

and should accelerate its efforts to identify meaningful cooperative ventures.

I believe such resistance is based on the conviction of most potential members that SCA can do little that is of direct professional value to them. Moreover, given our present programs, I doubt that one could write a persuasive argument to the contrary. Our programs serve quite well the interests of university researchers and graduate teachers, they serve less well the interests of teachers in four-year non-graduate institutions of higher learning, they serve poorly at best the interests of community college teachers, and their support for the high school teacher can best be characterized as "too little, too late".

It would be a grave error to assume that the solution to these inadequacies lies in curtailing research and graduate-teaching-oriented activities within the Association, for these represent the most fertile sources of future development in any intellectual discipline. But without diminishing such programs in any way, the Association needs to reach out in other directions with renewed emphasis, bringing to bear the fruits of our research upon problems of high school and community college instruction, and perhaps finding there unsolved problems that will challenge our most sophisticated research methods.

To bring more professionals into the Association requires that we show clear-cut advantages to the prospective member. For the high school, community and junior college instructor, this implies formulating new programs especially to meet her/his needs. For professionals at every level, it probably means forging stronger links of co-operation among state, regional and national associations. This is what we should be about in 1972.

2. We must find ways to better serve the needs of high school teachers of speech-communication. It is my impression that at present there is insufficient awareness at all levels of leadership in the national Association concerning just what those needs are and how SCA can best serve them. But surely if we were serving this group well, its membership among our ranks would be much greater than it is.

Just what proportion of high school teachers of speech-communication are members of SCA is not known, but it must be a very small percent. It is counter-productive to claim that high school teachers should be more professionally oriented; rather we should modify the programs of the Association

or add new ones in such a way as to give the typical high school speech-communication teacher what he/she clearly does not now have—a solid reason for joining and staying in SCA.

3. We must find ways to better serve the needs of junior and community college teachers of speech-communication. The great majority of community college teachers in our field are not SCA members. Only those who find the scholarly and academic papers that are printed in our journals and read at our conventions somehow relevant to their work, or who can enjoy (and can afford) the prestige of belonging to a national professional society remain affiliated with us.

Creating viable programs for the community and junior college professional will be no easier than creating programs for the secondary school teacher, but it is no less important. In both instances there is a dual problem: (a) identifying the leadership, actual and potential, within each group and consulting with that leadership about the wants and needs of the professional group in question, and (b) finding means to bring to the attention of that professional group resources within the Association and the profession of which they may have been previously unaware.

Some of what needs to be done in both cases can be accomplished through existing Divisions, Boards, Commissions and Committees. Some can be done through the national office. Wherever appropriate, I shall make use of such existing machinery as can be brought to bear on the problem, and where necessary I shall seek to establish new machinery.

4. We must find ways to bring more members of the profession into the Association. Membership in SCA presently stands at a little over 7,000. Membership in the profession is unknown but is probably close to 20,000. The difference between the two figures represents a challenge and an opportunity to SCA.

Some sort of membership campaign obviously is in order; but it would be well to remember that such campaigns have been tried repeatedly with slight effect. We have enough experience with membership drives to know that professional resistance to joining SCA is not based on lack of information, opportunity, or urging.

Presidential Address—1971

William S. Howell, President, SCA

(Delivered at the Convention Luncheon, 57th Annual Meeting of the Speech Communication Association in San Francisco, December 29, 1971)

We have, in the Speech Communication Association, an amazing variety of activities and people. If there is strength in diversity, and I believe there is, we are a strong association. Being a national officer turned out to be a great privilege, with rewards I had not anticipated. At the end of three years "inside" our professional organization some pressure to tell people about it has accumulated. So, please permit me to begin this talk with reminiscence.

Some of you are wondering, three years? I thought our president served one year term. This is true, but he becomes eligible for the presidency by serving a year as first vice president. And, he is transformed into a first vice president by acting as second vice president for the preceding year. Thus, being president of SCA is not simply a matter of stepping in and stepping out a year later, but rather it requires survival of basic, and advanced basic training.

When I became an officer, I was relatively bright-eyed, bushy-tailed, and naive. In 1968 I recommended that our 1970 convention have the theme of international and intercultural communication, that it be held in Hong Kong, and that we meet only in forenoons, reserving afternoons and evenings for us to become a part of the fascinating multicultural environment of that Oriental city.

