

JOURNAL OF THE



Arizona  
Speech and Drama  
Association



THE JOURNAL OF THE  
ARIZONA SPEECH AND DRAMA ASSOCIATION

Volume I

Spring 1971-1972

Number 2

Editors

John Monsma and James Edward Sayer  
Northern Arizona University

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

Letter From The Editor. . . . .	1
James Edward Sayer	
The Academic Market . . . . .	2
Robert Hall	
Speech: An Academic Discipline--Some Proposals . . . . .	10
Harold C. Larson	
The Value of High School Speech Activities. . . . .	16
Dennis and Darlene Brown	
Randon Thoughts on Drama in Education . . . . .	20
Jack Frakes, Don Doyle	
Selected Statements and Ideas from	
<u>Theatre in High School: Planning, Teaching, Directing</u> . . .	22
Reviewed by Jack Frakes, Don Doyle	
Functions of the Arizona Interscholastic Association, Inc.. . . .	24
H. A. Henrickson	

# LETTER FROM THE EDITOR

To my A.S.D.A. Colleagues:

This edition of the Journal will mark my final activity as a participating member of the Arizona Speech and Drama Association. As I prepare to pursue Doctoral work at Bowling Green University, I should like to take this final opportunity to offer two observations concerning the machinations of A.S.D.A.:

Just, while many of us give lip-service to the idea of having a strong state organization, the truth of the matter is that most of our colleagues are either not members of A.S.D.A. or do not attend any A.S.D.A. conventions or workshops. Why? Well, some feel that A.S.D.A. can do nothing for them--a true statement so long as more speech and drama teachers are outside the organization than inside. Others feel that speech and drama have nothing in common--to those I would suggest they read Dr. Larson's article in this issue and to think about the absurdity of trying to create a speech-drama schism.

Second, those of us who are active members of A.S.D.A. need to work harder to strengthen the organization internally. We must work more closely with our colleagues within our interest-area groups and within the entire organization membership. This point is made sufficiently in this issue: I asked the co-chairmen of all the A.S.D.A. interest-area groups to forward reports from their groups for publication. I received one.

I intend to retain my A.S.D.A. membership and hope to be able to return to Arizona in the near future. I hope to find A.S.D.A. to be a larger, stronger organization--I wish all of you well.

Sincerely,  
Jim Sayer

P.S. The Fall, 1972 issue of the Journal will be dedicated to an analysis of teaching bi- and multi-lingual students. The membership is requested to submit articles for consideration for publication by August 15, 1972.

Please send all articles to Professor John Monsma, Box 6006, N.A.U., Flagstaff, Arizona 86001.

## THE ACADEMIC MARKET

by

Robert Hall

In coming to the West, which is my home, I often wonder why, oh why I left Wyoming. In spite of the desolation seen when looking out the windows while riding from Phoenix to Casa Grande, I still discover it's a little better than the desolation of the streets of New York. It is a pleasure, as always, to come home, even if this is a little farther south. And, it's always a pleasure to be able to speak on the problems that now surround us in the field of speech, or communication arts and sciences as we like to refer to them--that umbrella term that covers the entire area as far as the Speech Communication Association is concerned. One of the most important problems we are now encountering is employment--not only on the academic level from elementary and secondary schools through the community colleges and the four-year institutions, but in business and industry, because the problem is there in all areas.

It probably began around 1967 in most of the other disciplines. English has been crying for years about the over-supply of people within their field. Most of the other disciplines have been doing the same thing. It really was not until a year ago, however, that the speech profession became aware of the fact that we were beginning to have a problem. Now that we've joined the group of people who are crying, it's probably appropo to say that the cry is universal.

Many of the articles which are appearing in the newspapers, slick-cover magazines, and academic journals are an indication of the problem. I would like to read some of the titles which I culled out of the New York Times, out of the Chronicle of Higher Education, out of Time Magazine and things of that nature to give you some indication of what really is happening. One of those which I found most interesting was an article in the New York Times called "New Breed of Drifter--The Ph.D.". Its real thesis was that if you are unemployed and having trouble finding a job, count your blessings because you might have a doctorate degree and be much worse off than you are. Other titles were: "Ph.D.--Who Needs Them?"; "Jobs Are Scarce in Academe and it's Now a Buyers Market"; that is one of the things very few people (particularly those in the Placement Service looking for positions) realize. A third article was, "Ph.D.--The Degree that has Become a Glut on the Market." I would have to agree that probably it has and probably will remain such through the next two decades.

That's a long time into the future, particularly for many of us. One of the things which has happened in New York, and which appeared in an article entitled "Educators Back Freeze on Ph.D.'s," was that the State Board of Education has simply decided there will be no new degree programs

Dr. Robert Hall is Director of Speech Communication Association Placement Bureau.

in any major at any time within the State until they find out exactly what the job market is going to be.

Other titles included: "Graduates Find it Takes Hard Digging to Get Jobs"; "There are More Ph.D.'s, Fewer Faculty Openings"; "Ph.D. Surplus Seen Benefiting Unions," (which is another problem we are going to have to face,) and one which appeared on Thursday: "Teacher Training Curb as Job Market Tightens." The latter deals primarily with elementary and secondary education. I could go on with titles of this nature but I think the point is made.

Yet, this situation always raises a question when we go through this type of thing, is there really a glut of Ph.D.'s on the market and is the market really as tight as these articles and the cries of the Placement Service directors would indicate? Bryce Crawford, Dean of the Graduate School of the University of Minnesota, believes that the situation is not nearly as dire as many would make us believe. He believes that prospective teachers will, if they really want, be able to find a job, but that they are not going to be able to be as choosy as they used to be. There was a time, not very long ago, when a young person coming out of college with a B.A., an M.A., or a Ph.D., could say to himself, "I'm only going to take a job at..." and he could pick a school and begin working to get that job. He might succeed. I think that period has long since passed, and so, instead of saying I am only going to teach at the University of Iowa, he's going to have to settle for Central Arizona College. He may feel that's a comedown or he may feel, when he gets there, that it is a much better job than what Iowa would have offered anyway. What Dean Bryce is saying is that if he really wants a job, he'll find it; he's just not going to get it where he thought he wanted to be. You probably are aware of the fact that people like to work where it's a little bit warmer; North Dakota is not a prime area for people looking for jobs, but there are jobs there if one is willing to go and face that climate.

