

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 127 967

IR 003 932

TITLE National Survey of Film and Television Higher Education; Report of Findings.
INSTITUTION American Film Inst., Washington, D.C.
SPONS AGENCY National Endowment for the Arts, Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE Aug 76
NOTE 31p.

EDRS PRICE MF-\$0.83 HC-\$2.06 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Colleges; Curriculum; Films; *Film Study; *Higher Education; *National Surveys; *Tables (Data); *Television; Universities

ABSTRACT

These data are the result of a survey taken in 1975 by the American Film Institute to assess individuals and organizations actively involved in film and/or television education. Survey instruments were sent to 3,276 film and/or television educators at colleges and universities throughout the United States. Tabular summaries of the 784 responses provide information on staff characteristics, staff attitudes, program resources, and program needs. (EMH)

* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *

ED127967

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

NATIONAL SURVEY OF FILM AND TELEVISION HIGHER EDUCATION

REPORT OF FINDINGS

THE AMERICAN FILM INSTITUTE

August 1976

IR003932

Study Committee

Task Force Group:

Raymond Fielding
Department of Radio/
Television/Film
Temple University

Donald Staples
(Task Force Chairman)
Department of
Cinema Studies
New York University

Howard Suber
Motion Picture/
Television Division
U. of California,
Los Angeles

Robert W. Wagner
Department of
Photography & Cinema
Ohio State University

Advisory Review Group:

Erik Barnouw
Professor Emeritus
Columbia University

Edgar Dale
Professor Emeritus
Ohio State University

Fanna Hyer
Coordinator, Instruction and
Professional Development
National Education Association

For The American Film Institute

Sam L. Grogg, Jr., Project Coordinator
Dennis Bohnenkamp, Survey Expediter
Diana Elsas and Lulu Kelso, Assistants

Special Consultants: Joseph Ziegler, Arts Development
Associates; Edward Singer, R/S Associates, Inc.

This project was funded by the National Endowment for the Arts, an independent agency of the Federal Government created in 1965 to encourage and assist the nation's cultural resources. Nancy Hanks, Chairman. The National Endowment for the Arts is located at 2401 E Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20506.

The American Film Institute is an independent, non-profit organization serving the public interest, established in 1967 by the National Endowment for the Arts to advance the art of film and television in the United States. George Stevens, Jr., Director. © 1976 The American Film Institute, John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts, Washington, D.C. 20566.

Portions of this report may be reprinted with permission of The American Film Institute.

FOREWORD

The American Film Institute received a grant from the National Endowment for the Arts to conduct "a survey and study of individuals, organizations, institutions, and special facilities actively involved in film/television education in order to develop its priorities for programs and services in education." The grant period was designated as October 15, 1975 to June 15, 1976.

From the outset of the project, The American Film Institute and all those involved in the project expressed their intention to conduct a study of "pedagogical and scholastic needs of film and television education in the U.S." that would be of use to the field as a whole and not simply a guide to a single institution concerning education policy or procedure.

AFI Education Liaison Sam L. Grogg, Jr. served as Project Coordinator. The study was conducted by a committee of well known educators in the field. That Study Committee was divided into two elements: a Task Force group and an Advisory Review group.

The Task Force contingent of the Committee was made up of Raymond Fielding, Temple University; Donald Staples, New York University; Howard Suber, University of California-Los Angeles; and Robert W. Wagner, Ohio State University. These people were responsible for the study's methodology, design of research tools

developed, and summary and presentation of data gathered by the project.

The Study Committee developed a questionnaire survey instrument that was sent to 3,276 film and/or television educators at colleges and universities throughout the United States. 784 individuals responded to the survey. The data gathered was tabulated so that certain portions of the survey could be computer processed, analyzed, and stored.

The Study Committee prepared an objective report on the survey which was submitted to The American Film Institute and the National Endowment for the Arts on June 15, 1976. What follows are findings of that report based upon the 784 completed questionnaires (24% of those surveyed). It should be noted that due to rounding off percentages, the possibility of multiple response, and occasional omission of irrelevant responses, the percentages do not always total one hundred percent.

In addition to the tallies included in this report, capabilities for further analysis of the data have been written into the computer program. Demographic breakdowns such as academic department, academic rank, teaching emphasis, etc. have been cross-referenced against seventeen of the attitudinal questions asked in the questionnaire. This data will be kept on file at the Administrative Offices of The American Film Institute, at the John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts in Washington, D.C., and made available to researchers and educators.