The Hong Kong proposal was NOT an idea whose time had come! I mention it to perpetuate it. Some day—well, I live in hope that our discipline will be truly intercultural and world-wide. We should congratulate the Western Speech Communication Association for holding their meeting next November in Hawaii. That is a step in the right direction.

The second vice president meets with the Administrative Committee of SCA in New York in March and October, where he begins to learn the complexities of managing a professional organization of seven to eight thousand members. But his major assignment is the publication of abstracts of presentations to be given at our national convention. Getting abstracts of papers four months before the paper are to be delivered is an exercise in applied persuasion that merits scholarly

continued, page 4

Keith S. Montgomery, School of General Education, Ferris State College, Big Rapids, Michigan 49307 has back issues of SCA journals for sale.

Howell, cont. from page 2

study. Here the diversity of our membership was revealed dramatically. A few of our members met or beat the deadlines for submitting their abstracts, most needed to be reminded, and responded to the reminder, and some were impervious to "double urgent" appeals. With the last, most challenging group, I experimented with three forms of rhetoric: forcefully directive, indignant, and pathetic. There were no significant differences in response. Proof that none of the three rhetorical forms modified behavior is found in the reasonably small number of paper titles that stand alone in the 1969 Abstracts.

Among our membership there was little agreement upon what constitutes an abstract. After editing three hundred or so I found that I was no longer confident that I would know an abstract if I saw one, myself!

Getting out the Abstracts is a substantial task, as Bob Jeffrey who did the Abstracts for the 1971 convention will testify. The volume I put together was the second in the series, and I was the first second vice-president to have this duty. Volume I of Abstracts was assembled, edited and published by Marie Nichols, then 1st vice-president, who also was responsible for the convention. Only Marie, who does twice as much twice as well as almost anyone else, could have handled both projects concurrently and successfully. At this late date, I want to recognize her unusual achievement, and thank her for getting Abstracts underway. Ted Cleverger produced the 1970 Abstracts, exercising commendable quality control. Now with Volume IV in print we can say that another significant publication in our field has been established and is in general use.

Assembling the New Orleans Convention of 1970 was a pleasant task for me as 1st VP because of the help of a basically efficient organization structured around the old Interest Groups. Building a hundred programs to meet the needs of 2000 professionals who attended was a challenge. In this project I encountered forces I had underestimated. I felt the energy and competence of our membership, an evangelical drive to spread the word of scholarship, a sense of urgency, a conviction that time is short, that we must move aggressively to shape the future. The unanticipated, dynamic change-orientation that revealed itself in many subfields of speech communication was exhilarating. My only regret was that I was so busy with organization business sessions in New Orleans that I was

able to attend only two of the exciting sessions I had seen in the planning stage.

In Year Three, being president was busier than I had hoped. There were committees to be appointed and instructed, professional meetings to be attended as representative of SCA, and most pleasant of all, the opportunity to attend regional and state speech communication conventions. And, I wrote letters. Last January Bill Work presented me with an immense bundle of presidential stationery. At the time I considered it a wasteful overrun. Three weeks ago I delivered to our departmental secretary back home the last of the sheets and envelopes. Amazingly, stationery and presidency ran out at the same time. What a tribute to the level of planning in our National Office!

Why so many letters? Because everybody turns to the president of an organization when issues arise. This is great, for he is in a position to reach everyone who is or should be involved. Also, when a president is at the center of the sociogram he is kept informed of the ebb and flow of events in his organization. Here my basic and advanced basic training paid off.

After living through it I'm convinced that the new SCA Constitution creates a role for the president that is practical and sensible. He has influence but not an excessive amount. He finds himself a part of a democratically run management team, with sufficient checks and balances to insure stability. In my case, I found the machinery operable. Further, it was being guided by high ability, dedicated people of great good will, from the national office and from the membership. In the final analysis, the human climate makes an assignment uncomfortable, tolerable or satisfying. As a result, my year as president was near the "satisfying" end of the continuum.

