JOURNAL OF BROADCASTING

FALL 1958

ASSOCIATION FOR PROFESSIONAL BROADCASTING EDUCATION

Abilene Christian College
University of Alabama
The American University
Arizona State College at Tempe
Baylor University
Boston University
University of California at Los Angeles
University of Denver
The Florida State University
University of Florida
Fordham University
University of Houston
The University of Georgia
Humboldt State College
University of Illinois
Indiana University
Iowa State College
Ithaca College
The University of Kansas
Kent State University
University of Kentucky
Lindenwood College
University of Miami
Miami University
Michigan State University
Millikin University
University of Missouri
Montana State University
New York University
University of North Carolina
Northwestern University
Occidental College
Ohio University
Ohio State University
University of Oklahoma
University of Oregon
College of the Pacific
The Pennsylvania State University
Queens College
San Diego State College
St. Louis University
University of Southern California
Stanford University
Syracuse University
Texas State College for Women
Texas Western College
The University of Texas
University of Tulsa
The State College of Washington
University of Washington

and

the broadcasting stations of the United States through
their membership in the National Association
of Broadcasters

VOL. II, NO. 4 FALL, 1958

JOURNAL OF BROADCASTING

Published Quarterly by the
Association for Professional Broadcasting Education

Subscription price $5.00 per year. Special student rate, $4.00 per year.
Correspondence should be addressed to the Editor, Journal of Broadcasting, University of Southern California, University Park, Los Angeles 7, California. Printed by the Citizen Print Shop, 540 S. San Pedro, Los Angeles 17, Calif. Second-class mail privileges authorized at Los Angeles, California.

CONTENTS

THE CANON 35 CONTROVERSY . . . AGAIN

WITH the publication of Volume I, Number I, two years ago, the *Journal of Broadcasting* featured an article by Judge Justin Miller on the Canon 35 controversy as one of the major issues confronting broadcastters. It is still a major issue but with one notable difference from the situation of two years ago. The legal professionand court officials are finally giving serious attention to the problem.

The joint efforts of the broadcasting and newspaper media began to bear fruit several years ago, prompting this comment from the Bar-Media Conference Committee on Fair Trial-Free Press:

> We found in 1954 that we were losing the Canon 35 piece by piece by the attack of the media and the influence of the media on separate courts, and judge after judge was being persuaded that the canon violated the rights of the media under the First Amendment.[1]

A special committee on Canons of Ethics of the American Bar Foundation devoted 18 months of study to Canon 35 and recommened revision, but retaining the broadcasting and photographic restrictions. Significantly, the House of Delegates at the Atlanta meeting broke precedent to permit media representatives a hearing as a result of "the tremendous importance of this question which deals with the public and other matters, the difference of opinion among lawyers, and some of the Bar Associations have taken different positions."

The outcome of this meeting was the postponement of further consideration of the proposed revision of Canon 35 until the meeting of the House of Delegates in Los Angeles in August, held in conjunction with the 81st annual meeting of the American Bar Association. And in Los Angeles, the House voted to defer action a second time, pending further study by still another specially-appointed committee. And there the matter lies, for the moment.

The issue is joined, and broadcasters, under the able leadership of Robert D. Swezey, executive vice president of WDSU-AM-TV, New

---

[1]Statement of Richard P. Tinkham on behalf of the Bar-Media Conference Committee, during proceedings of the House of Delegates at the February 1958 meeting, *Judicial Canon 35: Conduct of Court Proceedings* (Chicago: American Bar Association, 1958, p. 7.

Orleans, and chairman of the NAB Freedom of Information Committee, are pressing their advantage, organized as never before to publicize the groups, and to editorialize on the subject on the air. A Code of Conduct[3] for broadcast newsmen covering court trials and other public proceedings was approved by the NAB Board of Directors in June and Disseminated to all stations, and to bar groups as evidence of broadcasters' maturity and responsibility in the matter of courtroom publicity.

That these efforts are meeting with success is borne out by the decision of the Oklahoma Criminal Court of Appeals which recently held that Canon 35 was "obsolete and unrealistic" and that radio and television are entitled to the same courtroom rights as the press.