Allan Bain, the immediate past president of the N.E.A., insists that there really is not an over-supply of teachers, there is simply an under-supply of money. I think it's a combination of both at the current time. But, on the other hand, I think we have some hard practical experiences to demonstrate that there really is a problem, and to show that, I would like to simply compare some statistical data that I have accumulated during the six years which I have served with the national office.

When I came into the office in 1966, the first function I really got into was the Convention, which, at that time, was the last joint convention between what is now the American Theatre Association, and what was then the S.A.A., now the S.C.A. We had 800 listings at that one convention--a fair number of jobs. We had 1400 people looking. But that isn't as dire as it sounds when you consider that those were only convention listings. But what has happened in the following five years I think is indicative of what's happening to the market. From 800 in 1966, we went down in 1967 to 553, in 1968 to 461; in 1969 to 368; in 1970 to 342; and in the convention which just ended in San Francisco, we had 184 listings---a drop of almost 600 in the course of six years. That's a pretty hefty drop.

More indicative probably are the bulletin listings. When I came into the office in 1966, we had 1409 listings including graduate assistantships (I mention those because many of you will have students who want to go on to graduate study). In the year that ended on August 31, 1971, we had 662, a drop of almost 60% in a five year period. Currently the placement bulletin listings are forty-some percent behind last year at the same time. Some people will look at it and say it's simply a decrease of utilization of the Placement Service which S.C.A. has to offer, part of it because we've raised our dues during the course of those six years, part of it because people are no longer very interested in academic organizations; in both cases they may have a certain amount of truth to their argument. But I think the argument is much stronger in simply saying that the job market is no longer here. If we recognize that fact it's much easier to face the realities of life in the academic world. At the same time, the number of people in the Placement Service has gone up 33% since 1966.

When I came in we had 1200 people in the Placement Service in an average month. This year we were up to 1526 when I left New York; 1526 people looking for the 267 jobs which we have listed. I think the figures speak for themselves; it's not a happy situation. We're not alone--we've never really been one of those associations which has profiled our people or really looked ahead to the future. I think that is one of our mistakes and it is why we're frankly caught flatfooted in terms of what are we going to do about the problem as it presents itself.

Other organizations have studied their problems and they got caught flatfooted anyway, so I guess we're not as bad off as sometimes I think. The American Historical Association did a survey projecting several years in advance what they were going to need, and they assumed they were going to have 500 positions last September, and that for those 500 positions they would graduate 390 Ph.D.'s. What they turned up was 500 positions, but 881 Ph.D.'s. The universities are turning them out at such an enormously fast rate that they can't even project how many they are going to have five years from now. The Modern Language Association, has been doing a projection and they have missed every year, and the differential between the number of jobs and the people looking becomes greater every year and they have, on occasion, had riots at their placement center at their December meeting. The young Turks, what are now referred to as the Committee on the Status of Emerging Professionals in our association, threatened in December of 1969 to riot in our Placement Center, turn it upside down and simply close it down. Unfortunately, they didn't do it. They would have solved me a lot of problems during those five days in New York. But I think maybe they, too, have settled down and simply become aware of the fact that the problem is not all us, some of it has to do with the job market itself.

In the academic world, the oversupply as seen by S.C.A. falls into three areas. We have an oversupply of people qualified in rhetoric and public address; we don't need them anymore. For every job we list in S.C.A. we have anywhere from two to four applicants who are qualified and could be employed in those positions with a Ph.D., and I'm not talking about M.A.'s. In theatre, we are over-supplied almost to the point of

catastrophy and we list more theatre positions than our child A.T.A. We simply have an oversupply--in directing, in acting, in theatre history, in theatre literature, in drama or dramatic literature, things of that nature--almost a ratio of 10-1, and I think A.T.A.'s ratio is probably higher than ours. I would say there is no problem for people trained in radio-television at this time; there is probably no problem for people in interpretations as long as we do not start producing them in mass quantities; there's no basic problem in speech science, particularly in psycho-linguistics which seems to be an upcoming area; and we have been able to take care of the Speech Education people, those trained to train teachers.

If I were back on the college level teaching again, I would have to recommend to my department, to my colleagues, and to my students that they look not in those areas, the six which I have gone through so far; but, rather that they look to the areas where, from S.C.A.'s point of view, there is a shortage. The shortage is in technical theatre. Everybody wants to direct; everybody wants to teach acting; or they want to teach literature, dramatic literature, but nobody wants to do the dirty work--the designing--the building of sets. I think theatre people ought to stress that fact though I know it is very difficult to force a student into an area in which he may not be interested. I think the facts speak for themselves. There's a shortage in pathology-audiology. Part of that is because A.S.H.A. has been able to require such stringent certification requirements that it is very difficult to get a job. So, the job market becomes a little stronger and salaries should go up in that area. It's very difficult to fill the positions if they're looking for certified people. Film is up and coming. It's new and people train, as you know, for radio-television because film is going it's own way as a fully recognized academic discipline. New York University had the first, and still, at this point, the only Ph.D. in film. Concentration is in the academic role of film, in history in criticism, but not in production; but I think that will come very shortly. And, I would say, people trained in the behavioral sciences also have an advantage over those of us in rhetoric, public address, and in some areas of theatre.

On the whole, the academic marketplace is not very cheerful, unless you're in tech theatre, pathology, you're qualified and probably have a Ph.D. in film, and you're qualified in the behavioral sciences. In business and industry the problem is not better. Lots of people come to us, particularly young people, with only a B.A. or getting ready to get their B.A., and say what can I do with a B.A. in Speech besides teach because that isn't what I want to do. The answer is that they can do almost anything because a speech major is eminently qualified in all areas of business and industry, where a specific specialty is not requested. If employers want someone strictly in business management, obviously a speech major may not be qualified. Or, if they want somebody in the science area or in engineering then obviously, you're not going to make it either. But if they're looking for somebody with just a general liberal arts background, a speech major is just as qualified as any other major that comes out of any college or university in this country. You ought to explain that to your students, they're qualified to go into New York Telephone, Bell Telephone, Mountain States Telephone, Standard Oil,



or any area in public relations where there is a communication problem or where communication is important. Almost any business or industry will acknowledge the fact that communication is important to them; sometimes it's questionable if they recognize it's real value, but I think even more and more today they are becoming aware of the fact that if they have communication people within their system there is a chance they will be able to work.

