DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 091 785 CS 500 704

AUTHOR Postman, Neil
TITLE [Media Ecology: Communication as Context].
INSTITUTION Speech Communication Association, New York, N.Y.
PUB DATE Jul 74
NOTE 14p.; Keynote address presented at the Annual Summer Conference of the Speech Communication Association (9th, Chicago, Illinois, July 12-14 1973); Also in "Proceedings" published by Speech Communication Association, edited by R. Jeffrey and W. Work, pp. 1-10

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.75 HC-$1.50 PLUS POSTAGE
DESCRIPTORS *Communication (Thought Transfer); Conference Reports; Educational Research; *Environmental Influences; Higher Education; *Media Technology; *Social Influences

ABSTRACT

This paper discusses a new structure for understanding the communication process--a structure that reflects the trend toward reorganizing knowledge along the lines suggested by an ecological perspective. The paradigms that exist in the field of communication are discussed, and the inability of most of them to cope with the full range of communication transactions that researchers want to know something about is pointed out. The metaphor presented for the new structure for understanding the communication process considers all communication to be an environment. Also presented are illustrations of how context analysis works--the method of identifying the significant characteristics as a whole, the subsystems of which it is composed, the larger system within which it functions, and all the significant relationships among them. Finally, the speaker presents questions related to how media environments work. (WR)

KEYNOTE ADDRESS

Neil Postman
New York University

I would like to begin by acknowledging that my presence here tonight constitutes my first serious connection with the Speech Communication Association. I have little doubt that the SCA will survive the encounter. And I have even less doubt that I will be the chief beneficiary of that encounter, especially because I plan to stay around long enough to hear people other than myself do some talking. This is not said, by the way, as ritualistic self-deprecation. As you will hear in a moment, my colleagues, students, and I at NYU are engaged in a kind of perilous adventure in the field of communication, and we need the advice, empathetic criticism, and psychic support that only the members of this organization are qualified to give. And so, though I am the keynote speaker at your conference, I come not to bring you the word, which I don't have, but rather a whole bunch of question marks which probably you don't need. Nevertheless, I do so in the sincere hope that some of you by knowing about our situation might help us to find our way to a few creative solutions. Specifically, what I would like to do is tell you about the foolhardy, presumptuous, and exhilarating effort we are making at NYU to elaborate a new perspective for studying communication; one that might still make some sense twenty or thirty years from now. In effect, what we're trying to do is a work within a new structure for understanding the communication process - a structure that reflects the powerful trend toward reorganizing knowledge along the lines suggested by an ecological perspective. Now, as you may be aware, universities are not always sympathetic to such reorganizing efforts, perhaps because with age they suffer from hardening of the categories. Kenneth Boulding says in his book The Image:

> It will be a long time before the restructuring of knowledge which now seems to be underway will be reflected in the organization of universities. Indeed, it is difficult to visualize now exactly what the appropriate organization would be. There can be little doubt, however, that (this restructuring) will eventually have to be recognized officially. Until then, the new structures, as new structures have always done, will have to live in an underworld, an underworld of deviant professors, gifted amateurs, and moderate crackpots.

Let's skip the question as to which of these categories I most rightly belong. It is enough to say that at the School of Education at NYU, a most hopitable reception has been given to those of us who have shown a serious interest in doing something unusual in communication. At almost every turn, encouragement has been freely offered by administrators and faculty. We have even been allowed to invent a new name for our subject--Media Ecology. And one of the more delightful rewards we have reaped is in the fact that both our name and our "course of study" such as it is, were adopted whole by Oxford University last summer. We were encouraged, too, by the fact that Harvard University published this year the final

report of tis Program on Technology and Society. Since that program was established to begin inquiries into many of the same matters we at NYU are concerned with, we have almost begun to feel that we are part of the official knowledge establishment. As many of you know, even those in the academic underworld need stroking, and to receive positive reinforcement from the two greatest universities in the Western world -- well, it is almost too much to bear.

But one must do more than bear it; one must be suspicious of it. All the Oxfords and Harvards and NYU's in the world cannot change the fact that communication as a science and/or discipline just barely exists, if it exists at all; and our colleagues from more settled disciplines are right in viewing us with circumspection. As Gregory Bateson puts it, in Steps to an Ecology of Mind, those of us in communication are explorers, and "in the nature of the case, the explorer can never know what he is exploring until it has been explored." Among other things, that implies that an exploration can, after all, end up badly. And I do not mean by "badly" that you start out looking for spice in China and end up in Puerto Rico. I mean your ship may quite easily hit a rock as you leave the harbor and sink within sight of shore. You never know, at the beginning, if you will find glory and riches or end up a laughing stock in Davy Jones' locker.