The significance of the Oklahoma decision and of recent developments in the Canon 35 controversy made it appropriate to select for publication in this issue of the *Journal* two special reports: one, by Dr. Sherman Lawton of the University of Oklahoma, on judicial attitudes in that state; and a second, by Gerald Cashman and Marlow Froke of the University of Illinois, with respect to contrary views by Illinois judges. Perusal of these reports tends to support two conclusions: that educational efforts of broadcasters can be effective, but that the battle still is not won. Much depends on events in the months ahead. As the authoritative American Bar Association Journal admonished editorially two years ago:

> If any change is to be made in Canon 35 in the future it will only be because of intelligent, dispassionate persuasion supported by statistics, by further experiments in actual courtroom tests, and by mutual co-operation between the broadcasters, the Bench and the Bar.[4]

And each of these "tests", it would seem, are being met decisively by American broadcasters today.

—The Editor

---

[2]From proceeding of the House of Delegates, February 24, 1958, *ibid.*, p. 8.

[3]Published in full elsewhere in this issue.

[4]Editorial, "Canon 35 and the Broadcasters," *ABA Journal*, 42:848-9, September, 1956.

WHO'S NEXT?: THE RETREAT OF CANON 35

By Sherman P. Lawton

Significantly, most of the debate on Canon 35 has ignored the opinions of those who are expected to follow its dictates—members of the legal fraternity itself. To find out what judges and attorneys actually thought of broadcasting of trials became the concern of Dr. Sherman P. Lawton of the University of Oklahoma more than a year ago. Although the bar groups have at times surveyed their members with respect to the Canon, this was probably the first statewide study of its kind. Here Dr. Lawton reports on the results of the study in light of recent court developments.

Dr. Lawton has been Professor of Drama and Coordinator of Broadcasting Instruction at the University of Oklahoma since 1945. He received his Ph.D. in Speech from the University of Wisconsin in 1939 and has written several textbooks on broadcasting.

CANON 35 of the American Bar Association, concerning "Improper Publicizing of Court Proceedings," was originally adopted on September 30, 1937, and amended September 15, 1952. It states that the "taking of photographs . . . and broadcasting or televising of court proceedings are calculated to detract from the essential dignity of the proceedings, distract the witness in giving his testimony, degrade the court and create misconceptions . . .". On the basis of this canon, many judges have felt that it would be a breach of ethics for them to permit courtroom photography.

For more than twenty years broadcasters have struggled to establish themselves as legitimate reporters of court proceedings, and have insisted that broadcasting is "calculated" to inform constructively, not to detract, distract or degrade. Their case was cogently stated on repeated occasions.[1]

Some judges agreed that broadcasters should be given equal rights with other newsmen, and felt that if proper decorum were preserved, the purposes of Canon 35 (to insure justice) would not be violated. A few agreed to give broadcasters a fair trial.

In December of 1953, WKY-TV, Oklahoma City, covered the Billy Manley murder trial in the court of Judge Van Meter. In late 1955, the trial of Harry Washburn was televised in Waco, Texas. In April, 1956, Denver stations were able to establish photography rights in the trial of John Gilbert Graham. There were other examples, especially in Oklahoma and Texas.

---

[1]For example, Justin Miller: "The Broadcaster's Stand: A Question of Fair Trial and Free Information", "*Journal of Broadcasting*, Winter, 1956-7.

Reactions to such experiments were varied. One survey[2] of editors, judges and social science experts disclosed that 97% of the judges and 72% of the criminologists felt that Canon 35 should be adhered to and strengthened; 97% of the editors, naturally, favored revocation of the Canon. It goes without saying that most opinions of courtroom broadcasting were not based on first-hand experience, since there was little opportunity to observe it in action.

As experience with courtroom photography and broadcast coverage accumulated, judgment on the basis of acquaintance became possible.

Consequently, a survey of opinions of people in the legal profession in Oklahoma was undertaken for WKY-TV.[3] Three hundred attorneys and thirty judges in Oklahoma's seventy-seven counties were queried as to their attitudes on still photography, motion pictures and live television in the courtroom. It became clear that the more experienced lawyers and judges had with such coverage, the more favorable they were toward it.

> 61.7% of attorneys who had had some experience with courtroom still photography favored some permission for it, while only 38% of those without such experience favored it. 58.0% of attorneys who had had experience with courtroom motion picture photography favored some permission, while only 38.1% of those without such experience favored it. 58.2% who had had experience with live TV coverage were favorable toward it, but only 36.0% of those without such experience were in favor of it.