SURVEY FINDINGS

Tallies are presented as percentages of total respondents (784).

Respondents' type of school:

57% teach at a university; 24% at a four-year college; 14% at a two-year college; 3% did not respond to the question.

Academic department of respondents:

Respondents were asked to indicate the title of the department in which they taught. Those responding to the question listed 91 different department names. An attempt has been made to cluster departmental names whose program emphasis appears to be related. A full list of the departments indicated within the cluster is given in the appendix.

1. Communication related departments	19%
2. Broadcasting related departments	13
3. English related departments	13
4. Speech related departments	13
5. Film/cinema related departments	9
6. Art related departments	6
7. Theater/drama related departments	5
8. Audiovisual education related departments	3
9. Photography related departments	3
10. Journalism related departments	3
11. Other	10
No Response	4

2.

Department's Courses:

Both Graduate and Undergraduate	46%
Primarily Graduate	4
Primarily Undergraduate	45
No Response	3

Number of full time faculty members teaching film/television in respondents' departments:

Number: 0 / 1 / 2 / 3 / 4 / 5 / 6 / 7 / 8 / 9 / 10+
% : 3 / 22 / 16 / 12 / 9 / 7 / 4 / 3 / 3 / 1 / 13

Academic rank of respondents:

Professor	19%
Associate Professor	24
Assistant Professor	28
Adjunct Professor	2
Instructor	14
Adjunct Instructor	1
Lecturer	3
Graduate Assistant, Teaching Assistant	1
Other	1
None/No Response	8

3.

Administrative title (if any):

2% indicate titles at the level of college or university administration such as president, dean, or assistant dean; 11% indicate they are department or division chairpersons; 24% have titles of program administrators other than chairpersons; 5% have non-academic administrative titles such as television or radio station managers; and 54% of the respondents did not indicate an administrative title.

Full or part time faculty:

79% are full time, 17% part time, and 3% did not respond.

Primary emphasis of teaching in film and/or television:

Film studies	46%
Film production	30
Television studies	20
Television production	21
Other	5
No Response	5

Years teaching film/television courses:

Years: 1 / 2 / 3 / 4 / 5 / 6 / 7 / 8 / 9 / 10-15 / 15+
% : 3 / 7 / 9 / 9 / 12 / 10 / 7 / 5 / 3 / 17 / 11

4.

Percentage of teaching devoted to film/television teaching:

% of teaching: 100 / 75-99 / 50-74 / 25-49 / 0-24 / N/R

% of respondents: 40 / 11 / 17 / 15 / 11 / 6

Other professional activities which take up major portions of time:

Teaching subjects other than film/television	26%
Education administration	19
Film production	16
Writing	13
Research	12
Film/television administration	9
Television production	8
Consulting	4
No Response	13

EDUCATIONAL BACKGROUND OF RESPONDENTS

Degrees:

Doctor of Philosophy	43%
Doctor of Education	3
Doctoral Degree in Progress	4
Master of Arts	21
Master of Science	7
Master of Fine Arts	4
Bachelor of Arts	6

NOTE: The following degrees were also reported by individuals but the percentage of respondents was below 3 percent: Doctor of Fine Arts, Doctor of Divinity, Doctor of Law, Doctor of Arts, Master of Education, Master of Business Administration, Master of Divinity, Bachelor of Science, Bachelor of Fine Arts, Associate of Arts, and No Degree. 6% did not respond to this item.

Year highest degree awarded:

1959 or before	17%
1960-1964	13
1965-1970	29
1971-1976	28
No Response	13

Institution awarding respondent's highest degree:

Columbia University	5%
Indiana University	3
Michigan State University	3
New York University	5
Ohio State University	5
Syracuse University	4
University of Iowa	4
University of Michigan	3
University of So. California	4
University of Wisconsin	4

6.

Fields in which respondents have worked professionally for more than 6 months:

Film production	41%
Television production	37
Print/broadcast journalism	27
Film/television administration	23
Theater	3
No Response	27

NOTE: This question offered the respondent four broad categories from which to choose. It also allowed for "other" responses. In total, 25 fields of professional work were indicated, but only the five shown above appeared in significant amounts.

