trustees to plead your case. Your first task, therefore, is to acquire some understanding of the differences among these three kinds of funding agencies.

The second task within this step is to categorize your proposal, because proposals of different types often are submitted at differing times of the year. The National Endowment for the Humanities' breakdown of categories is instructive:[4]

1. Educational Programs (improve instruction and resources)
   - Project Grants (experimental courses, teaching materials, library materials, institutes and conferences, interdisciplinary courses and programs)
   - Institutional Grants (major curricular work, including planning grants to release people and acquire basic resources, program grants which support a fledgling program for up to three years, and developmental grants which fund full curricular reorganization)

2. Public Programs (affect the general adult public not in school)
   - Film/TV Grants (Public programming)
   - Museums and Historical Societies Programs (interpretive exhibitions, community education programs, personnel development programs)
   - Special Programs (innovative, "experimental" ideas)
   - Program Development Centers (regional touring teams)

3. Research Grants (scholarly and/or public research proposals)

4. Fellowships and Stipends (senior, younger, summer-only, and community college programs to support individuals)

These, as we noted, are NEH's categories. Other governmental agencies will have traineeship programs or funds designated solely for equipment purchase. To be sure, many foundations will not use these categories or even define their foci carefully in promotional materials, but at least an applicant should be able to use these terms.

Once you have determined a category, a general timetable, etc., searching the descriptive materials put out by funding agencies is in order. Normally, superintendents, deans, vice-presidents, and/or officers in research receive periodic announcements from governmental agencies wishing to support research or projects. These are easily available and usually you can be led through them by someone. Wending one's way through the list of philanthropic, foundation, professional, and university-based funding agencies, however, is another matter. The most important guides to philanthropy are both put out by the Council on Foundations, Inc., 888 Seventh Avenue, New York, New York 10019. The one, The Foundation Directory (currently, Edition 4), attempts to list all foundations (to date, 5, 454) of reasonable size offering funds; included in the Directory are general descriptions of awards, geographical or other limitations, and addresses.[5] The second, bi-monthly publication is Foundation News; it lists recent grants by field of interest, and often has articles of use to those seeking money.

In addition to these two and other[6] general helps, there are also publications devoted to more specialized research interests (see Appendix B). A good example is William L. Rivers and William Slater's Aspen Handbook on the Media.[7] In the 1975-76 edition will be found information on universities conducting major media research, other institutions doing it, and major institutions or agencies funding media projects. Because media-related projects are especially popular, the Aspen Handbook is invaluable.

Through all of these aids--and, often, blind luck at seeing an announcement or talking with someone else of similar interests--one ought to be able to discover two or three funding agencies particularly interested in the kind of project you envision. Matching your ideas and agencies' goals will lead you to step four.

Step 4: An Informal Application

In most cases, it is advisable next to make an informál, rather than formal, application to a funding agency. For some foundations (e.g. Exxon Education Foundation, Spencer Foundation) and for most state arts councils and the like, an informal application is a two-to-three page document, generally describing your institutional affiliation, the basic goals, scope, monetary needs, and time schedule for your project; evidence of other, similar research activity; and perhaps the names and addresses of knowledgeable persons who could be consulted. For most governmental agencies, an informal application is actually the regular application form completed in proper fashion; you simply indicate, however, that you wish an informal review for advice and consultation before you put the agency through its formal procedures.

An informal application accomplishes several things for a petitioner: (1) Most importantly, it gives you a gauge of your chances for success. If a foundation tells you it is not really interested in the type of proposal you wish to submit, you will have saved yourself time, work and frustration. (2) You very often get solid advice from the agency at the informal stage. A reviewer will tell you if you have made any technical mistakes in the application, if you need to clarify goals, procedures, budget, and the like, if you should bring in others, broaden or narrow your purposes, and so on. Most reviewers are candid in evaluating proposals informally, giving you the kind of feedback you need to maximize your chances for funding. (3) Rhetorically, we should add that an informal application increases your ethos; it shows that you are concerned for proper procedures, that you value the agency's advice, and that you are not simply slapping together a proposal in the last month before the deadline. Informal application indicates a healthy professionalism.

Step 5: Preparation of the Proposal

Assuming that you have made a successful inquiry on an informal basis, you are finally ready to build the proposal itself. The usual proposal--and of course there are many expectations--may contain the following forms or sections: (1) a cover sheet, summarizing the "hard" material from the proposal; (2) a budget sheet, invented by you or outlined by the agency; (3) specific questions around which you are expected to describe your project; (4) a call for personal data on the investigator, assistants, and/or consultants employed; and (5) evaluation sheets, to be completed by informed persons unconnected with the Project Director in institution. We shall examine these sections one at a time, using as a sample a proposal recently completed by Bruce Gronbeck.[8] This review will concentrate upon brief descriptions of items, and strategies to consider when drafting materials for those items.

(1) Cover sheet. Cover sheet information requested is pretty well standardized; you simply have to find out who represents your institution's authorizing officer and payee (normally a comptroller or business manager). Strategically, one has to think carefully about only two items--the title and the brief description. As with any title, the one on your application should be relatively short, informative, and at least reasonably engaging. Its descriptiveness, however, is its most important attribute, for it should trigger, as any encapsulation should, positive, informative associations with you and your project. Likewise, the brief description should concentrate upon "what," "how " and "for whom." Such descriptions not only remind application reviewers what your project is about, but furthermore they are often used for publicity and other kinds of public information. They must be able to stand alone as short, continuous messages; your credibility goes up in proportion to your ability to write short statements clearly.

(2) Budget page. "The budget," as Krathwohl states so wisely, "is an operational statement of the project in monetary terms."[9] Hiring investigators and secretaries, and paying for necessary supplies and equipment, computer runs, travel, preparation of manuscripts, mailings for, and reports following up, projects, and so forth, all cost money. Granting agencies know that, and are willing to pay for such items. Indeed, most people advising grant applicants argue that one should never undersell a proposal; a funding agency would rather see a more expensive, complete study done than a shoestring operation which could sacrifice quality. These agencies also know that no investigator really works in isolation, and hence they are willing, normally, to pay what are called "indirect costs"--costs incurred by an institution in providing space, lights, janitors, groundskeepers, and the like.