Judges were even more favorably inclined toward a relaxed attitude on Canon 35.

> 77.1% of Oklahoma judges who had had experience with courtroom still photography favored some permission of it; only 50.0% of those without such experience favored it. 83.2% of judges who had experienced motion picture photography in the courtroom favored it; only 49.9% of those without such experience were favorably inclined. 77.7% of judges experienced with live courtroom television were in favor of some permission of it; 52.3% of those without experience favored it.

Clearly the tide was swinging away from Canon 35, especially

---

[2]Geis, Gilbert, "The Press and Criminal Justice", *The Quill*, May, 1957.

[3]Lawton, Sherman P., *Attitudes of the Legal Profession in Oklahoma Toward ABA Canon 35*. January, 1957.

among those who knew first-hand that broadcasters could cover court events with dignity and significance.

It is no happenstance that high court interpretations of the Canon, indicating that the Canon is obsolete and unrealistic, should have come from two of the states with the most experience in courtroom broadcasts.

First came the Colorado Supreme Court opinion that photographs and broadcasts from the courtroom did not necessarily cause detraction, distraction, degradation or misconception.[4] Then it was Oklahoma's turn.

In the courtroom of Judge W. R. Wallace, Jr., where Edward Lee Lyles was to be tried for burglary in the second degree after a former felony, Scott Berner, a WKY-TV cameraman, took some motion pictures for telecasting purposes. These pictures were not taken while court was in session, but in advance of the selection of the jury and during a five minute recess of the court. Lyles felt that the pictures were prejudicial to his interests, and a motion was made for mistrial; this was denied. Lyles objected to the taking of further pictures, and the judge ordered that no more be taken. Lyles was convicted and sentenced to fifteen years' imprisonment. He then appealed to The Oklahoma Criminal Court of Appeals on several grounds. One of these was the claim that newspaper articles and television pictures gave great weight to the importance of the case, so that he did not receive a fair and impartial trial.

The Oklahoma Television Association, representing all of the television stations in the state, joined the appeal as friend of the court, and requested a ruling on the broadcasting of criminal proceedings, with special reference to the application of Canon 35 of the American Bar Association.

In dealing with this part of the appeal, the Court said, in essence:[5]

> When the rights of the accused are not infringed, agencies should be permitted to take proceedings for reproduction on

[4]Report of Court, No. 17915, *In Re Hearings Concerning Canon 35 of the Judicial Ethics.* Distributed by National Association of Radio and Television Broadcasters, Washington, D. C.

[5]Summary based on "Syllabi of Criminal Court Opinions", Lyles vs. State, No. A-12595, *Journal of Oklahoma Bar Association,* September 20, 1958, pp. 1189-1200.

sound track and television. The matter of televising or not televising, photographing or not photographing, criminal procedures is within the judicial discretion of the judge. The judge will not, of course, tolerate distractions, disturbance, or lack of regard for the court by the representatives of the press in any field of activity. if orderly procedure is interfered with, the court has the inherent right to suspend the taking of recordings or photographs. Newsmen should make pre-arrangements so such activities can be discontinued "instantly" if the court so directs. Freedom of the press is not infringed under those circumstances.

The accused has a right to a public trial. A trial is a public event and there is no special prerequisite of the judiciary which enables it to suppress, edit or censor events which transpire in proceedings before it.

The public is entitled to information about public events, and should know more about judicial processes. Televisors serve a proper function in public information and education. Freedom of the press is not a discriminate right, and is not confined to newspapers, etc.; it extends as well to radio and television. The courts can make no distinction among the media.

The courts must be open to every person. Under certain unusual circumstances, attandance may be restricted, and this restriction might include representatives of the press; but the public, generally or entirely, cannot be excluded.

The rights of the accused are not invoded by the publicity attendant on criminal trials, since, when one becomes identified with an occurrence of public interest, he emerges from his seclusion. The law does not recognize a right of privacy in that which is inherently a public matter.

The canons of the American Bar Association are a system of recommended principles of exemplary conduct and good behavior, and do not have the force of law. Courts have the implicit right to determine what is good behavior under given circumstances.

Broadcasters are urged to perfect an organization for pooling of resources, so arrangements and facilities may be reduced to a workable minimum.