But an explorer does at least have a plan and sometimes, a great notion. Well, at NYU we may not have a great notion, or even a plan, but we certainly have a starting point. What that starting point is can be stated in many ways, but I am particularly partial to its expression in Kinesics and Context, by Ray Birdwhistell. This is what he says:

> A human being is not a black box with one orifice for emitting a chunk of stuff called communication and another for receiving it. And, at the same time, communication is not simply the sum of the bits of information which pass between two people in a given period of time.

Now, as long as communication is conceived of as a chunk of stuff, moving this way and that in countable quanta, there is probably no need for a new approach to communication or any approach, for that matter. Each of several academic disciplines -- for example, physics, linguistics, psychology, sociology, literary criticism, semantics, and logic -- can supply a language and a perspective to describe pieces of the chunk. But once an atomistic view of communication is rejected and in its place is substituted a system of an ecological view, you have an entirely new set of problems for which there are no readily available conceptual handles. What you need, when you come right down to it, is a new paradigm. A paradigm, as you know, is a perspective or a model or even a metaphor that serves to define the legitimate problems and appropriate methods of a field of study. Aristotle's Physics, Newton's Optics, Franklin's Electricity, and Lavoisier's Chemistry were such paradigms. Each of them gave rise to a scholarly tradition, and permitted the passage into maturity of each of their respective fields. But history tells that the road to a firm paradigm consensus is exceedingly arduous,

and this is especially so in the social sciences. Take psychology, for example. At the present time, there are at least three important paradigms competing to pre-empt the field. First, there is the tradition begun by Watson and Hull, but which is now known as "Skinnerian." Second, there is the tradition known as "Freudian." And third, there is a relative newcomer, called "Rogerian" or "Maslovian." Each paradigm has its faithful adherents who look with distain on those who are faithful to the others. Each paradigm starts from a different set of postulates and has a unique language: Freudians talk about instincts, Rogerians about needs, and Skinnerians about contingencies. They barely understand each other, or even want to.

Somewhat the same situation exists in the field of communication, where we have several similar paradigms, each with its own special language and adherents. We are all familiar, I suspect, with the Shannon-Weaver-Norbert Wiener paradigm, which talks about communication in terms of noise, redundancy, information overload, and feedback. And I assume we also know about the Birdwhistell paradigm, which uses the methodology and some of the language of structural linguistics as a basis for describing non-verbal behavior or, as Birdwhistell calls it, kinesics. Then there is Erving Goffman's paradigm, which he calls a dramaturgical model because he likens interpersonal transactions to theatrical presentations. And there is also the McLuhan-Jacques Ellul paradigm, in which all human behavior is understood as a function of the dominant communication technologies of a culture. There are, of course, a dozen others that anyone in this room could name, including those of Eric Berne, David Berlo, Harold Lasswell, and Edward Hall. But in reviewing these paradigms as thoroughly as we were able, which is an education in itself, it occurred to us that each one of them is seriously limited in one respect or another. Some are merely special cases of larger paradigms. Some are based on purely atomistic assumptions. Most are unable to cope with the full range of communication transactions that we want to know something about. Information theory, for example, is very useful in looking into machine-machine communication, but it is, first of all, based on a mechanistic input-output metaphor and is, second, next to useless in describing human communication. Goffman's dramturgical metaphor is quite promising in a number of ways, but it is actually a special case of the role-playing paradigm, and it has nothing to say about men and their technologies. McLuhan has plenty to say about that, of course, but almost nothing sensible about anything else. Moreover, his methods are so idiosyncratic that anyone wishing to use his paradigm would hardly know how to behave himself, scientifically speaking.

So what we have tried to do is select a paradigm -- in this case, a metaphor -- that would reflect a holistic perspective, that would comprehend all communication transactions, and that would be useful in organizing research into the widest variety of communication situations. The metaphor we chose, as you might infer from the name media ecology, is, of course, that all communication is an environment. By adopting this perspective, we are not only rejecting the idea that communication is a chunk of stuff, but also the idea that communication takes place in an environment. What we are putting forward is the idea that communication is an

environment, from which we have concluded that the study of communication is, or should be, one of the ecological sciences.