All of this is not to say, of course, that you should ask for the moon and three years off from teaching; obviously, funding agencies attempt to gauge the amount of intellectual, social, and pedagogical gain for how many and for what sorts of people they will see per dollar spent. Generally speaking, the more you ask for, the more gain for more people you ought to be able to project. In other words, when drawing up a budget, balance concerns for thorough professionalism and pragmatic implications. With these injunctions in mind, we can review the common terms one has to deal with:

"Salaries" represent the base salary of the Project Directors, annual salaries or portions thereof for secretaries and graduate assistants, and any fees paid to special consultants or guest lecturers. For example, on the NEH proposal, Gronbeck asked for 100% of his salary for the two months of the core grant period (because he will be doing nothing professionally but work on this project for those months) plus partial support for another nine months (which represents preparation and follow-up time). He has also estimated the amount of time a secretary will spend in preparing materials, mailings, final reports, and so on.

"Fringe Benefits" will vary from institution to institution, but generally every institution will know the percentage-of-base-salary fringe benefits represent. They should definitely be added into any proposal.

"Cost of Materials"--including duplication, office supplies, postage and telephone, and materials for students' use--are hard to estimate, but normally a funding agency will accept any reasonable figure.

"Indirect Costs," as we noted earlier, represent monies paid by institutions in supporting you and your activities. Institutions heavily into the grant-seeking business normally negotiate annually a specific indirect-cost figure with the government and leading foundations; a dean or vice-president will know that percentage. If none has been negotiated by your institution, you will probably have to have some administrative official--or the granting agency--offer you advice. Again, do not try to cut corners by deleting this item; it is an accepted cost, even though it will seem to outrageously inflate your proposal. Note, too, that sometimes ~~it~~ is calculated only on salaries and wages, and sometimes, on the entire budget. Check your school's policy.

"Cost Sharing" refers to the portion of the budget your institution is picking up. Many budget sheets will actually have two columns rather than one, wherein money being requested is listed in the first, and money being cost-shared or supplied by the institution is listed in the second. "Cost sharing" is sometimes required, sometimes not. A federal agency might demand that

at least one-to-ten percent be picked up by the home institution; some monies are given only on a matching basis--fifty-fifty; and, some foundations may require anything from one-to-ninety percent of the cost shared by the home institution.

If the funding agency you are interested in requires a substantial amount of cost-sharing, there are ways of generating the money on paper: (1) Institutional absorption of the Project Director's preparation and follow-up time. In the Gronbeck NEH proposal mentioned earlier, for example, about $1,900 of cost-sharing could be picked up by indicating that the 10% of nine months (for preparation and follow-up) will be assumed by the university. (2) Partial support or departmental absorption of supplies budget. Depending upon the budget involved, this could amount to a few hundred dollars to thousands on a major project. (3) Reduction of amount of Project Director's percentage-of-salary. If pushed, for example, the Gronbeck proposal could ask NEH to pay not 100%, but rather 50%, of his summary salary, reducing the proposal by another $2,138, plus a proportional amount in the fringe benefit category as well. In other words, were NEH to really "put the screws" on the Gronbeck proposal, he could cost-share over $10,000, or nearly 25% of his budget. Now, NEH would probably never ask for that much, nor would a department happily absorb the supplies budget in particular, but it could be done and yet not hurt the proposal substantially.

Keep in mind, really, that "budgets" are normally made up of paper-only monies, from a researcher's point of view. That is, were Gronbeck not to get his grant for the summer of 1976, he would still have his summer salary, would still have secretarial services and supplies, would still have a building to work in. The great bulk of most grants go to the institution supporting you; except for travel funds, hard equipment purchases, perhaps a research assistant, and the like, you, as grantee, seldom make monetary gains, unless, of course, they allow you to work during a summer when you normally would not be on a payroll. Your gains are not principally monetary, but temporal: grants allow you to be released from teaching and staff duties to pursue research, creative, or planning activities. Especially in these days of lessening monies, most funding agencies will look hard at proposals hiring several graduate assistants, installing computer facilities, providing expensive guest lecturers, etc.; your gain comes principally in the form of freedom.

In summary, the budget page often looks formidable, but once you go through it step-by-step, acquire a basic understanding of such terms as "indirect costs" and "cost sharing," and find out from appropriate persons what your institutional norms are for indirect costs and cost sharing, estimated secretarial and staff salaries, and the like, you can prepare a budget easily. When you do it, only heed the two injunctions suggested--do not undersell your project (for you will be doing no one in particular a favor), and make sure that your project description justifies every single item you list. The budget does operationalize monetarily what you are doing; your job is merely to cost it out.

(3) Proposal description. A funding agency or an administrator with grant-seeking experience is almost always ready to offer you informal advice on budget-building, title pages, and other technical aspects of proposals. The proposal will, however, ultimately rise or fall on what you can say about the idea and your own abilities to carry it forward to completion--our next two topics. One key to your persuasive task, then, lies in the strategic drafting of a proposal description, a task we will approach both generally and specifically.

Generally, most funding agencies are looking for clear answers to "what," "why," "for whom," and "how" questions--what you are doing, why it is important theoretically and/or practically, what segments of society will receive the benefits, and how you will go about achieving your theoretical and practical goals operationally. Generally, in other words, a project description is an informative-persuasive document, similar in many respects to a dissertation prospectus. In [illegible] many funding agencies will ask you to describe a proposal in prospectus-type categories--reasons for the study, previous research, questions to be answered, and methods employed for answering them.

More specifically, however, funding agencies often will structure a series of particular questions into which the what/why/for whom/how information is to be put. Because those questions vary enormously from agency to agency, we can offer only the most general sorts of advice:

No matter what else you want to say, answer the particular questions as asked. For example, the Gronbeck grant application is for money to fund a special summer school class for teachers already in four-year and community colleges. NEH wants them to get advanced training in humanistic endeavors, generally, and in their own fields, particularly. NEH further asks to be supplied with information on "the suitability of the library collections for the advanced nature of the work which the participants may undertake over and beyond their work for the seminar." Given the content--eighteenth-century public communication media--of the seminar proposed, from Gronbeck's point of view a more important question about Iowa's libraries is, "Do they have enough primary materials from eighteenth-century England and America to make this teachable?" Indeed, his first draft of an answer to the question bullheadedly concentrated upon describing Iowa's eighteenth-century collection. Only when carefully re-reading did he make the necessary revisions; he first answered the question as asked, and then, with a graceful transition--"Actually, a more important question regarding library collections relates to the seminar itself, given the fact that it demands eighteenth-century primary material"--got to information he deemed more relevant.