This decision, handed down September 3, 1958, relies heavily on the arguments advanced by a referee of the Supreme Court of the State of Colorado, February 20, 1956. The referee, the Hon. O. Otto Moore, suggested that those who recommended rigid adherence to Canon 35 "are unfamiliar with the actual experiences and recommendations of

those who have permitted supervised coverage by photographers, radio and television of various stages of court proceedings."[6] The Colorado Supreme Court adopted the recommendations of the referee on February 27, 1956.

There is a difference, however ephemeral, between the action of the Colorado Supreme Court and the Oklahoma Criminal Court of Appeals. The Colorado decision is framed negatively. It says that if the trial judge believes that justice will be interfered with, the dignity of the court detracted from, etc., photography "should not be permitted." It is, in a way, a confirmation of the purposes of Cannon 35; but it recognizes that there are circumstances where the flat prohibition of radio and television would not be justified. The Oklahoma decision, on the other hand, is positive; it seems to consider that broadcasting should be permitted, except where conditions make it undesirable. It calls the contentions of Canon 35 (that inherently and *per se* justice and dignity are hampered by radio, constructed out of pure conjecture, and "fabricated out of sheer implication and not hammered out of the anvil of experience."[7]

It will be noted that the Oklahoma court went beyond the specific application to the case of Lyles, where the pictures had been taken, not during the trial, but before juror selection and during an intermission. At the request of OTA, it stated a broad principle, which covers proceedings and the trial itself.

Live television, it may be noted, is not mentioned specifically in the directive, which approves coverage "where court proceedings may be taken for *reproduction* on sound track or film." However, live telecasting is not excluded from the decision, and is covered by the statement:

> "In *re Hearings Concerning Canon 35, supra.* We are of the opinion the matter of televising or not televising, photographing or not photographing, criminal trials and proceedings . . . is within the sound discretion of the trial judge."[8]

Photography and television are clearly distinguished. Furthermore, live television is envisaged by directions that "for live telecasts, the cameras should be concealed in a booth . . . or from an installation outside the courtroom."[9]

---

[6]Report of Court, No. 17915, *Supra,* p. 4.
[7]*OBA Journal, supra,* p. 1196.
[8]*OBA Journal, Supra,* p. 1198.
[9]*Ibid.*

The Court notes that an accused may waive the right of a public trial if the case is of private and not public import. It is not clear, however, what the situation would be if an accused claimed the right of a public trial, including photography, radio and television, and the court should refuse to allow broadcasts. Presumably such an exclusion could take place only if all newsmen were excluded. Such a situation would require unusual circumstances.

CANON 35 AS VIEWED BY THE ILLINOIS JUDICIARY

By Gerald Cashman and Marlowe Froke

As heartening as the Oklahoma picture may have been to broadcasters, the story is a different one in other states. This is the report of a similar survey, of Illinois judges, in which a wholly opposite opinion to that of their Oklahoma colleagues as expressed.

Gerald Cashman received a Master of Science degree in Journalism and Communications from the University of Illinois and is currently enrolled in the doctoral program in the same area at that university. Marlowe Froke holds a Master of Science degree from Northwestern University, was formerly news director at KWAT, Watertown, South Dakota, and news editor at WGN-AM-TV, Chicago. He is currently Instructor in the College of Journalism and Communications and Supervisor of Television News at the University of Illinois.

THE controversy surrounding Canon 35[1] of the Canons of Judicial Ethics of the American Bar Association is well known. While it is only one element of the broader problem of access, newsmen in radio and television and their photography brethren from the printed media recently have focused more attention here than any other. They seek to equate the latest reporting tools with pad and pencil, and thereby gain equal[2] access in court coverage.

The principal arguments for and against the Canon are as well known as the Canon itself. Proponents of the Canon label radio, television and photography as physically and psychologically distracting to a degree which threatens constitutional guarantees of a fair trial for a defendant; opponents say radio, television and photography are being denied defined constitutional and competitive rights by failure of the

[1]Full text of Canon 35 of the Canons of Judicial Ethics of the American Bar Association, adopted September 30, 1937; amended September 15, 1952: "Proceedings in court should be conducted with fitting dignity and decorum. The taking of photographs in the courtroom, during sessions of the court or recesses between sessions, and the broadcasting or televising of court proceedings are calculated to detract from the essential dignity of the proceedings, distract the witness in giving his testimony, degrade the court, and create misconceptions with respect thereto in the mind of the public and should not be permitted.