But the one thing which we perhaps do wrong in training our B.A.'s who don't want to go on to graduate school but who want to go out and work in the world, is in forcing them to specialize at the B.A. level as we force people to specialize at the M.A. and Ph.D. level. I'm a heretic in many respects in the speech field: I object to this idea of specialization, I object to the splitting of departments because when we go five different directions we are only hurting ourselves; we strengthen none of us. Theatre--I understand their problems and why they want to go a separate way. I've understood why pathology and audiology felt they would be better off in the School of Medicine. It has more prestige than the School of Arts and Sciences, I suspect. But in many of the institutions where they have made these splits, the theatre people have discovered they are very unhappy, and Pathology is not nearly as excited about being in the College of Medicine as they thought they were going to be. Rhetoric and public address standing by itself is not a strong area in the academic world. Pathology-audiology probably stands best alone, but I think that there is still that strength in numbers which we used to present when we had a unified approach. But we've decided specialization is more important.

Business and industry happens, happily, to agree with me, rather than with those who want to specialize. They would say that if the speech major comes to them with a background in speech, with some training in journalism, with some training in English, and some training in film, he is going to be a very great asset to them. Because public relations work in these areas, the employee has to work in audio visual and he has to be able to write articles or pamphlets. He has to be able to go and meet the public and speak. Two weeks ago the University of Iowa completed a study on job opportunities in business and industry. They polled the 100 largest companies in America to discover if they would accept or could they use people trained in communication. Business and industry said "no" if they are specialists in communication because they are too esoteric and too over specialized to solve our problems. We need a more generalized approach to communication within the structure.

Business also felt that people coming out of college with speech really didn't have the practical experience which would help them because they had never been associated with business. I doubt if there are very few, if any departments in this country, who allow their students the practical experience of not only getting a degree but going out into business and working while they get that degree. That type of training program would be a very great asset to students who don't want to teach. If you have business and industry in your college community, work your students into some program with that industry so that the student can understand what communication is in that background. They will have a

better job not only with that company, but in the job market as a whole.

The important thing is that speech majors are not second rate citizens. The economic squeeze in this country has hit us on the academic level and it obviously has hit business and industry. They are not employing now; they are cutting back. Those companies which responded to the Iowa studies said the first people to go are the communication people simply because they were the newest ones added. This is always the case when you have to cut back faculty; it's the new man that is let go, not the tenured faculty whom you couldn't get rid of under any conditions.

These recommendations which I make are also rather unpopular in the profession but I make them anyway---sometimes to create controversy, but primarily because I believe them. I am not an expert in the field and I would not try to make you think I am or try to confuse you. I'm not a speech education person. I have not studied the market except for my six years in the national office; but, what I would do, is simply cut back on the enrollments within our departments. I think it is grossly unfair to bring a student into any profession, not just ours, but any profession, and tell them that there may be a job out there once you finish; we don't know, let's try it anyway. That is an honest approach, but it is much more honest to keep the best students and tell the weaker students that their chances are very slim. Maybe they ought not even to stay in college and maybe they ought to go elsewhere.

The placement secretary at S.C.A. is leaving me today and we begin a search on Monday to replace her. The pay is \$110 per week in New York City. Of the seven young ladies that I interviewed on Monday to be the placement service secretary, five had B.A. degrees. I think these young girls are coming to us and saying I don't know what to do with my major; I can't find a job and I am willing to do anything. I think it is unfair to a college graduate to put them into that situation. So, I think obviously the only thing that can be done is to begin cutting back enrollments all along the line. Open enrollment is a wonderful ideal. I just don't think it is going to work.

We've got to tighten up the college programs, make them more applicable to the community relationship which has to be established between people in communications and the world outside. Speech really ought not to be an entity unto itself; we ought not to breed people who only breed themselves within the academic discipline. We ought to make them aware that there are communications problems in the outside world which, if they face, can make their jobs much better. We are going to strengthen our stand if we can show that the work we are doing is applicable to the field outside.

Part of the problem of the university financial situation comes from the fact that the town and gown relationship has always been a problem; it is more of a problem now and it has spread to the legislatures who no longer look at you as that castle up there. You have too many riots, too many burned buildings, too many other problems and they're cutting you back. And speech, always that frill academic course, is being cut hardest of all. The demise of the program at the University of

California at Los Angeles is indicative of the problem. The speech department at Pepperdine University in Los Angeles is being phased out. The speech department at Cornell was phased out and that was one of the oldest and most respected departments in the country. When they studied the institutions they discovered that they really could get away with abolishing those departments and not the university suffer. As they discovered at U.C.L.A. they could probably abolish the physical education department (not their scholastic sports program but the department itself) as they tried to abolish journalism. In that case they did not succeed thanks to the Los Angeles Times.

We don't have a Los Angeles Times or something to support us when that comes along, but we could have if we related our programs more to going back into the community and begin showing the community how we work. You can go out to the Rotary Clubs, you can go out to the State Legislature, and, if you can make them understand what academe is, they are going to better understand that perhaps the cut-backs aren't really honest and aren't going to serve any great purpose. Until that is done I think we have problems. Who would be the best people at explaining to the community or to a group of legislators what the academic world is all about? Speech people, are not always called upon, but maybe we ought to force ourselves!

My other recommendation is that there should be absolutely no other program of any kind instituted until we discover how we're going to solve the oversupply we currently have. By that I don't mean new area programs. I don't think we need another M.A. program under any conditions. I know we don't need any new Ph.D. programs because we flooded the market. There is a movement afoot to a D.A., the Doctor of Arts degree to the speech communications field. I am opposed to that. If we can't place the Ph.D.'s, are we going to place a D.A. which many administrators look at as a second-rate Ph.D.? I don't think it should be that and I don't think it would be that, but that is the way many people view it. I do see new programs replacing or expanding existing programs. We've never studied, explored, or experimented with speech training of the pre-adolescence child where the real speech work begins. We are really not very adept at speech for the disadvantaged. We let other people work at it but we let it go by. Obviously, it ought to be our area. Maybe rhetoric ought to move in those directions; maybe speech educators ought to be more concerned with getting people to understand pre-adolescent speech problems, the problems of the disadvantaged or whatever everybody wants to call them now, rather than simply teaching method courses and other things which are not exactly the answer to the problems we face.