Attempt to write a proposal in the language-system of the funding agency. One often speaks of writing in "grantese," which is to say that most funding agencies habitually adopt certain terminologies--entire, circumscribed coding systems--for talking about various sorts of proposals. Even a casual check of The Foundation Directory shows that systems of language vary markedly from group to group. An example of language problems might be NEH's request that Gronbeck indicate "how the problem of transmitting humanistic understanding to college students is to be made an integral part of the seminar. (This should not be construed as the planning of curricula or pedagogical training.)" When faced with such an instruction, an applicant-for-monies starts bouncing off walls. What is "humanistic understanding" to these folks, and, if the question of transmitting such understanding to college students is not a question of pedagogy, what is it? First, he operationalized the concept "humanistic understanding" with references to philosophical or critical theory-building; that is, he talked about the kinds of theories humanists vis-à-vis scientists build. Second, being careful not to use the terms "curriculum building" and "pedagogy," he discussed ways in which so-called "humanistic" knowledge could be transmitted to non-experts, i. e., either young students or general adult audiences. Now, we all know that the question of theory-building is ultimately curricular, and the question concerning modes-of-presenting materials to students and the public is pedagogical. But, to meet NEH's concerns--i. e. to answer the question in the way they asked it--he carefully translated his thoughts into their language.

The notion of translation is especially important for investigators seeking funds from governmental agencies and foundations supporting educational research. The bureaucrats who write up proposal requirements often come from one particular school of educational theory rather than another; each school has its own vocabulary. Work hard--for your success will depend upon your effort--to translate your notions into theirs.

Do not skimp on describing how you will accomplish your goals. If you are proposing an experimental study, say, of reactions to male and female forms-of-address, detail your procedures, design, and statistical tests. If you are proposing a film documentary treating university administrators' communication networks, offer a minute-by-minute description of the film. If you are proposing survey research, historical research, creative projects, or whatever, similarly provide concrete discussions not simply of goals and knowledge-to-be-gained but also operational procedures. Indeed, it is even advisable--whether or not one is called for--to offer a full timetable of your activities, so that the reader can see that you can not only dream but also can pragmatically visualize the series of steps you will need to take to reach your goals.

Keep the proposal per se as neat, clean, and short as you can; use appendices for interesting/relevant/useful material not expressly called for. Special bibliographies, backgrounds on general university programs of which your proposal will be a part, discussions of consultants, theoretical defenses of pedagogical or critical points of view--such materials as these would probably clutter a proposal, break the flow. Put them in appendices. They demonstrate your thoroughness and expertise and indicate your concern that the reviewers fully understand programs and the like, yet they also show that you realize they are of secondary and not primary importance. They illustrate your professionalism.

Finally, the proposal description should stand as a continuous, well written piece of prose. The funding agency's questions may seem diverse and multi-faceted, but you must provide coherence to them. In the process of answering questions, do not simply offer terse, perfunctory answers, but rather, seek to make the agency's questions seem asked in the right order for the right reason. This means, technically, that you must work on transitions carefully, as you move from question to question; that you must use traditional rhetorical devices such as introductions, internal summaries, conclusions, and the like; and, that you must strike the balance between generalized abstractions and concrete examples or detail.

In summary, then, remember that proposal-writing is a rhetorical venture, one demanding audience adaptation. You are literally forced--and it all is frustrating--to take someone else's Weltanschauung (value system, attitudes, language, and habitual modes of acting) as givens, tailoring your own concerns to theirs. That is hard, time-consuming, and occasionally, even humiliating work; it goes against much, we are willing to wager, that you think you stand for. But as we noted earlier, you rise or fall on the quality of your adaptation. For validation of this comment, see Appendix C, which details the reasons proposals are rejected.

(4) Personal data. If the project description is one key to success, the second key is you--your education, professional duties, publications, previous awards, and the like. While you undoubtedly are accustomed to giving others such data, again keep in mind that it is useful for you to adapt it to funding agencies' concerns.

Lay out such data in a hierarchy representing the funding agency's or the proposer's principal interests. Because NEH, for example, is normally principally interested in supporting "scholars," one normally begins a vita for them with one's education, awards, and publications. Were you, however, proposing a curricular project to, say, the Exxon Education Foundation, you might be well advised to begin with your education and a listing of the courses you teach, as well as brief descriptions of curricular and pedagogical responsibilities you have had. Normally, we suggest using a primacy model--presenting the most relevant materials first, the next most relevant bits second, etc.

Chunk your bibliography in a manner appropriate to the funding agency's or the proposal's principal interests. Gronbeck, for example, in his NEH proposal, broke away from the usual modes-of-presentation, either a straight chronology or a formal categorization (books, articles, reviews, convention papers, etc.). Rather, he presented a bibliography by substantive category--"British Studies Generally," "Bicentennial Works," "Teaching and Pedagogical Concerns," "Media Studies," and "Rhetorical Criticism Generally." Each of those categories was relevant to the proposal; they tended to show his work in a manner which reflects the proposal's emphasis.

In other words, while most of you are accustomed to presenting important others with descriptions of yourself, do so in tactically sound ways. The same advice applies to the presentation of co-workers or consultants.

...ally, do not dump extraneous personal data into a proposal. Entitling a list of your wo... Selected Bibliography," not bothering to list, say, departmental committee responsiblities except as they bear upon experiences demanded by the proposal, avoiding gratuitous lists of

honors, etc.--these represent tactics designed to indicate (1) that you are not wasting an agency's time with irrelevancies, and (2) that you are the cool, not the indecorously overeager, professional. Let terseness and informativeness be your goals.

(5) Evaluation sheets. The last section of application forms usually consists of two or three copies of forms a granting agency wishes someone else to fill out. Agencies realize that they are not experts in all fields, and hence normally ask you to supply evaluators. Of course, they know you are likely to select ones who can be positive, but even so, these are important aspects of application. Three pieces of advice on evaluators are in order:

Make sure one of your evaluators knows you and your work well. If a funding agency receives only generalized comments from admittedly important people, they will discover only that you have big-time contacts. At least one of your recommenders should be able to speak or write from intimate knowledge of you; that recommendation will have detail, and an agency wants detail.

Try to have at least one evaluator with a recognizable title. Someone, for example, with a Speech Communication Association title (and letterhead) will look good in your packet.