Now, I do not suppose that this metaphor will strike any of you as especially startling. Every one of us has come across it before. For example, Edward Hall is not far from it, and Marshall McLuhan probably means something like it when he says that the medium is the message. Ray Birdwhistell certainly does when he defines communication as "that system through which human beings establish a predictable continuity in life." But what is distinctive, we think, in what we are trying to do at NYU is that we have assembled a community of teachers and students who have committed themselves to rigorously exploring the ecological paradigm to see how far it can take us, and in what directions. By "rigorously exploring," I mean that in all our research, in all our courses, in all our discussions, and in all our writing, much of which is contained in our publication, The Media Ecology Review, we start from the premise that every communication system and process is connected with every other communication system and process in a complex network, and that the study of communication processes is the study, not of elements, but of elements in relationships. Thus, our attention is focused not on who says what to whom through what medium, etc., but on how the who, what, whom, and medium are interrelated. From the ecological perspecitve, content analysis, for example, is viewed as either trivial or irrelevant. What matters to us is context, and to the extent that media ecology has, as yet, a methodology, that methodology might be called context analysis. This implies looking at communication environments as systems within systems within systems. It means trying to identify the significant characterisitcs of each system as a whole, the sybsystems of which it is composed, the larger system within which it functions, and all the significant relationships among them. To make things even more confusing, context analysis takes as its subject matter the transactions between individual and reality, individual and individual, individual and group, group and group, group and culture, and culture and culture, and tries to see them all as functions of one another. Moreover, context analysis, or media ecology gives special attention to the roles played in each of these transactions by the media through which they are conducted. By "medium", we mean any agent or agency through which two or more discrete elements are linked in a transacting system. Communications media include, therefore, both technologies like film, radio, and television and techniques, which are media composed of a set of procedures. I suppose one might call techniques "soft" media, although they are no less compelling than technology itself. The technique known as "operant conditioning," for example, is a medium which links behavior A to behavior B. Parliamentary procedure is a medium connecting event A to event B; and the medium known as Aristotelian logic links statement A to statement B. Thus, from our point of view, a technology or a technique is an environment within an environment.

To try to give you a concrete illustration of how context analysis works, let me choose the environment you and I presently find ourselves in. To begin with, I am reluctant to give this environment a name because by naming it, I will

prejudice the analysis. For example, if I call this environment, The Keynote Address, or even Postman's Keynote Address, I would impose on it the tacit assumption that the content of Postman's words is probably the most important element in the environment, which is quite probably not true. Moreover, by naming the environment, The Keynote Address, I would effectively obscure the role that the addressees have played in making the address what it is. Not only that, by calling it Postman's Address, I might foster the impression that the role you play is essentially passive; a matter of merely recording what I say, which is, of course, not what is actually happening. I don't want to dwell on this point beyond observing that the name one gives to the system one is looking at usually turns out to be an element in the system itself, because it always gives some degree of direction to the observations one will make. Let us say, then, that this environment is our keynote address, and leave it at that -- although a good media ecologist would never leave it at that because one of his first concerns is to specify the effects of his own behavior as an observer -- including his naming behavior -- on the system he is observing. In any event, one of the first questions we now have to ask is, What is the larger system of which this environment is only a part, and what is the relationship between them? Well, obviously, this system is part of the larger environment called the 9th Annual SCA Summer Conference, and the apparent function of this speech is to mark the beginning of the larger event. This fact calls attention to an invariable characteristic of all communication environments, namely, that they all have boundaries -- more or less arbitrary dividing lines signifying the end of one system and the beginning of another. College graduation ceremonies, doctoral orals, and wedding ceremonies are boundary markers of the most obvious and formalized kind. Dressing for dinner, signing in at conventions, and events like this speech are boundary markers of a more subtle kind. But they all serve the same function -- and that is to define the environment one is about to enter. They signal, in effect, that a certain set of behaviors, and not others, are in order.