I don't see a very hopeful market for probably 10 years and possibly beyond. If the legislatures give us more money, that means you have to take more students; that means that we get the cost-ratio of more students for the same number of jobs. They will always remain the same, more students than we have jobs available, until such point as the student enrollment goes down and the job market goes back up. I suppose that is a dycotomy because how can you have more jobs if you have less people to teach. Maybe it is a dog chasing its own tail; I'm not sure, but I would say that we do now face problems that we have not recognized

before. I think that the important thing is that the profession become aware of it and that we make young people coming into our departments aware that it is no longer the rosy future that it once was.

SPEECH: AN ACADEMIC DISCIPLINE----SOME PROPOSALS

by

Dr. Harold C. Larson

Mr. Daniel Julien, of Northern Arizona University, has made a valuable contribution to the long series of treatises which seek to define and unify the discipline within which most readers of this journal study and teach.<sup>1</sup> The article of Mr. Julien is pertinent in its context. It will be valuable, however, only if it is (1) read by many members of our association, and (2) extended to conclusions by other writers. Mr. Julien has effectively reviewed much of the history of the developments of speech and the disciplining of the field. He also has cited telling statements from recent works that describe the need for unity and cohesiveness in our discipline. Even more importantly, however, in the opinion of this writer, he has courageously charged much of our floundering in search of unity to our failure properly to police and instruct our membership: that is, to the ignorance that exists in many of us regarding the nature of our discipline and our relation to it.

Having performed the first of the duties described above, I shall now attempt to extend Mr. Julien's thinking in certain areas and to suggest answers to several questions he has asked. This article is in no way a rejoinder; neither is it a criticism of Mr. Julien's article. Rather, it is intended to be a sequel in an on-going process begun by Mr. Julien.

The thrust of what I have to say can be stated briefly under the following headings:

1. Speech is not an aggregation of teachers, performers, or practitioners of one variety or another tenuously bound together in a marriage of convenience through fear of extinction; rather, it is a basic discipline integrated by a compact system of phenomena and the principles that interpret and relate to them.
2. The speech discipline is best described and justified according to relationships which exist between the theoretical and practitioner levels of the field.
3. Mr. Julien is correct in tracing many of our unity problems to our permissiveness and our failure properly to police the competence of our membership.
4. The field of speech has already been identified, described, proscribed, delineated, explained, and instituted by philosophers and theorists both within and outside the speech profession. We are not, as Mr. Julien seems to indicate, involved in a pioneering search of discovery or an act of original creation.

Harold C. Larson, Ph.D., is Professor of Speech at Northern Arizona University.

5. There are definite actions that need to be taken by Arizona's speech profession.

Many of us are prone to view our field as being made up of various people engaged in broadcasting, oral interpretation, acting, directing or producing plays in the theatre, speaking to audiences, diagnosing and treating disorders of speech, teaching people to do these things, or teaching people to teach people to do them. It is true that our field does include people who are doing these things. It is not true, however, that these folk and their activities constitute the discipline of speech. In order to understand why we have departments of speech (or whatever we might call them) and why we have an organization called the Speech Communication Association, which is the primary professional association of our entire field, it is essential that we use as a reference system a true perspective of what constitutes a discipline, or field of study.

Philosophically speaking, any discipline that can be delineated as an academic unit will be characterized by three levels of endeavor: the levels of the philosopher, the theorist, and the practitioner. The philosopher's task is to draw the boundaries of the field, to describe relationships between that field and other bodies of knowledge, and to interpret relationships within the body of knowledge that falls within the boundaries described. In other words, the philosophy of the field of speech delineates, proscribes, and describes the field. The second level of endeavor is that of the theorist. He studies the phenomena and the principles that constitute and relate to the body of knowledge of the field and attempts to enunciate understandings as they are discovered. The third level, that of the practitioner, is devoted to manifestation of the phenomena and principles in the form of human behavior of some kind. In the case of speech, it is easy for us to be preoccupied with the practitioner level, because it includes the job of performance which accounts for most of our being in the field, in the first place.

There is a great irony that needs to be mentioned at this point. Most of the members of our profession and most of their students, in turn, have chosen or have been selected to enter the speech field because of early recognition of what we often refer to as "talent." It is probably more accurate to say that these people have had the good fortune to have been exposed to experiences (including teachers and parents) that encouraged such qualities of personality, flexibility, sensitivity, and skill as are useful in communication. Naturally, they in many cases were gratified by recognition and praise. Indeed, many schools have conducted notable programs in declamation, theatre, debate, and even speech pathology largely through recruitment of such lucky people, but that is not my point. The point is that since many of us have accomplished success by accident and have experienced gratification without the rigors of real teaching or study, it is easy for us as a profession to concentrate on what God has given us, so to speak, rather than on the task of teaching those who can learn to be actors or debators, but were less fortunate in their early years. It is also easy for us to settle on the pleasant plateau possible for many, who do their thing and

accept the applause without understanding what or why. In either case, we do not qualify as academic departments in educational institutions, if we concentrate on exhibiting ourselves and our students and forget to teach and to learn.

One of my tasks in this paper is to try to cast the various practitioners of the speech field in relation to the body of knowledge which makes up the subject matter of the discipline. Another is to respond to Mr. Julien's plea for location of a common set of phenomena to which we all can relate.<sup>2</sup> Perhaps the first task can be accomplished through reference to two metaphors--one used for the writer many times to remind his colleagues, his students, and himself--the other advanced by Dr. Wayland M. Parrish during a symposium of the Speech Association of America.