And, if you can have a third letter, get it from some recognized scholar or contributor-to-the field, perhaps even someone outside the field of speech communication. To have in your file a letter of recommendation from someone who has a book on your bibliography or from an "outsider" never hurts.

Overall, then, the letters of recommmendation or evaluation should offer a funding agency specific remarks and positive comments from titled and/or recognized scholars, or artists. Furthermore, obviously it would be to your benefit to contact these evaluators before the funding agency does. If you have time, send these people a pre-submission copy of your proposal, for comments, so that they can see your concern for social amenities; and, amazingly enough, your potential evaluators might be able to make useful suggestions for alteration if you contact them early enough.

With that comment, we come to the end of proposal-writing. Hopefully, you have done all of this hard, time-consuming rhetorical composition early enough to give yourself time to make the necessary copies of a proposal and to get the necessary institutional signatures. If so, you can mail off the proposal (registered mail), and then simply sweat out the results. You will be infuriated with the lack of communication from the funding agency and you will be bothered by the picayune reasons--if any--given for your lack of success, but sooner or later you will receive support for research or proeects you think worth doing. Indeed, if you have carefully selected granting agencies to which to apply, your chances for success are greater than you might think, despite the dour picture we painted earlier in this article.

Along with a successful application will come the chance to make greater than usual contributions to knowledge and people's lives, as well as additions to your own intellectual and personal well-being. No doubt you will learn to curse follow-up and summary reports, budgetary tangles with your own institution's business office, the innumerable requests from others who have seen your successful application listed in various places, etc. Yet, we think that particularly in the instances of research, creative, and curricular projects treating communication and society, you will be able to take highly personalized pride in your potential contributions to this world, even if they must come one small step--one small grant--at a time.

[1]By "outside" or "external" money is meant funds generated outside your own institution; we will not be concerned with ways of convincing your own school to give you release time, equipment, etc.

[2]Additional advice on early consultation is given in PROJECT DIRECTOR'S MANUAL (rev. 1970; Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Office of Research Administration, 1970). A copy can be obtained from them.

[3]To this list could be added two sources--such organizations as state arts councils (who normally use very simplified application procedures) and individual philanthropists (about whom generalization is impossible).

[4]Each fall, NEH puts out a general description of its programs, by category. Other organizations often follow its breakdown and, more importantly, its understanding of these terms.

[5]The DIRECTORY lists foundations with assets over $500,000 or annual grants over $25,000. The Council on Foundations also provides another service; for 15¢ per card, one can receive photocopies of annual reports filed with the Internal Revenue Service, giving one detailed information on granting policies.

[6]See Appendix B.

[7]Published by the Aspen Institute Program on Communications and Society, Palo Alto, California.

[8]This was an NEH proposal under its "Summar Seminar" program. This program funds summer courses for community- and four-year college teachers-in-the-field, to broaden their backgrounds and to give them interdisciplinary work. Specifically, Gronbeck's proposal (still pending) was for a course in "public communication media" used by advocates during the American Revolutionary period; it is available, as a sample, upon request.

[9]David R. Krathwohl, HOW TO PREPARE A RESEARCH PROPOSAL (Syracuse, N. Y.: Syracuse Bookstore, 1966), p. 44. This publication is particularly good on social-scientific proposals.

APPENDIX A

Aids to Proposal-Writing

The beginner would be well advised to either seek expert counsel or read general sources on proposal-writing before moving into this business full steam. Below find a few representative helps. Many of these, however, are dated, so you are advised as well to occasionally survey such periodicals as FOUNDATION NEWS, THE GRANTSMANSHIP CENTER NEWS, PHILANTHROPIC DIGEST, and THE CHRONICLE OF HIGHER EDUCATION, for timely help, tips, and news on sources of funds.

Church, David M. SEEKING FOUNDATION FUNDS. New York: National Public Relations Council of Health and Welfare Services, Inc., 1966. (419 Park Avenue South, New York, NY 10016.) $1.50.

Culbertson, Jack A., and Stephen P. Hencly (eds.). EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH; NEW PERSPECTIVES. Danville, Illinois: Interstate Publishers, 1963. See Egon Guba's chapter on proposals.

"A Guide to Obtaining and Administering Sponsored Research." (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Office of Research Administration, September 1, 1970.) Available upon request.

Hall, Mary. DEVELOPING SKILLS IN PROPOSAL WRITING. Corvallis, Oregon: Office of Federal Relations, 1971. (Extension Hall Annex, University Campus, Corvallis 97331.) $10.00.

Krathwohl, David R. HOW TO PREPARE A RESEARCH PROPOSAL. Syracuse, N. Y.: Syracuse University Bookstore, 1966. (303 University Place, Syracuse 13210.) $1.00.

Lindvall, Carl M. "The Review of Related Research." PHI DELTA KAPPAN. Vol. 40 (1959). P. 180.

PROJECT DIRECTOR'S MANUAL. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Office of Research Administration, 1970. (Ann Arbor 48104.)

Smith, Gerald R. "How to Write a Project Proposal." NATION'S SCHOOLS. Vol. 76, No. 2 (1965). Pp. 33-35, 57.

"Sponsored Projects Administration Services Manual; Section II: Guidelines for Preparation and Routing of Proposals." Iowa City: Research Services and Administration Section, August 1972. (University of Iowa, Iowa City, Iowa 52242.)

APPENDIX B

Aids to Sources of Funds

<u>Periodicals:</u>

FOUNDATION NEWS. Published bi-monthly by Council on Foundations, Inc. 888 Seventh Avenue, New York, New York 10019. Good journal on general philanthropy. Includes grants index covering recent grants, listed by field of interest. $10.00/year. Bi-monthly.

THE GRANTSMANSHIP CENTER NEWS. Grantsmanship Center. 7815 South Vermont Avenue, Los Angeles, California 90044. Contains articles of help, e. g. Vol. 3, Jan., 1974, includes "How to Use and Not Mis-Use the Foundation Directory" and "Philanthropy in a Changing Society." Bibliographies. $10.00/year.

PHILANTHROPIC DIGEST. Brakeley, John Price Jones, Inc. c/o Mrs. Gladys F. MacGee, Editor, 6 East 43rd St., New York, New York 10017. Summary of news and giving to education, health, religion, welfare, and the arts. $10.00/year. 16 issues/year.