One of the important functions of our keynote address, then, is to mark the boundary between conference and non-conference. This seemingly simple observation suggests a number of interesting questions, among them, this: if this event is primarily a boundary marker, is it the most effective structure that can be found to do the job? Of course, to answer that question, one would have to answer the question, what is the function of the larger system -- the 9th Annual SCA Summer Conference? Now that is, I'm sure, a complex question. Depending on who you are, the answers will be quite different. They will range from, "I've always wanted to go to Chicago," to "It's good to have this on my record," to"Let's get away from the kids for a weekend," to "I need some contacts for a job." I doubt, incidentally that the formally stated purpose for holding this conference was the compelling reason for bringing most of us here. The formal declaration is more in the nature of what media ecologists would call, a binding strategy, or for short, BS. Nevertheless, one of the functions of the conference as a whole is to serve as a boundary marker within a larger system -- for example, it draws a line between those of us who are " committed speech communication professionals" and those "ordinary, standard-brand slobs" who stayed home.

Whatever the specific functions of a particular professional conference may be, the communication system known as a convention has certain structural characteristics as a whole that are worth noting, because they serve to explain much of the behavior that takes place inside the system. For example, in examining other convention environments, I have come to the conclusion that they are apt to be quite weird in that they are almost entirely closed systems -- that is, environments that are not truly connected to any larger systems. It is almost as if conventions hover in a world of their own -- beginning, middling, and ending -- leaving memories but few consequences. That is why, I imagine, so much hyperbole and fantasizing goes on at conventions, and occurs in all the convention's sub-systems -- hotel bars, hotel rooms, the keynote address, workshops, restaurants -- wherever the conventioneers gather. The closest parallel I can find to the communication environment of a convention is the system that is created on airplanes when passengers engage in complex transactions. That environment begins when you enter the plane and ends when you leave it, and except in rare cases, has no relationship to other systems within which passengers must function. That is why, I believe, so many people tell outrageous stories about themselves to other passengers. One need fear only internal contradictions. There are no external implications. That is also why the tales, fantasies, and flirtations in which one may engage on an airplane may be regarded as harmless. The same is true for the tales, fantasies, and flirtations in which one may engage at a convention, because for all their differences, the airplane and the convention are structurally quite similar in that their boundaries are extraordinarily well defined -- almost, in fact, impenetrable. As environments, they are self-contained. Now, this characteristic of conventions helps to achieve certain purposes: - it promotes, for example, a strong sense of group identity and loyalty. At the same time, it precludes other purposes, for example, the carryover of convention spirit and learning into the less exotic systems in which we function back home.

Of course, no communication environment is so completely closed that its boundaries cannot be breached, although in general, the more isolated the system is from its suprasystems, the more extreme the behavior within it must be to break through the boundaries. And such breaks, when they do occur, are always traumatic. To shift the context for a moment, this is in part what the Watergate scandal is about. What Haldeman, Mitchell, Erlichman, and Dean did was to create a closed communication environment, which accounts in part for the intense team spirit and loyalties of which they all speak. But as their behavior became increasingly bizarre, it was inevitable that their system would be penetrated by searching inquiries from those in the larger systems surrounding the White House. The trauma that resulted broke the closed-system to pieces, destroyed all the coordination of its elements and made it into a junk pile rather than a system. One might even say that the entire problem of the present administration is that it assumed that the Presidency was a closed system.

But to return to our present situation, I should point out that the relative openness or closedness of any system varies for different participants, by virtue of their position and function within the system. My own position and function in

this environment, for example, imposes certain definite restrictions on the number and quality of the fantasies I may create simply because, if someone records my remarks or asks for a copy of my talk, I am immediately faced with the possibility of being drawn into some larger system of which this convention is only a part. I am not saying, by the way, that I am therefore creating no fantasies, but only that I am aware that my behavior in this environment is governed in part by my relationship to larger systems. So is yours, of course, but probably to a somewhat lesser extent -- unless you choose to do something bizarre. For example, if you should fall asleep within the next five minutes, the chances are that your behavior will not have implications much beyond this room. If, however, you should stand up, remove your clothes, and announce that you are going for a swim, I should not be surprised if your wife, or your dean, or even your mother would eventually learn of it. Should any of you do this, by the way, here's what we'd say about it as media ecologists: that you have, first of all, misconceived the structure and function of this environment; that you have misread the boundary markers; that you are an element, so to speak, that has rejected being part of the available subsystems within this environment; and that your action will change all the relationships of all the other elements in the environment in such a way, I suspect, as to render the original environment untenable. You would, in short, have created a traumatic system break, or, to use another ecological metaphor, polluted the environment beyond its capacity to regenerate itself. Unless, of course, you do this now -- in which case none of what I just said will be true. In other words, not that I have mentioned and discussed the possibility of such behavior, the meaning of your doing it will be entirely different from what it might have been before. The context, you see, always determines the significance of the content.