The presidential year, coming as it does after two years of preparation, resembles the last chance saloon, or the filling station before the desert. It is a one shot deal. The president either affects the enterprise, or he does not. I lobbied for several changes. One was more emphasis on international and intercultural communication, another was more service to elementary and high school teachers, a third was acceptance of a special kind of relevance as important to our field. The relevance I advocated assigns a high importance to integrating what we do with the surrounding community. I wanted us to spend more time and effort meeting the needs of individuals and organizations out there in the "real world." What

relevance means in this sense came through loud and clear in a statement made by a political scientist at a conference of the International Studies Association in Puerto Rico. He told his colleagues, "We should stop chasing each other's footnotes and start chasing the action."

Those were my persuasive propositions. Another issue required investigation rather than advocacy. The trend toward collective bargaining in American public education is gaining momentum at an increasing rate. As SCA president I attended the summer conference of the Higher Education Division of NEA in Ann Arbor. The entire conference dealt with organizing, political action and negotiation. I reported on the conference in an article in SPECTRA. Efforts not only to "unionize" faculties but to organize both students and teachers are upon us. Since my SPECTRA piece the trend has moved more rapidly than anticipated. In October the lead article in *Harpers Magazine* was "Professors, Unite!" and in the November issue of *Academe* the conservative American Association of University Professors announced that it would pursue collective bargaining as a major way of realizing AAUP's goals in higher education. At the end of 1971, the obligation for us to think through the issues of organizing and collective bargaining at all levels of education is immediate and compelling.

It was a privilege for me to learn something about collective bargaining in education first hand. Another good thing that happened because I was president was that Tom Tedford, the editor of our *Free Speech Yearbook 1971*, invited me to write an opening essay. This gave me a chance to say some things that seem to me to be important under the title "Freedom of Speech and Change in American Education." I'm grateful both to SCA and to Tom Tedford.

Any president who passes the gavel to his successor reflects about the probable fate of programs and directions he advocated. It would be satisfying to see the Speech Communication Association dominate research and training in intercultural and international communication. I would be happy to see SCA replace the National Council of Teachers of English as a resource for elementary and high school teachers of speech. It would be good for our profession to have organizations in our communities think of us first when they seek help with their problems of interpersonal communication. Development in these directions conforms to my biased point of view.

continued, page 5

Howell, cont. from page 4

But, I'm relaxed about our future as a profession. Growing numbers of able, well-trained and youthful specialists and even a few generalists, are moving into SCA. They are not excessively modest about their contributions. They tend to fit the entrepreneurial stereotype of the "aggressive gentleman", a person who is "pushy" but un-faillingly polite, and this is fine, for our establishment is badly in need of being "shaken up." In our brawling, competitive culture the softly spoken word of wisdom goes unheard. I respect and trust our evolving membership. If the programs and directions that seem so productive to me in 1971 die aborning they will be replaced by programs and directions better suited to the times, and of greater potential.

But, enough about the axes I have been grinding the past three years. I am reminded of Howard Gilkinson, one of the truly great pioneers in research in our field. Howard's perspective was scholarly to the point that use of the adjective "esoteric" might have been justified. One spring Howard mentioned to me that he was soon to deliver a high school commencement speech. This seemed an unusual assignment for Howard Gilkinson, so I was anxious to get his report. The morning after the commencement I stopped in Howard's office. He was busily reading some student papers. When I asked, "Howard, how did your commencement speech go last night?" he looked up and said with complete calm, "I talked about some things that interested me. It did not interest them." And he returned to reading his papers.

Like Howard, I feel that thus far my talk has been severely limited by my interests, with (I hope!) cells of responsive listeners scattered about the room. Now let me turn to issues of a general concern to the spectrum of specializations in speech communication. All of us have a stake in these. I am wording them as questions.

How is higher education in America changing?

How can we cope with the interdisciplinary nature of our discipline?

How can we minimize future shock in speech communication?

Unease on the campus, or as my wise colleague Bryngelsson terms it, "dis-ease," has intensified to the point that the old order probably cannot return. Apparently, established patterns have become truly obsolete. While we can agree that the Tower of Ivory is shattered we cannot advance in a sensible fashion without some diag-

nosis of the case.

One key to understanding the predicament of higher education is a profound shift in attitude of our constituents. I remember well that two decades ago the Minnesota legislature gave our university money because they did not understand what we were doing. They concluded that since our work defied understanding it must be profound, and was therefore important and deserving of support.