"Provided that this restriction shall not apply to the broadcasting or televising, under the supervision of the court, of such portions of naturalization proceedings (other than the interrogation of applicants) as are designed and carried out exclusively as a ceremony for the purpose of publicly demonstrating in an impressive manner the essential dignity and the serious nature of naturalization."

[2]In the strictest sense of the term, radio and television have equal access in that they are just as welcome as the press in reporting trial coverage with pad and pencil.

ABA to recognize electronic and photo journalism which, they say, are nothing more than extensions of the accepted "press."

In support of the Canon, nationally prominent attorney Morris Ernst has said: "There is here a clash of two values, The value of an informed public seeking the truth. The other is due process, another kind of search for truth: The search in the courtroom. It ought to be considered how much we are nudging this most delicate search out of its proper path."

In opposition to the Canon, Judge Justin Miller comments on the controversy: "The whole thing is a gradual growth from the time of the ecclesiastical and star chamber courts. First the audience, then the pamphlet, then the newspaper. Now radio and TV which expand the vision of the people. Inevitably we are coming to the recognition of this new form of information to the people.[3]

There is no absolute division between jurists and newsmen in the Canon 35 controversy. Some judges oppose the Canon; some newsmen support it.

Judges who privately or publicly oppose the Canon regard it as an unwarranted bit of influence from the ABA. In most state courts[4] the Canon has no legal status, and in those states each judge has the authority, with or without the Canon, to refuse or to decline admission of electronic and photographic gear. However, newsmen believe the presence of the Canon unduly influences a jurist's decision against radio-tv and photo journalism.

On the other hand, some broadcast newsmen are not in favor of a major skirmish with the ABA over the Canon. Their position is that

---

[3]*Sponsor*, February 25, 1957, page 41.

[4]Federal courts are off-limits to photography and radio-tv broadcasting. The Federal Rules of Criminal procedure state: "The taking of photographs in the courtroom during the progress of judicial proceedings or radio broadcast . . . from the courtroom shall not be permitted.

Among the States in which the Canon has legal status is Nebraska. It was adopted by the State Supreme Court in 1951. Recently, in Omaha, Judge James T. English was charged by State Attorney General Clarence Beck with committing contempt of court by violating the Canon. Judge English has permitted photographers from both newspaper and television to take courtroom pictures of anything except the defendant during trial recesses. Photographers extended the privilege granted them and allegedly Judge English did not object. Attorney General Beck did. His charges against Judge English were made before the State Supreme Court.

perhaps broadcast newsmen and photographers are putting the cart before the horse: asking for privileges before developing responsibility.

Most newsmen who oppose the Cannon emphasize that they do not advocate a flat "open-door" policy to courtrooms. They recognize the responsibility and the duties of judges to maintain dignity and decorum commensurate with the administration of justice. Individual judges already possess such authority without the prop of the Canon. The Canon is extra-legal, the newsmen say, and promotes prejudice against their tools of reporting.[5]

Broadcast and photo journalists put themselves in the position of saying they are willing to be barred from courtroom coverage by a judge exercising authority to insure a fair trial and a decorous courtroom, but not to be barred by a judge merely subscribing to the extra-legal Canon 35.

Recently an ABA committee recommended a rewording of the Canon, shifting its emphasis from photographic-radio-tv gear as a physical distraction to a psychological distraction. Such polemics did not change the over-all tone o fthe revised canon.[6] It still would have the effect of banning photographic and electronic reporting tools from the court room. On February 24, 1956, the ABA House of Delegates deferred action on the committee report until August 25, 1958, the date of the ABA's annual convention. The deferment came after re-

---

[5]The American Newspaper Publishers Association recently issued a statement which said in part: "Should a private group decide what is moral or what is ethical and then have the power of the federal government used to enforce these rules or Canons? They can be changed at will by the Bar Association itself, and the public has no voice . . . We have taken the position that this private, professional group has no right to legislate for the American people by seeking to impose its "laws" on judges through the back doors of the courts without review or approval by the elected representatives of the people."