But the context of any communication environment is only partly defined by the larger system in which it functions. It is also defined by the smaller systems which make up the environment, and the relations among them. This leads to the question, What are the subsystems that comprise our present environment? I am, myself, an obvious subsystem, and so are you, and if we inquire into both our purposes for being here, and our functions in this system, we will undoubtedly uncover important information about the environment as a whole. For example, from a functional point of view, it wouldn't make much difference if I fall asleep in the next five minutes, or take off my clothes. Either way, I induce a traumatic system break. In other words, the variations in the functions of subsystems explain the range of permissible behaviors within the environment. Moreover, when we ask about the effects of our physical arrangement - including the vantage points from which we see or hear each other, we learn even more. And when we inquire into the technologies that are part of this environment -- whether it is the microphone in front of me or the tape recorder you hold, we learn still more about what this environment is all about and how it is shaping up and shaping us. For example, how would I be different if I were being video taped? How would you be different if you were watching a video tape instead of me in the flesh. Would you be offended? Would you be more engrossed? Would I seem to speak with more authority? Would you feel more free to talk to the person next to you,

and if so, how would that effect your relationship with the other people around you now, and with me? What is the most effective medium to use in order to link you and me and everyone else here in a single system with a common goal? This last question is especially fascinating to media ecologists, and we have been most concerned to find out something about the relationship between the people in a communication environment and the technology they are using. Since most of you are teachers, I am sure you have noticed, for example, that the fastest possible way to lose the coordinated attention of a group is to pass out written material while you are talking. Print is the isolating medium par excellence. It creates a special environment all its own, resulting in the temporary suspension of all the imperatives of larger communication environments around it. And there is no point either in telling your audience not to look at the printed material until you have finished talking. So far as we have been able to determine for most people, print will win the competition for attention with speech in most contexts. Perhaps that is why most teachers insist on reading aloud to students whatever is contained in printed material they hand out. They must intuitively sense that the only way to maintain control over a print environment is to superimpose on it their own voice. I might add, here, in case you are interested, that our initial research indicates that in the competition among media for people's attention, the telephone wins hands down in just about every context. We even have testimony to the fact that the act of love can be terminated instantly by the ring of a telephone. In media ecology, we call this telephonis interruptis. Less serious, but equally revealing is the fact that on two occasions in the past year, bank robbers in the actual process of being surrounded by police, took time out to answer phone calls placed by curious reporters. One of the bank robbers actually said, "Could you call back later. I'm busy now."

This question -- How does technology affect human perception, feeling, and value? -- has been almost a preoccupation with us. It is difficult enough to analyze a communication environment such as this keynote speech, or a courtroom, or a classroom, or a business office. But in such environments, the rule of interaction are usually quite explicit and sometimes even formally stated. However, in the case of technologically-created environments -- that is, the relationship between people and their radios, films, television, telephones, computers, and the like -- the rules of interaction are mostly hidden from view and are next to impossible to uncover. This is probably due to the fact that we are so easily distracted by the content of these media. The compelling question always seems to be, What is the message? or What is the movie about? But, of course, what the media ecologists wants to know is how media environments work - how they structure what we see and say, and, therefore, do, and how this structuring changes as the media themselves move from one environment to another. A very difficult task. But the difficulty of it has not stopped us from asking some of the big questions. For example, in what ways does technology generate social change? What are the consequences of new communication environments -- from computers to communes -- for education, politics, literature, and religion? In what ways do speeded-up communication environments affect interpersonal relationships? What role does language itself play in conserving social institutions?