Now, our legislature requires some information about an educational activity before they finance it. Their challenge is direct. Show us what you are doing and how it benefits the community, and we will supply money. Whatever you are engaged in that you cannot demonstrate to be of value to contemporary society, we will de-emphasize, financially, says the Appropriations Committee.

A New Doctrine of Accountability has come to dominate Gown and Town interaction. We in the education business find ourselves looking at our curriculum from a changed perspective. A contemporary affairs orientation appears where it was conspicuously lacking before. A thoughtful friend of mine sensed the trend of the times and about three years ago, suggested a new course called "Practical Philosophy." He was laughed down by his committee. Today, his recommendation would have greater appeal. I predict that within five years courses titled "Practical Philosophy" will appear in college and university catalogs across America! We are very nearly ready to accept the severe dietum of the late Norman DeWitt, who was Chairman of the University of Minnesota Classics Department when he said, "If you learn something you can't use, you haven't been educated, you have been entertained."

This past fall as President of SCA I attended the annual conference of the American Council in Education in Washington. By far the most insightful message at that conference was a talk by Father Hesburgh, President of Notre Dame. The title of his speech implied that the plight of colleges and universities is indeed serious. It was, "Resurrection of Higher Education." Father Hesburgh produced more than his quota of memorable statements. Here are a few that describe events of the past few years in our institutions of higher learning.

"Everything seemed to come unglued at once."

"We were the victims of our own success. Our growth was external, not internal."

"Colleges and universities ceased to be communities."

"We must admit we were given magnificent coverage, indeed, when we were at our very worst."

Father Hesburgh said that he had pondered at length the predominant purpose of modern higher education. Finally, he found his answer to what it was all about. He phrased it in these words:

"What higher education must supply is the opportunity to become personally involved in adult affairs."

I submit that this statement of purpose does not describe the goal of present higher education. To accomplish significant involvement in adult affairs required a level of integration of community and university that is extremely rare.

My simplified diagnosis of the case finds that American higher education is in deep trouble at least in part because it has isolated itself from the surrounding real world of things, events and people. We attempted to remain "The University" when the facts of social change required that we become "a Communitiversity." If colleges and universities are to survive they will do so by moving off-campus. Community and university will blend so that it will be difficult to identify one or the other in their shared facilities.

How can we cope with the interdisciplinary nature of our discipline?

During the past spring and summer I helped publish a directory of scholars in international communication. Faculty of five universities were included, Illinois, Indiana, Michigan State, Minnesota and Wisconsin. Each person listed was currently engaged in research or teaching in communication, specifically that communication crossing the boundaries of nation states. One hundred twenty two such scholars were listed in the directory. It occurred to me that a count of the academic departments represented might be a rough indicator of the extent to which our field involves other disciplines. I was amazed to find that the 122 scholars represented thirty nine distinct and recognized departments. How shall we relate to 38 or more specializations which are already happily engaged in tilling the soil of the academic field we like to think of as ours?

The first solution that comes to mind is the most incisive, eject the interlopers. Like most incisive solutions, this one is difficult to implement. It is unlikely that sociologists, for example, would be asked to abandon worthy scholarly endeavors to which they have

continued, page 6

Howell, cont. from page 5

contributed and are contributing significantly.

A second solution is one we have been trying tentatively. We have been inviting certain of our colleagues in other specializations to come work with us. Many reasonably successful joint ventures have resulted from application of this second solution. But in the long range it will fail, for a good reason we don't like to talk about.

To state it bluntly, perhaps crudely, when an able scholar works with a colleague in another department, the consequence is to the advantage of the department he visits. As a result of his efforts, the visited department may get money that otherwise would have been allotted to the home department of the travelling scholar. Particularly in our present contracting economy it is unrealistic to expect a loyal faculty member to run the risk of contributing to the competitive position of a rival department. The depressing conclusion is that we can expect diminishing returns from interdisciplinary cooperation in colleges and universities organized along departmental lines, and most of them are so organized.