[6]Text of proposed revisions: "The purpose of judicial proceedings is to ascertain the truth. Such proceedings should be conducted with fitting dignity and decorum, in a manner conducive to undisturbed deliberation, indicative of their importance to the people and to the litigants, and in an atmosphere that bespeaks the responsibilities of those who are charged with the administration of justice. The taking of photographs in the court room during the progress of judicial proceedings or during any recess thereof and the transmitting of sound-recording of such proceedings for broadcasting by radio or television introduce extraneous influences which tend to have a detrimental psychological effect on the participants and to divert them from the proper objectives of the trial; they should not be permitted. Proceedings other than judicial proceedings, designed and carried out primarily as ceremonies, and conducted with dignity by judges in open courts, may properly be photographed in or broadcast from the courtroom with the permission and under the supervision of the court.

newed protests from various news organizations, including the Radio Television News Directors Association. They charged that the committee had not adequately investigated the situation before making its recommendations.

Protests against the revised Cannon bore fruit at the August convention. The ABA House of Delegates, on the recommendation of its Board of Governors, again deferred action and appoointed a nine-man committee to study the Canon revision proposals. Robert Swezey, chairman of the National Association of Broadcasters Freedom of Information Committee, described the ABA action as "affording a chance for lawyers, broadcasters and the press, working together in the spirit of good will and cooperation, to find answers to the questions involved in coverage of court trials by radio and television and still photographers."

Because the Canon is not binding, broadcast newsmen in some states have had success in winning access to courtrooms despite its existence. A notable success was in Colorado.[7] And, more recently, Oklahoma newsmen won an impressive victory.

The three-judge Oklahoma Criminal Court of Appeals, in ruling on an appeal involving the privacy rights of an individual who had been found guilty of burglary, in effect stated that Canon 35 is unrealistic.

Referring to the Canon, the court decision read in part:

> The adoption of the cannons of ethics by the courts did not give the canons force of law. They are nothing more than a system of principles of exemplary conduct and good character . . . Freedom of the press as guaranteed by the state and federal constitutions is not confined to newspapers and periodicals, pamphlets and leaflets . . . but these provisions of free press extend to broadcasting and television . . . The courts make no distinction between various methods of communication in sustaining freedom of the press.

As in Colorado, the Oklahoma ruling left to individual judges the decision of permitting radio-TV-photographic coverage of particular trials.

---

[7]On Feb. 27, 1956, the Colorado Supreme Court ruled out Canon 35 in Colorado courts. The ruling came following a week long hearing, requested by photographers and broadcast newsmen. The hearing included demonstrations of modern broadcast and photographic gear. In a decision written by Justice O. Otto Moore, the Supreme Court ruled that the ABA Code of Judicial Ethics, "of which Canon 35 is a part," is not law and should not be enforced as such.

Similar, if less spectacular successes have been reported in other states and in isolated cities. Conversely, there have been setbacks from a newsman's point of view. For example, in March of 1958, the Ohio State Supreme Court flatly implemented the Canon for all courts of record in the state. It warned that violations would invite prosecution for contempt.

Canon 35 has no legal status in Illinois, but it has been adopted by the Illinois Bar Association. Illinois broadcast newsmen have made no major, statewide, concerted drives against the Canon, nor against the broader aspect of courtroom access. There have been no major "educational" campaigns. Any victories or defeats which have been recorded have been the result of personal relationships between individual newsmen and individual judges, and the positive or negative effect of access incidents in other states.

Against this background, a questionnaire was formulated and sent to 173 county and circuit judges in Illinois to learn their individual views of restrictions encouraged by the Canon. The questionnaire contained 13 items. The first 10 simply elicited "yes" or "no" answers to questions concerning particular techniques of reporting in courtrooms; the next two attempted to learn how much information individual judges had about these techniques; the final item requested any comment on the Canon which the judges wished to make.

Each judge was instructed not to sign his name when returning the questionnaire. Sixty-six judges responded. The following is a restatement of the first 12 items on the questionnaire and the tabulation of the judges' responses.[8]

1. Do you object to "pencil and paper" news coverage in your court?
   Yes: 1 (1%) No: 65 (99%)
2. Do you object to the taking of "still" pictures, using existing light[9] in your court?
   Yes: 45 (68%) No: 21 (32%)

[8]Some judges did not respond to all items.

[9]The question was framed "existing light" in view of photo and TV's self-policing effort to eliminate the distraction of flash bulbs and lights. For the text of the National Press Photographers Association "Canons," directed toward self-policing, see appendix.