I like to compare the field of speech to a wagon wheel with several spokes. All of the spokes, together with the hub to which they are attached at the center, are enclosed by an outer rim. In the analogy, the hub represents the body of knowledge we possess relative to human communication behavior, both receptive and expressive. That hub is made up of our knowledge of what people do when they communicate. It includes the psychology of speech, phonetics, voice, articulation, the process of symbolizing, empathy, managing attention, structure, uses of language, non-verbal communication, role-taking for audience analysis, motivation, movement, uses of various means of symbolization, stress, rhythm, dramatic key, and all of the other elements of communicative behavior and what we know about them. The hub is central, directing and energizing the spokes as they move within the perimeter of the limits of the speech discipline. Each of the spokes, then, becomes a manifestation of the movement of the hub, each, in effect, being a place where the movement of the hub comes into contact with the world. The microphone, the proscenium arch, the camera, the reader's stand, the podium, the discussion table, and the debating platform--all of the places where people communicate with other people. The same kinds of actions, governed by the same principles, are performed in all of the places, but each adapted and modified according to the unique nature of the setting in which it is happening. I would suggest that the common body of knowledge Mr. Julien asked is compactly and systematically contained in the principles of human communication behavior, and the articulation or integration of the various parts of our field depends on our utilization through adaptation of these common principles. We all are (or are occupied with) people saying things to other people within a set of circumstances through the use of whatever symbols are available.

Dr. Andrew T. Weaver, of the University of Wisconsin, defined speech as "The process by which one individual (the speaker) seeks to stimulate and influence the mental activity of another individual (or other individuals) through the use of visible and/or audible symbols produced solely, and without instrumental mediation, by the speaker's own muscles and mental activity."<sup>3</sup> While it is true that all practitioners of speech communication employ other kinds of symbols (lighting, color, composition, musical stimulation, camera angle, visual aids) in their various settings, the definition advanced by professor Weaver does describe the primary activity of all, so the definition is suitable for all. It provides the "common thread" indicated by Mr. Julien as being essential to our discipline.

The other metaphor that might be helpful in describing the speech field as a compactly integrated body of knowledge is that advanced by Professor Parrish, of the University of Illinois, during the same symposium at which Professor Weaver offered his definition.<sup>4</sup> In remarking about then current trends toward segmentation and proliferation, Parrish recalled, "I was early taught that the proper way to get at the essential nature of a thing is to look at its roots, to see what it started from." He then spoke of the "center of common ground" and reminded that the growth of the speech field has been "growth away from the center, so that the center has become almost completely obscured by the proliferation of the foliage."

If there is a "center" or "root system" from which the field of speech communication has stemmed, it should be found in the essence of the several kinds of symbols traditionally treated by students of the speech arts. Any artistic endeavor consists of treatment of four variables. In speech they have been delineated as content or subject matter, disposition or structure, symbolic formulation or style, and modes of presentation. Whether in theater, television, interpretation, public speaking, or group discussion, thoughts and feelings are being presented; symbolic structures are being employed; languages of one kind or another are being utilized; and voice, diction, body action, and other symbolic behaviors are being carried out. Here, again, in the principles which surround these central basic speech communication functions is constituted the body of knowledge which is the "root"--the "common thread" of the discipline.

Earlier, I made a plea for a central core of courses which would embody the body of knowledge which is basic and general to all special applications of speech. The rationale for that group of courses was that it would represent the integrative focus of the field. I have written about the special manifestations of communication: broadcasting, theatre, interpretation, public speaking, and group discussion. There are two specialties in our field that more than any other factors mark it as an integrated discipline. They are speech pedagogy and speech pathology. Pedagogy--the teaching of teachers, and pathology--the study of the anomalies present in the field, do not lend themselves to conglomerates. They are both precise in nature and must be directed toward specific systems. We can not conceive of a "pathology of theater" or a "pathology of public speaking." We must think in terms of the "pathology of speech," for the stutterer or the brain damaged function with equal difficulty under the proscenium arch, before the camera, or on the platform. The disorders of speech are related to conceptualization, thought processes, symbolization, perception, voice, fluency, articulation, and personality. They are anomalies of artistic invention, style, structuring, and presentation.

In like manner, speech pedagogy must be directed toward the central hub of the discipline. Certainly, we can not deny that many teachers will specialize in preparing students to be practitioners in theatre, broadcasting, public speaking, and the other spokes of the wheel. But we do deny that teachers are specialists in teaching students to "be on



the stage" or "be in perview of a camera" or "sit in a group for discussion." Instead, each is intent first on teaching his students to communicate--then on teaching them to adapt their communication to the setting and the special symbolization of that setting. The conclusion follows naturally: speech pedagogy must stress first that the student preparing to teach be grounded in the basic, central, general knowledge of the discipline--then prepared to interpret that knowledge to his students according to the demands of the performance setting.

It disturbs the writer, within the context so far established in this article, to call to mind the arrangements which exist here and there in the state of Arizona. The very title of our professional organization would suggest either ignorance on the part of powerful people within the organization who have forced compromise, or motives more closely related to what Julien has called in his article devotion to "our private little traditional, protective world(s)" and lack of "genuine interest in worthy academic instruction" and "substituting showmanship for the hard effort necessary to real teaching." This writer has yet to hear a viable case presented for either treating the central discipline (speech) and any of the specialized manifestations of it (theatre, broadcasting, etc.) on the same level of abstraction, as is indicated by such titles as "Department of Speech and Theatre," "Speech and Drama Association," or, in a single institution, separate departments of Speech and Theatre. Professor W. Norwood Brigance writes incisively regarding this question: "Such titles are like hearing of a Department of Mathematics and Algebra, a Department of Mathematics and Geometry, or a Department of Mathematics and Trigonometry."<sup>5</sup> I am not surprised, but I am concerned and disturbed to hear at meetings of our state association people asking why they are there.

At the outset, I proposed certain content for this article. Perhaps three of the five propositions have been justified. Speech is not a motley assemblage contrived for administrative convenience. It is a compact, integrative, discipline, but so basic and vital that it has diversified manifestations on the practitioner level. The discipline has been delineated and described. It is best understood according to the relationships which exist between the theoretical and practitioner levels. And the actions and rhetoric of some people of the speech profession in the state of Arizona would seem to suggest that we are a young group that should probably individually, as an association, and as academic departments give more attention to the discipline which is our strength and succor and less attention to our little special worlds that isolate us.

There are, of course, reasons other than the ones I have chosen to deal with that encourage the integrative discipline of speech. One is that together we are able to exercise greater "clout" in the politics of academia. Another, and much more important one, is that divisive disciplining encourages proliferation of courses and duplication of course content. We can be much more "accountable" as an integrated discipline. However, the reasons we must live within the final analysis are those presented here: the scholarly, philosophical evidence of the existence of relationships that spell out rationally a discipline. The responsibility to our institutions and to our students who would support us and

study in our field must outweigh our natural permissiveness toward ignorance and ambition that would distort and divert.