HIGHER EDUCATION AND NATIONAL AFFAIRS. American Council on Education. One Dupont Circle, Washington, D. C. 20036. Good journal covering governmental actions relevant to education. Free to university administrators. 40 times per year.

THE CHRONICLE OF HIGHER EDUCATION. The Chronicle of Higher Education. 1717 Massachusetts Avenue, N. W., Washington, D. C. 20036. Good, interesting reading on current topics and events in education, including funding. $20.00/year. Weekly.

NON-PROFIT REPORT: THE PHILANTHROPY MONTHLY. Non-Profit Report, Inc. 205 Main Street, Danbury, Connecticut 06810.

REPORT ON EDUCATION RESEARCH. Capitol Publications, Inc. Suite G-12, 2430 Pennsylvania Avenue, N. W., Washington, D. C. 20037. Journal of highlights of current education research projects. $40.00/year. Bi-weekly.

FEDERAL NOTES. Office of Federal Relations, Division of Continuing Education, Extension Hall Annex, University Campus, Corvallis, Oregon 97331. Notes on upcoming governmental actions.

EDUCATION-TRAINING MARKET REPORT. E. F. Shelley and Co., Inc. 1730 Rhode Island Avenue, N. W., Washington, D. C. 20036. Articles on current national topics, including budget appropriations, personnel changes, research programs, etc. Bi-weekly.

BEHAVIORAL SCIENCE NEWSLETTER FOR RESEARCH PLANNING. American Institutes for Research. Suffridge Building, Suite 221-225, 1775 K Street, N. W., Washington, D. C. 20006. Current events in the behavioral sciences.

Other Support Source Information:

ANNUAL REGISTER OF GRANT SUPPORT. Academic Media, Division of Computing and Software, Inc. 32 Lincoln Avenue, Orange, New Jersey 07050. A guide to grant support programs of governmental agencies, foundations, and business and professional organizations. Annual. $35.00.

ASPEN HANDBOOK ON THE MEDIA. Ed. William L. Rivers and William Slater. Palo Alto, California: Aspen Institute Program on Communications and Society, current 1975-76. See the paper for information carried.

THE FOUNDATION DIRECTORY. Columbia University Press, in cooperation with The Foundation Center, Washington, D. C.. Reference book containing raw data on 5,454 foundations with assets over $500,000 or annual grants over $25,000. Published every 3-4 years.

THE TAFT INFORMATION SYSTEM. Taft Products, Inc. 1000 Vermont Avenue, N. W., Washington, D. C. 20005. Membership rate of $185/year includes looseleaf binder with in-depth information on major foundations, with periodic updates, revisions, news flashes, etc. Excellent source.

CATALOG OF FEDERAL DOMESTIC ASSISTANCE. Superintendent of Documents, U. S. Governmental Printing Office, Washington, D. C. 20402. Comprehensive listing and description of federal programs and activities which provide assistance or benefit to the American public. It includes over 1,000 programs administered by over 60 federal agencies, departments, commissions, and councils. $7.25/year.

SOURCES OF INFORMATION ON FUNDS FOR EDUCATION. Office of Federal Relations, Division of Continu- Education, Extension Hall Annex, University Campus, Corvallis, Oregon 97331. An annotated bibliography on publications concerning funds available for education.

A GUIDE TO FEDERAL FUNDS FOR URBAN PROGRAMS AT COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES. Office of Urban Programs, American Association of State Colleges and Universities. Information on programs for support of urban projects.

APPENDIX C

Reasons Why Proposals Fail

Assuming that funds are available, and that neither geographical nor political factors can affect you, proposals should rise and fall on the merits of the ideas and the quality of the presentation. The following is a list of shortcomings of 605 proposals rejected by the National Institutes of Health, published by Dr. Ernest M. Allen (Chief of the Division of Research Grants, National Institutes of Health) in SCIENCE, 132 (November 25, 1960), pp. 1532-34. We took this material in abstracted form from A GUIDE FOR WRITERS OF RESEARCH PROPOSALS (Ann Arbor: Office of Research Administration of the University of Michigan, September 1971), pp. 15-16.

A. PROBLEM (58 percent)		
1.	The problem is not of sufficient importance or is unlikely to produce any new or useful information.	33.1
2.	The proposed research is based on a hypothesis that rests on insufficient evidence, is doubtful, or is unsound.	8.9
3.	The problem is more complex than the investigator appears to realize.	8.1
4.	The problem has only local significance, or is one of production or control, or otherwise fails to fall sufficiently clearly within the general field of health-related research.	4.8
5.	The problem is scientifically premature and warrants, at most, only a pilot study.	3.1
6.	The research as proposed is overly involved, with too many elements under simultaneous investigation.	3.0
7.	The description of the nature of the research and of its significance leaves the proposal nebulous and diffuse and without a clear research aim.	2.6
B. APPROACH (73 percent)		
1.	The proposed tests, or methods, or scientific procedures, are unsuited to the stated objective.	34.7
2.	The description of the approach is too nebulous, diffuse, and lacking in clarity to permit adequate evaluation.	28.8
3.	The overall design of the study has not been carefully thought out.	14.7
4.	The statistical aspects of the approach have not been given sufficient consideration.	8.1
5.	The approach lacks scientific imagination.	7.4
6.	Controls are either inadequately conceived or inadequately described.	6.8
7.	The material the investigator proposes to use is unsuited to the objective of the study or is difficult to obtain	3.8
8.	The number of observations is unsuitable.	2.5
9.	The equipment contemplated is outmoded or otherwise unsuitable.	1.0
C. INVESTIGATOR (55 percent)		
1.	The investigator does not have adequate experience or training for this research.	32.6
2.	The investigator appears to be unfamiliar with recent pertinent literature or methods.	13.7
3.	The investigator's previously published work in this field does not inspire confidence.	12.6
4.	The investigator proposes to rely too heavily on insufficiently experienced associates.	5.0
5.	The investigator is spreading himself too thin; he will be more productive if he concentrates on fewer projects.	3.8
6.	The investigator needs more liaison with colleagues in this field or in collateral fields.	1.7

D. OTHER (16 percent)

1. The requirements for equipment or personnel are unrealistic. 10.1
2. It appears that other responsibilities would prevent devotion of sufficient time and attention to this research. 3.0
3. The institutional setting is unfavorable. 2.3
4. Research grants to the investigator, now in force, are adequate in scope and amount to cover the proposed research. 1.5

(NOTE: These percentages do not total 100%, of course, because any given proposal could have been rejected for more than one reason.