Respondent's involvement in research which resulted in publication during the last five years:

	<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>NR</u>
%:	47	49	4

Respondent's involvement in the training of secondary/elementary school film/television teachers:

	<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>NR</u>
%:	35	58	7

Professional and scholarly organizations to which respondents belong:

University Film Association	24%
American Film Institute	16
Broadcast Education Association	15
Speech Communication Association	15
National Association of Educational Broadcasters	14
Society for Cinema Studies	11
Modern Language Association	9
Association for Educational Communications and Technology	8
Society of Motion Picture and Television Engineers	7

NOTE: Over one-hundred national organizations were listed in answer to this question. In addition, many respondents listed local organizations and regional study centers (22%), and honorary societies (10%).

Respondents were asked to check five resources in the following list that have been important to their career development:

Individualized study	61%
Conferences	56
Formal study	56
Hands-on workshops	36
Observing production	32
Professional seminars and short courses	32
Visits by noted professionals	32

8.

Resources (cont.):

Research grants/fellowships	27%
Sabbaticals	23
Production grants/fellowships	21
Faculty exchanges	17
Internships	16
Visits by noted professors	12

NOTE: 7% of the respondents indicated the importance of "production experience" by adding it to the list.

Position of film/television education in the administrative hierarchy of respondent's school:

	<u>Film Ed.</u>	<u>TV Ed.</u>
Respected	36%	30%
Accepted	37	33
Tolerated	12	10
Threatened	3	3
Will probably be absorbed/abolished	0	0
No Response	10	21

Enrollment growth in respondents' courses:

9.

Production:

	<u>Currently</u>		<u>Next 5 Years</u>	
	<u>Film</u>	<u>TV</u>	<u>Film</u>	<u>TV</u>
Expanding	35%	46%	34%	47%
Contracting	4	4	5	4
Same	18	22	15	21
No Response	43	28	45	27

Studies:

	<u>Currently</u>		<u>Next 5 Years</u>	
	<u>Film</u>	<u>TV</u>	<u>Film</u>	<u>TV</u>
Expanding	38	40	39	42
Contracting	4	4	4	3
Same	18	23	16	20
No Response	39	33	42	35

The primary goal of the courses respondents teach for each kind of student:

	<u>Undergraduate</u>	<u>Graduate</u>
A Liberal Arts education	52%	29%
Professional training	24	15
Both	14	6
No Response	8	48

10.

Do students agree? Primary goal of each kind of student:

	<u>Undergraduate</u>	<u>Graduate</u>
Professional training	42%	36%
A Liberal Arts education	33	9
Both	12	4
No Response	12	50

Using a scale of 1 to 5 ("unimportant" to "very important"), please rank each of the following measures of academic potential for both kinds of incoming students:

Undergraduate:

	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>N/R</u>
Academic record	6	6	23	21	23	21
Interview with applicant	12	8	18	20	17	23
Portfolios/samples	17	10	16	16	14	28
Professional work	19	10	15	15	13	28
Professionals' recommendations	14	12	21	17	8	28
Standard test scores	11	13	25	16	12	24
Statement of purpose	11	12	21	20	11	24
Teachers' recommendations	9	10	23	22	10	27

Graduate:

	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>N/R</u>
Academic record	4	3	7	15	25	47
Interview with applicant	5	4	11	12	19	49
Portfolios/samples	6	4	9	13	17	51
Professional work	5	4	11	16	13	51
Professionals' recommendations	4	6	12	16	10	51
Standard test scores	6	8	15	12	9	51
Statement of purpose	5	5	10	17	14	49
Teachers' recommendations	2	5	13	16	12	51

Should there be a standard instrument to test student potential?

Academic Potential

	<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>N/R</u>
%:	42	48	9

Artistic Potential

	<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>N/P</u>
%:	22	67	11

12.