In trying to answer these questions, our ecological paradigm has been excitingly useful. But lest you start wondering where are all the question marks I promised, let me say that we have been unable, so far, to develop a workable taxonomy. Our theories, such as they are, are woefully weak -- sometimes tautological or simply trivial. Our methods of context analysis are still gross and eclectic. The results of our analyses are frequently so complex that we hardly know how to organize what we have observed. There are times, frankly, when we wish that communication was, after all, a chunk of stuff. But, of course, we carry on, and by "we" I mean mostly the students in our program. And before concluding, I would like to say a word about them. To begin with, I have the impression that I was in fact invited here not so much to talk about communication, but to say something about communication education. Well, although it may not have sounded like it, I think I have. You see, the fact that media ecology is in such an under-developed condition makes it all the more useful in schools -- at all levels -- as an approach to communication. Media ecology is not yet a "subject," and may not be one for decades still to come. Media ecology is a field of inquiry; and fields of inquiry imply the active purusit of knowledge. Discoveries. Explorations. Errors. Uncertainty. Change. New Questions. New Terms. New Definitions. In short, media ecology is, itself, an open system, which, as I see it, should be the main characteristic of the curriculum of the future. A subject, on the other hand, is too often closed. It implies a well-ordered and stable content, a parcelling out of information, an act of ventriloquizing someone else's answers to someone else's questions. But in media ecology, we offer students an environment, including a paradigm, that permits them to think and invent in ways that are too often closed to them in more settled disciplines or appraaches. In a way, you might say that students in media ecology and other underworld enterprises will be the knowledge organizers of the future, no matter how tentative their scholarship must be today. Which reminds me of the wonderful exchange between Justice Holmes and John Dewey -- a sort of paradigm itself for life in the academic underworld:

Justice Holmes said, "Professor Dewey, I think your early writing was clearer than your later writing." "Yes," said Dewey, "then I was digging down three inches; now I'm trying to dig three feet." "Ah, yes," said Holmes. "When I've stopped think, I'm very lucid."

I would sincerely like to invite any of you who are willing to forgo lucidity to help us or join us in our digging.

Thank you.

REPORT OF THE EDUCATION PRIORITIES DIVISION

OVERVIEW

R. R. Allen, Division Director

This division sought to establish educational priorities related to three important topic areas: competency-based teacher education, communication in secondary school language arts curricula, and implications of university reorganization of speech departments for the preparation of secondary school communication teachers. After a brief divisional meeting on Friday, July 13, participants met in groups for the remainder of the day. The groups were chaired by Gustav Friedrich, Edward Pappas, and Barbara Lieb-Brilhart.

Each group began with a consideration of stimulus statements. The groups were then divided into interest groups to explore the issues raised by the stimulus statements and to arrive at recommendations.

On Saturday morning, July 14, the Education Priorities Division met in plenary session to consider the recommendations prepared by the three groups. Following a report by the three group chairpersons, a spirited discussion ensued. Since time was limited, no attempt was made to secure divisional consensus on the recommendations advanced. Thus, the recommendations presented in this report should be taken as position statements of the participants in the group offering each of the recommendations.

In the following three sections, a summary of the deliberations of each of the groups is provided. The report concludes with a brief summary statement.

GROUP ONE: COMPETENCY-BASED TEACHER EDUCATION

Gustav W. Friedrich, Chairperson
Cassandra L. Book, Recorder

Traditionally, teacher educators have assumed that if a student accumulates a specified number of credit hours with a C average or better and survives the student teaching experience, he or she is ready to begin teaching. In recent years, however, teacher educators in speech communication have expressed increasing dissatisfaction with such an assumption and have been actively searching for viable alternatives. One such alternative, competency-based or performance-based teacher education (CBTE), was selected as the focus for this group's discussion. To facilitate discussion, activities of the group were divided into two phases: an input phase and a deliberation and recommendation phase.

Input Phase

The input phase consisted of four brief commissioned stimulus statements: Philip P. Amato, Emerson College, explained the case for CBTE; L. E. Sarbaugh, Michigan State University, discussed some of the competencies which speech teachers need; William D. Brooks, Purdue University, considered the issue of how speech education programs can best develop such competencies; and Kathleen M. Galvin, Northwestern University, raised the question of how the results of CBTE programs can best be evaluated. These stimulus statements are presented as Appendix A.

P R O C E E D I N G S

Speech Communication Association
Summer Conference IX

Long Range Goals and Priorities in Speech Communication

Palmer House Hotel, Chicago, Illinois
July 12-14, 1973

Edited By
Robert C. Jeffrey
and
William Work

Speech Communication Association
Statler Hilton Hotel
New York, New York 10001

PREFACE

In September 1972, the Speech Communication Association sponsored a conference at Airlie House, Virginia to consider long-range goals and priorities for the Association and the profession. The seventeen conferees at the Airlie Conference generated a report (published in the April, 1973 issue of Spectra) that was widely discussed at the 1972 SCA Convention in December. The Legislative Council at that convention approved plans for the 1973 Summer Conference to expand upon the "Airlie Report."