Some straws in the wind suggest that relief from the tyranny of competing academic specializations is in sight. There is a general recognition that departmental compartmentalization of knowledge is not adequate to the needs of a complex modern society. Fixed quotas of departmental requirements for college degree programs are being relaxed. The Bachelor of Elected Studies degree is becoming epidemic, a program which permits awarding a bachelors' degree for successful completion of 180 quarter credits—any credits—or equivalent. But most promising is the organization of collegiate units along other than departmental lines.

At Minnesota we have established a division of the university devoted to cross-disciplinary studies. All courses in that school are to be interdisciplinary courses. In addition, we are establishing Graduate Centers for Advanced Interdisciplinary Studies. The rationale of the approach in the new school is "to develop new kinds of problem-oriented teaching and research programs." The intent is to reward rather than penalize those who would combine disciplines for the more productive study of subjects like communication.

Because of the intrinsic interdisciplinary nature of our enterprise I cannot avoid the conclusion that speech communication should seek an aca-

demie home in a grouping of cross-disciplinary units rather than in an environment of conventional academic departments.

How can we minimize future shock in speech communication?

When we assess our profession we usually ask two questions: Where are we? Where are we going? These questions are the wrong questions to ask about education in speech communication, now.

To identify what is of value in the present and to serve as a guide to innovation I suggest two different questions: Who needs us? What are we doing to help them? These questions must be answered to justify public support. The foundation on which the future in our field will rest is the moral and financial backing of the public we serve.

It is possible that in attempting to answer the recommended questions honestly, we may decide that few people really need us and that it is difficult to prove we are supplying significant help to those who do. We who teach may succumb to wishful thinking and assume that certainly our students need us. This ain't necessarily so! We may or may not be bridging the generation gap with concepts and experiences meaningful and helpful to modern youth, here and now.

Earlier in my talk I suggested that we had neglected the service dimension of our profession. Many people who need us without knowing it populate the communities in which we live. Why we have made so little progress in helping them with their communication problems deserves some analysis.

A helpful insight comes from investigations into communication interactions around the world. The study of intercultural speech communication has highlighted an interesting trait that varies from culture to culture, the tendency to assign a low priority to getting things done. In France, for example, and even more so in India, the important people are the ones who manipulate concepts *verbally*. The man who accomplishes change is "just an expeditor". Similarly, in the world of academic speech communication our respect goes to "men of words." Doing things in the real world often comes off a poor second.

For many years I have watched a few members of our profession improve communication in key agencies of our society. Practically single handed, they have introduced and applied communication theory to medical schools, hospitals, police departments, municipal governments, veterans ad-

ministrations, great and small corporations, and many other organizations throughout midwest America. As a result of their efforts thousands of people are treating each other as human beings, which before was not the norm. You might say that these scholars have been devoting their lives to changing human behavior where it needs changing most. Yet, in the world of academe their achievements are considered less important than publishing scholarly articles. They are "just expeditors". Until we find a way to reward the person who improves our way of life by applying scholarship to the solution of contemporary problems, we in speech communication education will continue to neglect our obligation to help our constituents. Meeting that obligation more fully will perhaps do more to minimize future shock in our profession than anything else we might do.

Future shock for us can be further reduced by increasing our receptivity to new approaches to old problems. For example, the general reaction of the SCA membership to the Human Potential Movement resembles the initial American Medical Association's response to acupuncture. Yet we may find that a major source of input to the teaching of speech communication is the Human Potential Movement, represented by Humanistic Psychology and embracing T-Groups, Esalen, group relations, encounter, Bob and Carol, Ted and Alice, group dynamics and the formerly respected but now suspect "sensitivity training." This movement is perhaps best designated as a Third Force in psychology, the first two forces being Freudianism and Behaviorism, respectively.

Certainly there must be a mid position between uncritical rejection and uncritical acceptance of the Human Potential Movement. We have become disillusioned with atomistic procedures, of studying the human being, breaking down human behavior into parts and observing the parts in isolation. Experiential learning, symbolic interaction, communication as process are increasingly important to speech communication. Minimally, we can keep informed on what humanistic psychologists are doing in human relations, and feel free to try what we think might help us attain our objectives.