Based on respondents' experience, three careers students most often enter:

	<u>Bachelor</u>	<u>Master</u>	<u>Doctor</u>
College teaching	6%	24%	36%
Commercial TV production	43	18	1
Educational TV production	24	23	5
Film/TV administration	6	13	5
Graduate school	36	16	3
Print/broadcast journalism	29	10	3
Non-feature film production	21	13	3
Research/criticism	2	5	22
Secondary teaching	20	16	3
Theatrical film production	5	2	0
No Response	21	44	61

Printed materials for classroom instruction:

	<u>Use</u>	<u>Needed</u>	<u>Not interested</u>	<u>N/R</u>
Anthologies	46%	16%	18%	23%
Audience studies	22	29	27	26
Biographies	27	13	30	32
Histories	56	16	12	22
Interviews	39	18	15	31
Program notes	23	20	28	31
Published scripts	38	31	13	26
Reference works	58	18	5	23
Study guides	22	21	31	29

Printed materials (cont.):

	<u>Use</u>	<u>Needed</u>	<u>Not interested</u>	<u>N/R</u>
Technical texts	60%	15%	11%	19%
Transcripts for oral histories	9	22	37	35
Translations	19	26	29	32
Unpublished scripts	19	34	22	30

Audio-visual materials for classroom instruction:

	<u>Use</u>	<u>Needed</u>	<u>Not interested</u>	<u>N/R</u>
Complete films/ videotapes	76%	23%	2%	11%
Excerpts from film/ television	48	42	6	18
Films on film/ television	49	36	8	19
Outtakes	19	43	16	27
Slides/filmstrips	32	23	23	27
Tapes of oral histories	9	25	35	34
Videotapes on film/ television	33	33	14	27

14.

General teaching resources:

	<u>Use</u>	<u>Needed</u>	<u>Not interested</u>	<u>N/R</u>
Book/periodical collections	71%	18%	2%	17%
College owned films/videotapes	61	37	1	15
Commercial film distributors	56	18	8	22
Commercial theaters	32	20	17	34
Film societies	35	21	14	32
Film/videotape archives	27	43	7	29
Photo/slide collections	27	29	16	31
Privately owned films/videotapes	31	28	11	32
Public library films/videotapes	32	30	12	31
Script collections	21	36	15	33
Television programs on the air	48	17	12	27

Various teaching methods ranked by respondents on a scale of 1 to 5 ("useless" to "very useful"):

	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>N/R</u>
Field experience	5%	7%	15%	22%	40%	12%
Lectures	4	10	33	31	15	7
Production workshops	5	4	10	27	41	13
Screenings	4	8	21	26	33	8
Seminars	4	9	20	31	25	11
Technical demonstrations	4	10	26	30	16	14

Films/videotapes respondents most often use in teaching:

482 different titles were mentioned. The following showed significant percentages. In addition, a number of respondents answered this question with a descriptive phrase rather than specific title. Eight percent answered "personally" or "locally" produced films, and five percent felt that the films they used changed too often for them to specify particular titles.

17%	CITIZEN KANE (1941). 119 minutes. Orson Welles.
10	THE BATTLESHIP POTEMKIN (1925). 75 minutes. Eisenstein.
4	AN OCCURENCE AT OWL CREEK BRIDGE (1956). 27 minutes. Robert Enrico.
4	BASIC FILM TERMS: A VISUAL DICTIONARY (1970). 14 minutes. Sheldon Renan.
4	THE BIRTH OF A NATION (1915). 102 minutes (varies--also 195 minutes). D.W. Griffith.
4	INTERPRETATIONS AND VALUES. (1964). 30 minutes. American Cinema Editors.
3	MAKING OF A LIVE TV SHOW (1971). 26 minutes. Charles Braverman.
3	WHY MAN CREATES (1968). 25 minutes. Saul Bass.

Current periodicals respondents find most useful:

18%	<u>Broadcasting</u>
16	<u>American Cinematographer</u>
16	<u>Film Comment</u>

16.

Periodicals (cont.):

13%	<u>Filmmakers Newsletter</u>
13	<u>Film Quarterly</u>
10	<u>Sight and Sound</u>
9	<u>American Film: Journal of the Film and Television Arts</u>
9	<u>Journal of Broadcasting</u>
9	<u>Variety</u>
8	<u>Super 8 Filmmaker</u>
4	<u>Take One</u>
3	<u>Action: Directors Guild of America</u>
3	<u>Broadcast Management/Engineering</u>
16	No Response

Books respondents most often recommend to or require of students:

12%	A SHORT HISTORY OF THE MOVIES (Gerald Mast)
12	TELEVISION PRODUCTION HANDBOOK (Herbert Zettl)
10	INDEPENDENT FILMMAKING (Lenny Lipton)
8	BROADCASTING IN AMERICA: A SURVEY OF TELEVISION AND RADIO (Sydney W. Head)