THE EMERGENCE OF THE SELF-PACED CLASS: A RECENT INNOVATION AT THE UNIVERSITY OF SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA

The concept of self-paced learning is not a new one, but it has taken a decidedly new form in the graduate program of the Annenberg School of Communications at the University of Southern California.

Annenberg's self-paced classes have mid-terms and finals; however, in no other way do they resemble ordinary classes. There are no lectures or classroom meetings. Instead, students are given lists of learning objectives toward which they gear their study as they do readings or work with audio-visual materials in the school's "learning center."

Students set their own study schedules and meet individually or in small groups with professors when they have questions about the materials. Occasional discussion groups and field trips complement this self-paced system.

Many courses take advantage of audio-visual materials, such as videotapes, for teaching communication concepts. In the words of the Dean of the Annenberg School, Dr. Fredrick Williams, "We can teach a student about communication technologies not only in audio-visual lessons but in the student's actual use of the technologies to obtain the lesson."

The primary advantage of the self-paced classes is that they allow the learning experience to be maximized by eliminating unnecessary experiences and by placing the primary responsibility for learning on the student. In a sense, it is a matter of efficiency: students have only to study material new to them and professors do not have to repeat what is covered in the assignments or gear their lectures to students who have had no prior exposure to the subject. In addition, therefore, professors are free to devote more time to individual consultations and research projects.

An advantage of self-paced classes peculiar to Annenberg is that mid-career professionals who wish to take one or two classes per semester while continuing in their jobs can do so with relative ease. The "learning center" is open from 10 a.m. to 10 p.m. four days a week, and from 10 a.m. to 5 p.m. one day a week.

Expansion of the school will eventually take the form of locating curriculum at remote learning sites. Currently there are plans to offer selected self-paced classes in Iran so a student could begin studies in the Annenberg School before coming to the United States.

Both students and professors seem to be happy with the self-paced classes, although most admit to an initial awkwardness--a result of being conditioned to conventional teaching methods. Whether most learning institutions could adopt such self-paced learning advantageously is questionable, but Annenberg has found it ideal for its needs.

Michele McGlade

"FREE CHOICE," "INFORMED CHOICE," NO CHOICE

Despite the rather bleak job prospects facing the humanities student today, the Association of Graduate Schools (AGS) reports that graduate enrollment has not decreased to any significant extent. In its report (abstracted in Behavior Today, October 27, 1975, Vol. 6, #39), the AGS responded to a request from the Association of American Universities (AAU) for a statement on the desirability of any form of national planning to determine graduate enrollment. Their response: ". . .the substitution of a governmental decision for a private one on something as personal and important as education would violate our tradition of individual choice in a free society. On a more pragmatic level, manpower forecasts are not accurate enough to be given such weight. . .. They may be usefully taken into account by a student faced with a career decision, but they are too unreliable to be the basis of a national quota system." They continue by advising graduate departments to inform their students of the current national forecast for job opportunities in their chosen fields, and further suggest that "*every professional group, including its academic members, should review the prospective supply-demand ration sic in its field and advise the academic community accordingly.*" (Italics mine)

In the field of education, particularly, the outlook is grim to the point where the increase in graduate enrollment has assumed an air of Darwinian struggle. According to the AGS report, "much of the increased enrollment appears to be the result of defensive credentialing--that is, by teachers seeking to stave off dismissal by securing a master's or a doctorate in education." We can see, then, that although teaching positions have decreased drastically, with no visible signs of improvement in the near future, scores of students are continuing to pursue graduate degrees in education which might sooner lead them to the unemployment line rather than the groves of academe.

The abstract of the AGS report is concluded with a summary of three steps called for by the AGS to improve the quality of graduate education and its usefulness to students: 1) assessment of departments and programs, to include both internal assessments and those conducted by visiting committees on a systematic, periodic basis, using methods of greater validity than mere "reputation" surveys; 2) publication of placement information pertaining to recent graduates by individual departments; and 3) publication of job market forecasts as a guide for prospective students.

Michele McGlade

AFFIRMATIVE ACTION IN DOCTORAL PROGRAMS: (WHAT IS) THE REAL STORY

In a recent issue of *Science* magazine,[1] Joseph L. McCarthy and Dael Wolfle, in "Doctorates Granted to Women and Minority Group Members," published findings from a survey they conducted among universities affiliated with the Association of American Universities (AAU). To date, 75% of all doctorates granted in the United States have been awarded by these 46 AAU universities. Because these institutions are among the most distinguished and highly recognized in the country, thereby offering a 'choice market' for the recruitment of faculty members, it was felt by the authors that their present trends in granting doctorates to women and minority group members would be both of interest and help in identifying those trends in terms of the nation as a whole.

Information on the number of doctorates awarded in each field from July 1, 1972 to July 1, 1975 to women and minority group members was requested from the graduate dean of each AAU member university; with but two exceptions, each institution supplied data. Where data was incomplete--a relatively infrequent occurrence--proportionate estimates were given. A general summary of their findings reveals significant data, indicating both new trends and directions, and concomitantly illustrating the continuation of traditional academic pursuits vis-a-vis women and minority group members. It should be noted that, for the purposes of this survey, the minority groups referred to here are the four principal minority groups of the United States: Afro-Americans, American Indians, Asian-Americans, and Spanish-surnamed Americans.

The number of doctorates at AAU institutions is not substantially increasing above the 1969-72 level, with an increase of less than 0.7% between the 1971-72 and the 1972-75 periods. This small increase is apparently attributable to the substantial increase of women and minorities receiving the doctoral degree. However, among the 712 "distinguished and strong departments" (Roose-Andersen survey, 1969) of the AAU schools, a 3% decline in the total number of doctorates from 1969-72 to 1972-75 was observed. "Majority men show a decrease of 7% in these departments (com-pa[illegible]th a decrease of 9% for all departments); majority women increase 39% (34%); minority men in[illegible] 47% (61%); and minority women increase 221% (133%).

During this six-year period (1969-75), of all the doctorates awarded in the natural sciences, mathematics, engineering, religion, and business administration areas, women received less than 10%. In contrast, women received over 25% of the doctorates in the fields of speech, English, Romance and Germanic languages, social work, health sciences and home economics. In the 1969-72 period, 47% of all doctorates granted to women were in six fields only: anthropology, biology, education, health science, psychology, and Romance language. For 1972-75, 45% are still in these six fields.