Dr. Brigrance told of the following incident. "I was talking in the lobby of the Mayflower Hotel in Washington to an educator who was then a dean, and is now a university president. He asked, 'Why doesn't the term speech include drama?' I replied, 'It really does. Our Association agreed on that in 1917.' Then came a more difficult question, 'Why do some departments call themselves the Department of Speech and Drama?' To which I could only answer, 'I don't know, except that they want to be individualists.' Next came a still sharper question, 'But why do even individualists want to confuse educators in other fields?' Remember please, that I was not exactly free to speak as an individual. I was representing the Speech Association of America, and even in a hotel lobby I had a responsibility to be a spokesman for that Association. As I hesitated in replying, there came that final question, 'Is it possible that some people in the Field of Speech aren't exactly clear where they belong in education?' I escaped answering that by finding an excuse to talk about color photography, and I hope never to be asked that question again."<sup>6</sup>

The writer suggests that it is high time that we ask and answer such questions as the one put to Professor Brigrance. He also submits that it is high time that we stop fooling ourselves. I agree with Professor Julien that we should, in one or more of our Association meetings, devote attention to the integrative essence of our discipline, in order that we, as colleagues, understand philosophically the field and our positions in it. In addition, I propose that we insist at all stages of education, that our students be grounded in understanding of the basic principles of communication, so they can not only recognize their relationship to a discipline of knowledge, but so they can function and grow more effectively in the execution and teaching of their specialties. In addition, I suggest that colleges and universities provide programs of courses which unabashedly present the basic knowledge of the central core of the discipline, and that faculty advisors and instructors encourage their students to partake fully of these courses. Finally, I submit that we must cease to tolerate the actions and rhetoric of those who selfishly or jealously sustain divisive thinking, and, instead, insist that those who, as Dr. Parrish might put it, accept the shelter of the foliage, be aware that they are standing on the roots.

\*\*\*\*\*

#### FOOTNOTES

<sup>1</sup>Daniel J. Julien, Jr., "Speech: An Academic Discipline--Reviewed," Journal of the Arizona Speech and Drama Association, Vol. I, No. 1, (Winter 1971-72), p. 2.

<sup>2</sup>Ibid., p. 8.

<sup>3</sup>Andrew T. Weaver, et al., "What is Speech? A Symposium," The Quarterly Journal of Speech, Vol. XLI, No. 2, (April 1955), p. 151.

<sup>4</sup>Ibid., p. 149.

<sup>5</sup>Ibid., p. 148.

<sup>6</sup>Ibid., p. 148.

## THE VALUE OF HIGH SCHOOL SPEECH ACTIVITIES

PURPOSE: TO ANALYZE HIGH SCHOOL SPEECH  
ACTIVITIES AND THEIR RELEVANCY  
TO EDUCATIONAL PRINCIPLES

by

Dennis Brown, Darlene Novakovich Brown

At the March 18, 1972, Northern Arizona University High School Festival, a questionnaire concerning speech activities and their value was distributed to 300 high school students from every part of Arizona. Two hundred fifteen of these questionnaires were returned. The following data was then analyzed and computed for reference.

In preparing the questionnaire we followed a basic "pyramid" format with every third question being most significant. The purpose of the questionnaires was to gather information that would enable the department to improve and develop speech activities that would enhance the students' learning experience. Second, it was an assignment from the Education Psychology Class, Section 4, to find out whether or not the festival and tournament activities are justified in expenditure of time and money. The criteria was to find out from the high school students themselves as to whether or not the speech activities acted as a complement to their classroom instruction. It was also our endeavor to find out if this activity also met some of the adolescent's developmental needs.

Students were given a sheet of paper with nine questions each with a number of choices from which to choose. The students were also allowed to circle more than one appropriate answer. The ninth question was a personal essay asking for the student's opinion as to how the speech tournament and/or festival activities could be improved.

As to how each question was developed, credit should be given here to Mr. James Sayer and the N.A.U. Forensics team for their assistance in preparation and analysis. As future Speech and Drama teachers who had a good deal of experience at various speech activities, their suggestions and criticisms were invaluable. As the questions were drawn up, we gave serious attention as to their significance to the high school student; we also were made conscious of what our reaction would be to student responses.

The following is a complete breakdown of student responses:

- Question #1. How many high school speech tournaments and/or festivals have you participated in prior to this one?
- A. None - 14.8%
  - B. One to three - 33.3%
  - C. Four to six - 16.2%
  - D. Over six - 35.6%

As the results would indicate, the majority of students had previous

tournament experience. This gave us an indication as to how many students could give qualified responses.

Question #2. Which of the following event(s) are you most interested in?

- A. Debate - 21.8%
- B. Extemp - 13.1%
- C. Oratory - 18.5%
- D. Oral Interp - 38.3%
- E. Radio Speaking - 8.4%

As an overview of what this age level was not interested in, this question will help the high school teacher plan for tournament activity.

Question #3. I have come to this speech festival:

- A. to have a good time - 22.5%
- B. to gain learning experience - 40.0%
- C. to win a certificate - 12.2%
- D. to meet people - 18.0%
- E. to get away from home - 7.2%

A surprising percentage of responses indicated that the students showed a desire for learning as well as social interaction with others in their age group. Special notice should be made of the 7.2% to Choice E. This would indicate a special need that the tournament activity was able to fill. Adolescence is a time when the individual will experience difficulties in adjustments with parents and home life. Here they were able to temporarily relieve their tension in supervised educational experience.

Question #4. How much time did you spend in preparation and practice for the event(s) you have entered?

- A. less than five hours - 20.2%
- B. more than five hours - 7.6%
- C. less than a week 16.1%
- D. more than a week - 56.1%

56.1% of the responses would indicate that a majority of students had spent more than a week in preparing for the events they entered. Others spent comparatively little time in preparation. This would give an indication of two possible reasons:

- (1) the wide range of student capabilities;
- (2) lack of adequate time for teachers to help students prepare.