Books (cont.):

6%	ELEMENTS OF FILM (Lee R. Bobker)
6	FILM THEORY AND CRITICISM (Gerald Mast and Marshall Cohen)
6	GUIDE TO FILMMAKING (Edward Pincus)
6	THE LIVELIEST ART (Arthur Knight)
4	AMERICAN CINEMATOGRAPHER'S MANUAL (Joseph Mascelli and Arthur C. Miller)
4	FILM FORM AND THE FILM SENSE (Sergei Eisenstein)
4	A PRIMER FOR FILMMAKING (Kenneth Roberts and Win Sharples, Jr.)
4	UNDERSTANDING MOVIES (Louis Giannetti)
4	WHAT IS CINEMA? (Andre Bazin)
3	THE FIVE C's OF CINEMATOGRAPHY (Joseph Mascelli)
3	A HISTORY OF BROADCASTING IN THE UNITED STATES, 3 volumes (Erik Barnouw)
3	SIGHT, SOUND, MOTION (Herbert Zettl)
3	THE TECHNIQUE OF TELEVISION PRODUCTION (Gerald Millerson)

18.

Professional and/or academic organizations respondents find most valuable:

16%	University Film Association
12	American Film Institute
11	National Association of Educational Broadcasters
10	Broadcast Education Association
8	Society of Motion Picture and Television Engineers
6	Society for Cinema Studies
5	Association for Educational Communications and Technology
5	Speech Communication Association
3	Modern Language Association
33	No Response

BOOKS, FILMS/VIDEOTAPES, PERIODICALS,
ORGANIZATIONS NEEDED

Type of Books needed:

Basic film production	7%
Film history	7
Television production	4
No Response	48

NOTE: In addition to the above content categorizations, several respondents replied in descriptive terms. Five percent felt that "more scholarly, more critical" works were needed and four percent felt that books should be "better."

Type of films/videotapes needed:

Film excerpts	8%
Non-technical films on filmmaking	7
Technical film production	7
Technical television production	6
No Response	52

NOTE: In addition to the above, eight percent of the respondents felt a need for cheaper film/videotape rentals while another six percent indicated a desire for "more accessible" films and videotapes.

Periodicals:

NOTE: Responses to this question were diffuse and were generally made in terms of attitude rather than specific kind. Seventy-three percent of those who responded to the questionnaire did not respond to this question. Five percent of the respondents called for more scholarly, more serious publications, three percent felt a need for "better" periodicals while another three percent said that no new ones were needed.

Organizations:

NOTE: See appendix.

Resources/needs in film/television teaching:

Part I. Priority of teaching resources.
(1=Most needed; 6=Least needed)

	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>6</u>
Additional faculty	20%	9%	7%	8%	7%	8%
Artists-in-residence	1	3	4	4	5	8

20.

Resources/needs (cont.):

	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>6</u>
Assistantships, fellowships and scholarships	7%	10%	8%	13%	10%	13%
Clerical and technical staff	3	6	10	9	13	13
Film/videotape rentals and purchases	24	12	15	12	10	7
Guest lecturers	1	4	5	9	13	12
Library books and periodicals	4	9	12	15	16	14
Production equipment	28	18	12	10	6	4
Viewing/monitoring facilities	5	20	18	11	10	11
No Response				8		

Part II. Teaching resources respondents can do without.

Artists-in-residence	66%	Library books and periodicals	22%
Guest lecturers	48	Viewing/monitoring facilities	16
Clerical and technical staff	39	Production equipment	14
Additional faculty	33	Film/videotape rentals and purchases	12
Assistantships, fellowships and scholarships	31	No Response	8

21.

Respondents were given six possible programs/services from which they chose three to serve their needs:

Program to make films more accessible	70%
Conferences and workshops	58
Program to make television productions more accessible	47
Job referral service	43
Information services	39
Curriculum advisory service	19

On the college/university level, film and television study should be considered:

Related but separate disciplines	68%
The same discipline	18
Different and separate disciplines	8
No Response	5

Other academic discipline(s) to which respondents feel television is most closely related:

Journalism	32%
Theater/Drama	20
Communications	18
Film, Cinema	11

22.

Television (cont.):

Art	10%
Radio	10
Sociology, Social Sciences	10
English	9
Speech	7
All disciplines	3
No Response	14

NOTE: In all, 59 different disciplines were mentioned in response to this question, but only the preceding appeared in significant percentages.