Minority group members received 3% or less of the doctorates awarded during this period in the fields of the natural and biological sciences, engineering, mathematics and related fields, classics, linguistics, business administration, religion, and agriculture, while they received five percent or more of the doctorates in the fields of social work (15%), Romance languages, education, library science, atmospheric sciences, pharmaceutical sciences, fine arts, philosophy, and specialized biological sciences. The concentration of 52% of all doctorates awarded to minorities was found in five specific fields: education (28%), engineering (8%), chemistry (6%), foreign languages (5%), and psychology (4%).

The distribution of 1973 decotrates is further broken down in the study according to racial and ethnic group and field of doctoral specialization. The data--gathered from students of United States citizenship and those here on immigrant visas, only--reinforces the point that minority group students are unevenly distributed among specific areas of concentration, and further show that the four minority groups differ substantially in their interests as follows:

1. Over 80% of those doctorates received by students of Asian ancestry were in the sciences and engineering; and 75% of all minority members of the national stock of doctoral-level scientists and engineers are of Asian background. This concentration is equally consistent in both native-born Americans of Asian ancestry and those of foreign birth.

2. The 1973 black doctoral recipients were also broken down into two groups: native-born and foreign-born. Here, as opposed to the Asian-American group, distributions were clearly marked, with the former group concentrated heavily in education (60%), while members of the foreign-born group were much more often found in the scientific fields.

3. American Indian and Spanish-surnamed students are most like the white majority in terms of their distribution across the fields of specialization. The former group was largely concentrated (50%) in the sciences and engineering fields, 30% in education, and the remaining 20% in various other fields. Native-born Spanish-surnamed recipients were distributed across the fields of specialization in a way similar to the general majority of students, but with a marked preference for the arts and humanities. Combined, the American Indian and the Spanish-surnamed students account for only one-fifth of the minority total.

Those who are familiar with the 1973 National Research Council (NRC) survey on racial and ethnic information on doctorates conferred by United States universities will undoubtedly note a

conflict between the NRC's statistics and those included in this study by McCarthy and Wolfle. The NRC survey reported that 11.8% of all doctoral recipients in 1972-73 were members of the four primary minority groups, and an additional 2% were members of other minority groups. However AAU universities expected to award only 5.8% of all their doctorates to minorities in 1972-75. This vast difference in data prompted to NRC to execute a special analysis of 1973 doctorates which explains the conflict in figures. The analysis revealed that NRC data was obtained through self-reports at the time of receipt of the doctorate, and that of the 1973 minority doctoral recipients, only 37% were United States citizens, with an additional 29% in the country on immigrant visas, and 34% of other types of visas.

McCarthy and Wolfle's data came from institutional records, with each of those AAU deans supplying information using a different system: non-citizens were included by some universities in their minority counts, while two universities excluded Asian-American students from their counts, and four included blacks only. Thus, while their figure of 5.8% from the AAU schools is slightly underestimated, the NRC figure of 11.8% is clearly overestimated.

In summation, it is seen that the AAU universities--the prime 'marketplace' for the recruitment of new faculty members--are significantly increasing the number of Ph.D.'s awarded to women and minority members, and are decreasing the number awarded to majority males. Between 1969-72, and 1972-75, doctorates awarded by these universities to majority men declined by 9%; to majority women, increased by 34%; to minority men, increased by 61%; and to minority women, increased by 133%. While such statistics strike an optimistic note in the ears of women and minority doctoral candidates, both present and future, the overall melody is a bit off-key when we stop to consider the job prospects facing us.

Michele McGlade

---

[1]Joseph L. McCarthy and Dael Wolfle, "Doctorates Granted to Women and Minority Group Members: What Changes Have There Been in Recent Years in Numbers and in Distributions Among Fields of Study?", *Science*, 189 (September 12, 1975), pp. 856-859.

BRINGING DINNER THEATRE TO THE COLLEGE AND COMMUNITY

Brice Wilkinson

A recent innovation at Winona State University was created, at no cost to the University, and with unlimited potential for theatre students, actors in the local community, cultural enlightenment, and departmental and university good will: dinner theatre.

Dinner theatre provides the theatre student with a new surrounding quite different from the secluded, protected arena of the college or university stage. Hecklers, drunks, conversationalists, kitchen help, and barroom noise are quite a change from the traditional audience and stage of collegiate theatre. Practice on an unfamiliar set without the benefit of the scenery to be used in the production is more frequently the rule rather than the exception, since the dinner theatre stage is often unavailable for evening practice or even auditions. Parties or previous business commitments, often a band, bingo, or other activities, such as a governor's luncheon or an annual boat club coon feed, will interrupt any schedule you may have planned: The challenges are novel for the collegiate actor and thespian. The benefits, however, seem to far outweigh the disadvantages, what with a new audience, new stage, a business atmosphere ("if the public doesn't pay, you won't stay"), and the chance to list some semi-professional experience on the student vita sheet. You will, if successful, provide valuable experience for student and community actors which can provide challenge and growth to the involved students and department.

An open audition to mix adult community talent with collegiate personnel helps the young actor and should enhance the end results of all the performances, while also providing the community actor with an outlet for his or her often dormant talent. Thus, you hope to provide theatre for the masses while involving some of the neglected or graduated talent in a setting for theatrical expression.

Dinner theatre brings the theatre to the poeple, a much-needed avenue if theatre is to provide enlightenment, comedy, history and lessons-in-life for the public. A dinner theatre patron can be an avid theatre fan, a walk-in, or a person out for an enjoyable meal and a good night's entertainment. He is relaxed, but not captive, since he chose to attend; he is sometimes intoxicated, but generally quite at ease and, by the second act, receptive to a good show regardless of his theatre background. The man on the street may, and often does, hesitate and fear to attend productions staged on the college campus, foreign to him, while quite ready to accept a friend's advice to attend a well-done dinner theatre performance in a popular local night spot. The opportunity to reach a new clientele for good theatre is definitely present.

The department at Winona State University invested nothing. It merely sold the idea to a local supper club and found a talented graduate student director to manage at one-half the ticket price for the play, with the other half of the admission going for production costs and a student internship program in dinner theatre. The management keeps the dinner fee, drink fees, and any spin-off in increased business. Dinner theatre can and should bring new clientele to a supper club, and it can be sold to management as a means to build business on slow nights. The department need only find an enterprising restaurant or night spot that is willing to take a small gamble. The department will not ruin or compete against its on-campus offerings, but it must realize that it takes initiative and courage to innovate and deviate from the safe path of tradition. Conservative department members will be worried about detracting from student productions and possibly adding extra work to their own already overburdened schedules. If handled properly, the student and community talent should shoulder the major responsibilities of production and performance.