Question #5. Do you feel your participation in speech tournaments and/or festival activities will:

- A. add to your present knowledge of the fundamentals of speech - 51.1%
- B. contradict what you have learned during classroom instruction - 1.9%
- C. help you relate to other people - 37.5%
- D. none of the above - 9.5%

Active participation of the learner is one of the basic principles in education, especially in the area of vocal skills and intellectual development. The 51.1% of the responses indicated that students felt that this activity would add to their own understanding of the subject; they also gave a strong indication (37.5%) that the activity would provide an opportunity for them to learn more about other people. During adolescent

development the individual is preoccupied with himself; for this reason it is extremely important to give the adolescent opportunities which allow him to look outside himself, helping him make needed social adjustments.

- Question #6. Do you feel that your individual school would benefit from hosting a Speech tournament and/or festival?
- A. yes - 68.9%
  - B. no - 31.1%

The students' response would indicate that the majority of students felt their school could benefit from hosting a speech tournament. The 68.9% would also be an indicator of a rather positive attitude on the part of the adolescent. The 31.1% is also an indication of a more negative attitude and an ability on the part of the adolescent to discriminate between what he would consider beneficial or non-beneficial.

- Question #7. What do you think a speech judge's responsibilities are?
- A. give an honest critique - 41.0%
  - B. initiate constructive criticism - 33.7%
  - C. rank contestants as to the quality of their presentation - 25.3%

The distribution of responses among the three alternatives points to the students' concern. All three are the ultimate responsibility of the judge; students, however, seemed to indicate that the judge's first responsibility to them was that of honesty. The responses would also point to the priorities indicated.

- Question #8. I am:
- A. not interested in hearing others give speeches - 6.9%
  - B. interested in hearing others speak on current issues - 54.3%
  - C. interested in listening to debate - 38.9%

The selection of response B (54.3%) gives us an important understanding of the contemporary interest of the adolescent. Here, the speech activity proves to be an effective means of providing a sounding board for student views.

- Question #9. (Designed as an essay question to give the students an opportunity to respond in a constructive manner.)  
How would you improve speech tournaments and/or festival activities?

Student responses fell into five main categories:

- A. better judges (more qualified) - 21.9%
- B. more organization (keep things on schedule) - 41.9%
- C. did not feel qualified to answer - 5.6%
- D. system adequate - 7.4%
- E. blanks - 23.3%

We had felt that this question would prove to be the most useful to us in knowing how students felt tournament activities could be improved. We were surprised at the number of students who left the question blank. The overwhelming majority of students gave the question their serious attention and seemed very straight forward in answering the question.

This questionnaire is not meant as a scientific analysis of high school speech activities. It is, however, an accurate as possible sample of 215 Arizona high school students. We feel that our findings have demonstrated not only the desirability of speech activities but also the areas in which they can be improved. Teachers in their enthusiasm for their subject sometimes forget that it is not merely the subject matter they must teach but how they teach their students that will make the final difference. Programs such as speech activities are unique inasmuch as they provide time for individual instruction, exposure to new ideas, and social intermingling. We felt that participation in these activities is extremely important at this age level. Consider if you will that one half of our population will not go beyond the high school level in their education. If we do not provide these kinds of activities, how are we to teach them ideas that are based on democracy? Democracy depends on an informed citizenry that can reason for themselves in a manner which is both communicative and constructive. This is, after all, the function of a good speech background.

\*\*\*\*\*

Dennis and Darlene Brown are senior speech majors at Northern Arizona University.

RANDON THOUGHTS ON DRAMA IN EDUCATION

by

Jack Frakes

Don Doyle

Philosophy, goals and objectives in school handbooks are often in terms of affective learning (learning through the involvement of the senses and emotions) which psychologists and psychiatrists will affirm is the most effective learning. However, through tradition there is still strong pressure to teach in terms of cognitive learning (factual material). At the rate new knowledge is needed and old factual "truths" discarded, only affective learning which is concerned with the process approach to problems may be of any real value to the student in the long range.

The established "required curriculum" leans heavily toward the cognitive (without totally ignoring the affective, when well taught) while the fine arts and drama and some other "elective" courses lean heavily toward the affective (without totally ignoring the cognitive, when well taught).

In The Medium is the Massage, the social anthropologist Marshall McLuhan says, "We have now become aware of the possibility of arranging the entire human environment as a work of art, as a teaching machine designed to maximize perception and to make everyday learning a process of discovery. It would seem only reasonable to extend such controls to all the sensory thresholds of our being."

William Glasser, M.D. and psychiatrist, wrote in the October 1971 issue of "Today's Education" that today's children want and need roles (i.e. find an identity--a belief in who they are) before they set goals (i.e. what they do or their objectives). In the past, with most teachers and parents, goals came first. Of course, some students who know who they are will work for goals. But if a student doesn't and he fails a subject, then he feels he is a failure as a person and often reinforces this belief by doing nothing or resorting to misbehavior.

McLuhan reinforces this belief by saying, "Education must shift from instruction, from imposing of stencils, to discovery--to probing and exploration and to the recognition of the language of forms. The young today reject goals. They want roles--R-O-L-E-S. That is, total involvement. They do not want fragmented, specialized goals or jobs."

By participation in drama: acting a variety of roles, working cooperatively on a group project, reading and discussing plays that define our times, a student is helped in defining his self-identity and role.

Carl Rogers, psychiatrist and author, says, "A person learns significantly only those things which he perceives as being involved in the maintenance of, or enhancement of, the structure of self." Drama is

toward helping students understand and define themselves.

Robert Havighurst, in Human Development and Education, identifies ten developmental tasks which the adolescent must complete in order to become a successful adult. These tasks are:

1. Achieving new and more mature relations with age-mates of both sexes;
2. Achieving a masculine or feminine role;
3. Accepting one's physique and using the body effectively;
4. Achieving emotional independence of parents and other adults;
5. Achieving assurance of economic independence;
6. Selecting and preparing for an occupation;
7. Preparing for marriage and family life;
8. Developing intellectual skills and concepts necessary for civic competence;
9. Desiring and achieving socially responsible behavior; and
10. Acquiring a set of values and an ethical system as a guide to behavior.

Many of these tasks are social--or at least the individual discovery is made because of the involvement with social interaction--and school drama, which is organized on the basis of social interaction, can play a strong part in helping the student with his self-discovery.