Other academic discipline(s) to which respondents feel film is most closely related:

Art	36%
Theater/Drama	29
English	28
Communications	10
Journalism	10
Television	10
Sociology, Social Sciences	6
Humanities	5
Music	5
Photography	5

23.

Film (cont.):

History	4%
All disciplines	3
No Response	12

NOTE: A total of 63 different disciplines were mentioned.

Need for specialized university level training for elementary/
secondary school film/television teachers:

	<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>N/R</u>
%:	72	20	8

Need for specialized accreditation of film/television
departments:

	<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>N/R</u>
% :	43	44	13

NOTE: In answer to the question of who should do the
accrediting, respondents suggested a panel of
representatives from universities and professional
organizations (9%); existing accrediting agencies (3%);
"don't know" (4%). 66% did not respond to this
question.

APPENDIX

p. 1. Departments in which film/tv is taught.

Cluster # 1

Communications
Communications and Art
Communication Arts and Sciences
Communications Studies
Mass Communications
Mass Media
Media

Cluster # 2

Broadcasting
Broadcasting and Film
Radio/Television
Radio-Television-Film
Telecommunications
Television

Cluster # 3

Creative Writing
English
English and Film
Languages and Literature
Literature

Cluster # 4

Speech
Speech/Broadcasting
Speech Communications
Speech and Drama
Speech/Drama-Film-Television
Speech and Theater

Cluster # 5

Art
Arts
Cinema and Art
Creative Arts
Design
Fine Arts
Fine Arts and Film
Fine Arts and Theater
Graphic Arts
Graphic Design
Graphics

Cluster # 6

Cinema
Cinema Studies
Film
Film and Television
Film and Video
Moving Image
Visual Studies

Cluster # 7

Drama
Drama and Communications
Drama and Telecommunications
Film and Theater
Theater
Theater Arts

Cluster # 8

Audiovisual Education
Educational Media
Instructional Materials
Instructional Media
Learning Resources
Library Service
Media Center
Media Services

Cluster # 9

Cinema and Photography
Photography
Photography and Cinema
Photography and Film

Cluster # 10

Journalism
Journalism and Communications
Journalism and Graphics

Cluster # 11

Other:

American Culture
American Studies
Anthropology
Applied Arts

11 Other (cont.):

Architecture	Geology
Biological Sciences	History
Commercial Art	Humanities
Continuing Education	Industrial Technology
Criminology	Instruction
Data Processing	Liberal Arts
Education	Liberal Studies
Electronics	Media Technology
Environmental Arts	Philosophy
Experimental Pathology	Physics
Government	Police Science
	Popular Culture
	Political Science

p.19 Organizations needed

Only 25 percent of the total number of respondents answered this question, providing suggestions such as those listed below. Four percent of the respondents indicated that they felt "none" were needed.

Experimental film organization
 Film education organization
 National student organization
 Grant-getting group
 Professional television organization
 Regional study centers
 Film studies organization
 Scholarly association of writers and critics
 Unions
 Organizations to improve access to films
 Film seminars
 Film aesthetics society
 Information department in film institute
 Organization to unite academia and industry
 Organization for interdisciplinary studies
 Film production organization
 Filmmakers honorary fraternity
 Job placement bureau
 College/secondary film teachers' organization
 Junior college media organization
 Animation organization

AFTERWORD

The major objective of the National Survey of Film and Television Higher Education was to seek out the needs of the field as expressed by college and university teachers of these subjects. The results must be interpreted: (1) in the light of the nature of the respondents and of their particular situations; (2) in terms of their definition of "the field"; and (3) according to the expression of needs growing out of the first two conditions.

The results must be considered in terms of personal and professional biases. One must ask, for instance, if the expressed needs are, in some cases, simply "want lists" reflecting highly specialized and personal, rather than broadly philosophical and long-range academic judgments. Finally, since we are dealing with a fluid field of study in a changeable society, the expression of needs is necessarily, though not exclusively, pegged at 1976. Thus, the report reflects the present state of the art as well as a certain degree of ignorance not only of the future, but also of existing resources by which some of the needs might easily be met.

It is hoped that the information gathered and presented here will aid individuals, institutions, and organizations in developing programs and services that will fulfill the needs of this aspect of higher education.

The Study Committee