The college now has a new catalog offering new challenges and programs for students, has contributed to the community night life, has gotten many students into the business community, has brought theatre to the people and has illustrated that theatre is a saleable product at the local level. Theatre makes a contribution to the improvement of the life of the everyday citizen; dinner theatre brings that enhanced entertainment, enlightenment or great lesson of history into the citizens' and non-college theatre goers' lives. When handled correctly, dinner theatre enable both theatre and the department to reap real benefits in good will and cultural contribution to the community. Student and departmenal growth, due to an innovative and creative new adjunct to the traditional departmental and collegiate theatre offering, makes the challenge both attractive and potentially rewarding.

Why isn't more of this type of theatrical innovation being done on the college and university level? Each reader must and should answer this question for him- or herself. To involve your department in this question, why not present the possibility of this new and exciting challenge at your next departmental meeting and do your part in building a new student offering while bringing theatre to the public in your community.

Record of Winona State University's Dinner Theatre Effort

First, we sold the idea to the management of a local supper club with an inadequate stage--and inadequate lighting--at the beginning of the fall term, 1975. We then selected a good play with a small cast that would hopefully set a standard of excellence for the future. Another step was to improve the inadequate stage and lighting facilities.

Advantage was taken of all free news media coverage on radio, television and in newspapers, and by university press releases and personal appearances. A non-profit dinner theatre account was established so that more free news coverage was possible. The Communication and Theatre Arts Department cooperated with the local management and established ten four-credit-hour student internships in theatre, in the areas of technical production, acting, business management and publicity. These were token paid internships to provide semi-professional experience and incentiv to students.

The Department attempted to keep established summer community theatre and other groups with boards of directors and staffs, including our own, as separate from the hired manager-director as possible. The management of the supper club worked solely with the graduate student manager-director.

The upcoming production was advertised with posters, newspapers, and whatever the limited, often non-existent, budget allowed. We contacted all the local service organizations and clubs with offers of a free program of excerpts from the play for their groups. The show played Wednesday and Thursday nights for a six-week run to over 600 people. At $2.00 per ticket the show broke even and new student and community interest insured the successful casting and production of future runs. The total buffet and theatre price was a low $5.95 per ticket. It should be noted that this was genuine dinner theatre, with the patrons eating in the same area prior to, and often during, the play. Try to select a setting where this arrangement is possible, to make dinner theatre the experience it should be, where all of the sense modalities of the audience are stimulated. The setting need not be like the Marriott Inn Drury Lane North Theatre in Chicago, with its so-called 'dinner theatre.' There patrons, if they choose, eat first and then go to a separate 800-seat theatre. Is such a setting really dinner theatre, or merely transplanted traditional stage theatre? Most colleges have an adequate collegiate forum, so seek to establish a new arena that is a true dinner theatre, providing new challenge and potential.

We envision someday employing an artist-in-residence both on-campus and in the dinner theatre. and will hopefully provide gainful employment for the manager-director and valuable experience for our would-be actors and other theatre personnel.

The supper club management is still enthusiastic about the results, and this, together with the overwhelming critical and public response, supplmented by growing student interest and participation, causes us to conclude that the future looks bright for dinner theatre in Winona, Minnesota. Our University-management agreement to date has been a "gentlemen's agreement." The total cost has come from the admission price with no expenses paid from either the supper club management or the University Department. We both conclude that the potential for business growth in dinner theatre is unlimited, and with continued success a formal, contractual business arrangement is possible in the future.

ABOUT THE AUTHORS

Robert N. Hall is ACA Staff Coordinator and Editor of the *BULLETIN*.

Robert L. Heath is an Associate Professor in the Department of Speech at the University of Houston, Texas.

James Sayer is an Assistant Professor, Department of Speech Communication, Wright State University Dayton, Ohio.

Lawrence Chase is an Assistant Professor in the Department of Communication, Cleveland State University, Ohio.

Norbert Mills is an Assistant Professor, Department of Speech Communication, University of Toledo, Ohio.

Beatrice M. Romano is an Instructor of Speech in the Department of English at Rockland Community College, Suffern, New York.

Ronald L. Applbaum is an Associate Professor in the Department of Speech Communication, California State University, Long Beach.

Gerald M. Goldhaber is an Associate Professor in the Department of Speech Communication at the State University of New York, Buffalo.

Mary T. Newman is an Instructor of Speech Communication at the Pennsylvania State University campus in Abington.

Bruce E. Gronbeck is a Professor in the Department of Speech and Dramatic Art, University of Iowa, Iowa City.

Harriet Douthitt is a doctoral student in the Department of Speech and Dramatic Art, University of Iowa, Iowa City.

Michele McGlade is the Assistant to the Editor, ACA *BULLETIN*.

Brice Wilkinson is the Chairperson, Department of Speech Communication, Winona State University, Minnesota.

GROWTH!

NATIONAL VISIBILITY!

IMPACT!

SCA offers excellent avenues for bringing your departmental program to the attention of a large, nation-wide audience of students and professional colleagues:

<u>Quarterly Journal of Speech</u>

<u>Communication Education</u>

The Combined <u>Directory</u>

Convention Program

SCA Advertising Supports Your Program and Supports Your Professional Association

SCA Publications are Multiple Reader Publications

It (still) Pays to Advertise!

* * * * * * *

For full information about rates, dates, and contracts, write

Wilson Korpi
Speech Communication Association
5205 Leesburg Pike
Falls Church, VA 22041

THE ACA BULLETIN

Robert N. Hall
Staff Coordinator & Editor

Michele McGlade
Assistant to the Editor

The ACA BULLETIN is a quarterly publication of the Association for Communication Administration. The BULLETIN is published by the ACA, 5205 Leesburg Pike, Falls Church, Virginia 22041.

Membership in the ACA is open to any Speech Department or administrative unit at an annual dues of $25.00. Inquiries should be directed to the Staff Coordinator.

Articles are welcomed for consideration for publication in the BULLETIN. Manuscripts should be typed double-spaced. Two copies of each manuscript should be submitted.