I can summarize the guiding principles for minimizing future shock in speech communication in two totally undignified phrases:

"Hang loose!" and "Keep in touch".

continued, page 7

ANNUAL FINANCIAL REPORT SPEECH COMMUNICATION ASSOCIATION

Howell, cont. from page 6

During 1971 I made dozens of committee appointments, most of them demanding a lot of time and hard work. When I began writing and calling people I was reluctant to ask them to accept assignments. I worried about having a second and third list of backup people. To my amazement, with one exception, every single person I asked to serve consented, usually with enthusiasm. The one person who said "No" was trapped by circumstances that clearly made it necessary for him to decline.

The willingness of everyone to do what he can for our Association dominates all the other recollections of my presidential year. You are a great group. I thank you for permitting me to occupy for a year, the mutually privileged position of serving as your president.

OXFORD DEBATE WORKSHOP

The third Oxford Summer Debate Workshop will be held at the Oxford Union in July 1972. The Workshop enables American Speech, Debate and Political Science faculty and students to gain practical experience in many facets of contemporary British speaking. The Workshop combines practical speaking and debate experience with detailed group and tutorial analysis sessions plus audience analysis and the techniques and purpose of humour.

The cost of the program including rooms (in an Oxford College), three meals per day, full social program and free curriculum related travel is \$550 for 28 days. The Workshop is a purely academic program; all travel arrangements to and from Oxford are the personal responsibility of the individual student. Faculty and students at both college and high school level who are interested should apply directly to the Workshop Director, Eric Parsloe, 32 St. John Street, Oxford, England. Closing date for application is April 1, 1972.

NEW JOURNAL

A new journal, *Moments in Contemporary Rhetoric and Communication*, has been established as a national outlet for undergraduate and graduate students' research and critical evaluations. As a study in rhetoric and communication, authors describe, interpret

Income	Audited Income 1970-71	Budget 1971-72	Recommended Budget 1972-73
Memberships and Library Subscriptions	\$203,808	\$198,000	\$198,000
Publications and Royalty	32,311	40,500	40,500
Placement Service	30,723	33,000	33,000
Advertising	46,092	45,000	45,000
Convention	18,209	16,000	16,000
Special Projects	4,541	4,000	4,000
Interest	8,094	5,000	5,000
Other	12,890	11,500	11,500
Totals	356,668	353,000	353,000

Expenses	Audited Expenses 1970-71	Budget 1971-72	Recommended Budget 1972-73
Publications and Printing	\$ 62,605	\$ 77,800	\$ 77,800
Salaries, Payroll Taxes and Employee Benefits	129,630	157,000	157,000
Travel and Meetings	19,065	19,000	19,000
Convention	16,272	17,000	17,000
Supplies and Material	6,525	7,000	7,000
Equipment Purchase, Rental, Maintenance, Repair and Depreciation	8,809	9,500	9,500
Postage	13,417	15,000	15,000
Telephone and Telegraph	2,312	3,500	3,500
Insurance/Bond	315	500	500
Office Rent	20,090	21,000	21,000
Outside Professional Services and Fees	1,268	1,200	1,200
Special Projects	16,180	31,000	21,000
Other	5,345	3,500	3,500
Totals	301,833	363,000	353,000

and evaluate contemporary social and political acts that convey a message to others. The Editors "have assumed that the discipline of speech-communication might easily deal with more than 'great speakers' and that any social-political act that conveys a message to others might legitimately fall within the purview of the rhetorical/communication critic. It would have to be said, as one looks over previous issues of *Moments*, that critics have reacted to flagrantly compelling messages whether those messages come from great speakers, television, a play, records, guerrilla bombings, or controversial social and political movements."

Any undergraduate or graduate student may publish an article in *Moments*, but it is hoped that all students, professors, as well as members of the nonacademic world, will find the rhe-

torical/communications studies relevant to them. While articles published in *Moments* are restricted to students, faculty members are invited to provide critical and directive input for the journal or submit critical analyses for the mass media and fine arts section of the journal. Articles should not exceed 4,000 words and critical reactions and evaluations of articles published in *Moments* or mass media and fine arts analyses should be limited to 1,000 words.

Moments is published quarterly and all correspondence, articles, reactions, or subscription requests should be addressed to The Student Press, 1129 South Eighth Street, Minneapolis, MN 55404. James W. Chesbro and John F. Cragan (Ph.D. Candidates at the University of Minnesota) edit the journal.