In Counterblast, McLuhan writes: "All our teenagers are now tribal. That is, they recognize their total involvement in the human family regardless of their personal goals or backgrounds."

Drama is a social subject--with social interaction as the key to personal discovery and the defining and growth of self. Drama is aimed toward helping the student gain a strong self-identity and become a mature human being.

\*\*\*\*\*

Jack Frakes is an instructor at Rincon High School, Tucson.  
Don Doyle is an Associate Professor at Arizona State University.



SELECTED STATEMENTS AND IDEAS FROM  
THEATRE IN HIGH SCHOOL: PLANNING, TEACHING, DIRECTING  
(Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1970)

by

Charlotte Kay Motter

reviewed by

Jack Frakes, Don Doyle

The school that either omits drama from the curriculum or places it on the frills list as an extracurricular activity fails to meet its responsibility to its students and to society.

The theatre arts--motion pictures, television, and theatre--are a primary source of information for the mid-twentieth century American. It has been estimated that one-third of the nation is in the audience of the theatre arts every evening. Ninety million people watch television; six million see a motion picture; seventy-five thousand attend the theatre. If the high school is to prepare its students to live in American society, it must offer them the opportunity to acquire a basic education in the theatre arts.

Like all subjects offered in school, drama can claim a legitimate place in the curriculum only if it meets the needs of the students. A well-planned and well-taught secondary school drama program can satisfy the students' need to:

- Obtain skill in the use of oral language;
- Develop a well-adjusted personality;
- Learn to cooperate with others;
- Attain approval of his peers;
- Develop a capacity for intellectual recreation; and
- Develop an appreciation of aesthetic and cultural concepts.

Although many of these needs may be met by other disciplines, some are so specific that they can be obtained only through a drama program.

Although few high school drama students pursue careers in the theatre (high school theatre training is not designed to be primarily pre-vocational training), they are often helped by their experience in the theatre to find themselves and to develop self-respect and a sense of direction. Drama provides the student with an opportunity to explore ideas and activities and to evaluate his interests, abilities, and limitations. Tomorrow's electricians, commercial artists, teachers, carpenters, writers, salesmen, T.V. cameramen, window decorators, politicians and theatre artists may be guided to these careers through high school play production activities.

The place of drama in the school curriculum is largely a reflection of society's attitudes toward the theatre arts. Our Puritan heritage has been evident in the attitude that theatre, if given encouragement by the schools, may lead our children to lives of sin. It is all right for them to act in the Christmas pageant or even the senior play, but we

wouldn't want our daughters to become actresses. The suspicion that theatre is somehow immoral may be one reason why schools have been reluctant to offer courses in drama. Why this fear of developing professionals has not extended to the teaching of poetry, music, and painting in the schools is a mystery. In spite of the Puritan background, or perhaps in rebellion against it, drama classes entered the high school curriculum in increasing numbers during the thirties, forties and early fifties.

By 1950 drama was well-established as an elective course in most high schools. It was usually associated with the English Department. Russia's Sputnik and Harvard's Conant threw high schools into a panic in the late 50's. Drama, along with the other arts and humanities, suffered while curricula requirements increased in mathematics and science. Partly because it was soon discovered that all students cannot become scientists and partly because teachers of the arts and humanities were roused to action (and re-evaluated their objectives), the overemphasis on science and math was short-lived in the high school curriculum.

In September of 1962, the newly created National Council of the Arts in Education, made up of representatives of professional associations of artists and educators in the arts, held its first annual National Conference on the Arts in Education. The recommendations, by this conference, that a comprehensive study of the arts in American life be undertaken and that specialists in art, music, and theatre arts be added to the staff of the Office of Education have been partially implemented.

President Kennedy's appointment of August Heckscher as Special Consultant on the Arts, in the spring of 1962, marked the beginning of the federal government's active concern with and support of the arts.

Paralleling the federal government's recognition of the value of the arts to society, their value in education was proclaimed in September 1962 by the National Association of Secondary School Principals' Bulletin in the publication of the N.A.S.S.P.'s curriculum position paper, "The Arts in the Comprehensive Secondary School." This paper states;

The Association firmly believes that the subjects taught and experienced provided for all children in the area of the arts as defined here are essential to the general education of all secondary school youth. The arts in this paper are basically conceived to include the fields of music, visual arts, theatre arts, and some aspects of home economics and industrial arts...

The arts are subject disciplines which emphasize the use of the intellect as well as the development of sensitivity, creativity, and the capacity to make reasoned, aesthetic decisions...The arts give direction to man's patterns of living from the setting of his table to the expression of his most cherished aspirations. The arts constitute a vast communication system which complements man's cognitive word system.

FUNCTIONS OF THE  
ARIZONA INTERSCHOLASTIC ASSOCIATION, INC.

Editor's Note: The following letter was solicited from Mr. H. A. Hendrickson, to explain the function of the A.I.A.

March 2, 1972

Mr. James Sayer, Director of Forensics  
Northern Arizona University  
Box 5006  
Flagstaff, Arizona 86001

Dear Jim:

Your letter of February 15, 1972 is appreciated. The article below will perhaps clarify some of the confusion that may exist regarding the Arizona Interscholastic Association and its function.

The A.I.A. is a voluntary organization of high school administrators, who organized to establish rules and regulations governing both athletic and nonathletic activities. The A.I.A. takes an active part in promoting forensics. They have divided the state into four districts, and provide competition at district and state level in debate, extemporaneous speaking, original oratory, prose, poetry and dramatic reading, and one-act plays. In addition to this, the A.I.A. sanctions speech and drama tournaments and festivals requested by high school oriented organizations, and University speech and drama departments.

The A.I.A. provides a form for organizations to request approval of their activity. Basically, the A.I.A. wants to be assured that the activity does not involve excessive loss of school time, does not charge unreasonable fees to participate, and that the rules of competition are fair. When a requested activity meets the criteria as established by the A.I.A., the event is sanctioned and a University, Community College, or other organization can sponsor the requested activity.

A Speech Advisory Committee that includes representatives of both high school and university personnel builds a calendar of events for the school year, trying to avoid excessive duplication, thus assuring a balanced program.

A.I.A. member schools may not participate in activities sponsored by organizations other than high schools unless sanctioned by the A.I.A.

Personal regards,  
H. A. Henrickson  
Executive Secretary