The basic purpose of the Ninth Annual SCA Summer Conference was to extend the impact of the Airlie Conference by democratizing participation. The planners of the Conference predicted that those attending would contribute significantly to thought about the future of the profession by further defining goals, designing implementation strategies, and establishing priorities. To that end, all members of the SCA were invited to participate.

Since the "Airlie Report" presented recommendations in three broad areas—Education, Research, and Futurism—, the major divisions of the Conference were arranged to reflect those areas. Participants in Division A considered Education priorities, those in Division B dealt with Research priorities and those in Division C reflected on Futuristic priorities. Divisions A and B were each further organized into three Groups and Division C into two Groups. Participants, upon registering for the Conference, were asked to select the Division and Group in which he/she would like to participate. The Conference Program, reproduced in this report, sets out the sequence of events within the Groups and Divisions over the one and a half day conference.

The Division directors were asked to keep careful records of the deliberations within the Division, particularly of the recommendations and supporting rationales. They were also asked to collect any materials that were distributed to the Groups for reproduction in these Proceedings. Division Directors Ronald Allen and Lloyd Bitzer of the University of Wisconsin and Frank Dance of the University of Denver were diligent and aggressively original in planning for the work of the Divisions, and they were prompt in forwarding materials for publication. I am deeply indebted to them. The product of their labors and those of the Group chairmen forms the basis for this publication.

Major contributions were made to the Conference by Neil Postman of New York University who delivered a provocative and stimulating keynote address, and by L.S. Harms of the University of Hawaii, who concluded the conference with a look into the future, as the luncheon speaker. Transcripts of their addresses appear in these Proceedings.

The Director of the Conference is grateful to William Work, Executive Secretary of the SCA, for his efficiency in coordinating the efforts of many people who contributed to the Conference. The major kudos, however, go to the participants who generated the thought represented on the pages that follow.

Robert C. Jeffrey
Conference Director

PROGRAM
SCA SUMMER CONFERENCE IX

Palmer House, Chicago — July 12-14, 1973

Thursday Evening, July 12

8:00 pm	Keynote Address: Neil Postman, New York University
9:00 pm	No Host Reception

Friday, July 13

9:00 am	'The Airlie Conference,' First Vice-President Samuel L. Becker
9:15 a.m.	SCA Summer Conference IX Overview, President Robert C. Jeffrey
9:30-9:55 am	Organization of Conference Divisions
Division A:	Education Priorities, Ronald R. Allen, Director
Division B:	Research Priorities, Lloyd F. Bitzer, Director
Division C:	Futuristic Priorities, Frank E.X. Dance, Director
9:55-10:15 am	Coffee Break
10:15 am-12:15 pm	Division Groups Meet
A: Group 1:	Competency-Based Teacher Education, Gustav Friedrich, Chairman
Group 2:	Communication in the Secondary School Language Arts Curricula, Edward Pappas, Chairman
Group 3:	New Thrusts in Departmental Organization and the Preparation of Teachers, Barbara Lieb-Brilhart, Chairman
B: Group 1:	The Future of Communication Research, Gerald R. Miller, Chairman
Group 2:	Research Dealing with Models of Decision-Making, Kenneth E. Andersen, Chairman
Group 3:	Research on Problems of Freedom of Speech, Franklyn S. Haiman, Chairman
C: Group 1:	The Communication Needs & Rights of Mankind, L.S. Harms, Alton Barbour, Chairmen
Group 2:	Future Communication Technologies: Hardware and Software, William Conboy, Larry Wilder, & Jack Barwind, Chairmen
12:15-2:00 pm	Lunch Break
2:00-5:30 pm	Division Group Meetings Continue
8:00-10:30 pm	Optional Division Group Meetings

Saturday, July 14

9:00-10:40 am	Plenary Sessions: Divisions A, B, C.
10:40-11:00 am	Coffee Break
11:00-12:00 noon	Conference Plenary Session: Recommendations and Priorities
12:15-2:00 pm	Conference Luncheon Address: L.S. Harms, University of Hawaii, "The Communication Rights of Mankind: Present and Future"

Presiding at all General Sessions: Robert C. Jeffrey

TABLE OF CONTENTS