3. Do you object to the taking of motion picture film, using existing light, in your court?
   Yes: 57 (86%) No: 7 (14%)

4. Do you object to the taking of still pictures, using existing light, in the corridors outside your court.[10]
   Yes: 6 (10%) No: 60 (90%)

5. Do you object to the taking of motion picture film, using existing light, in the corridors outside your court?
   Yes: 18 (27%) No: 48 (73%)

6. Would you permit a tape recording to be made of proceedings in your court for use on a radio news program?
   Yes: 20 (31%) No: 45 (69%)

7. Would you permit "live" radio and/or television coverage of cases tried before your court?
   Yes: 7 (11%) No: 57 (89%)

8. Would you permit "live radio and/or television coverage from the corridors outside your court?
   Yes: 31 (48%) No: 33 (52%)

9. Do you consider modern radio and television equipment "physically distracting" in a courtroom?
   Yes: 60 (95%) No: 3 (5%)

10. Do you consider modern radio and television equipment "psychologically districting" in a courtroom?
    Yes: 64 (100%) No: (0%)

11. Have you ever witnessed a demonstration of modern radio and television equipment and procedures designed to cover court proceedings?
    Yes: 21 (32%) No: 45 (68%)

12. Have you ever discussed radio-tv news coverage of courts with anyone in the radio and/or television industry?
    Yes: 24 (36%) No: 42 (64%)

[10]Corridors outside courtrooms are considered within jurisdiction of presiding judges.

The final item in the survey asked for individual comment on the Canon. Twenty-seven judges responded, 14 in detail. Their responses, to a degree, echoed some of the background information presented earlier in this paper, and covered the gamut of objections to photo and electronic journalism in the courtroom.

One judge said he had no personal objection to access for photo and "electronic" journalists, but felt that he must follow the Canon. He proceeded to check the answers in accordance with the Canon.

Another commented that no cardinal rule should be adopted. Each court, he said, should act in each given case to see that justice is done. He then proceeded to mark his questionnaire granting access in all situations.

Another judge said he would not object to some modification. "The trouble," he said, "is that the proposals (those by newsmen to revise or eliminate the Canon) are designed for sensationalism. Press, radio and TV are interested only in murder cases and those having a sex angle. They care little about an ordinary criminal trial, such as burglary, and nothing whatever about civil suits for damages, which account for 70 to 80 per cent of court trials."

A fourth judge said, "My objections to the taking of pictures of any kind in court during trial is that it is distracting . . . takes the minds of jurors and witnesses as well as lawyers off their duties and can be most dangerous in certain types of cases, particularly, to a just, legal and appropriate outcome of the cases."

"Witnesses," said another, "are often in court because they are required to be so by law. In view of this they should not be required to submit to TV or radio or pictures while in attendance."

Another judge said: "I feel that the court room is not a place of public entertainment nor as adjunct to a profit-making institution. In a metropolitan area, photographers, cameramen, and reporters are out to either scoop a competitor or to slant a story differently than anyone else. They uniformly disregard the proprieties which must attend court proceedings. Justice, rather than the manufacture of news, is the function of the court."

"The serious problem," said one judge, "is the effect of pictures in *jury* cases. I believe they would distract."

Most of the judges who commented tersely stated: "I approve of the Canon."

Summary of Survey

One striking feature of the responses to the questionnaire is the jurist's almost unanimous regard of photo-radio-tv coverage as psychologically and physically distracting in the courtroom. Only three judges regarded such coverage as not physically distracting, and even these three regarded photo-radio-tv as psychologically distracting.

This near unanimity provides the basis for another striking feature. The clash of the two values suggested by Morris Ernst apparently weighs heavy on some of the judges' minds. While considering the photo-radio-tv reporting techniques distracting, a small (but yet surprising) percentage of the respondents indicated an over-riding value of "an informed public seeking the truth" by saying they would permit such coverage techniques.

The responses also indicated a substantial (but still a minority) awareness of these techniques. Thirty-two percent of the respondents said they had witnessed a demonstration of modern radio and television equipment and procedures, and 36 percent said they had discussed radio-tv news coverage with someone in the radio and/or television industry. A separate tabulation and comparison of the responses to the two questions showed that 32 judges (48 percent) had exposure to either or both. Ten judges (15 percent) had both. Admittedly the survey questions made no allowance to measure what constituted "modern" in the mind of a particular judge, nor the degree of exposure in "discussions" with broadcasters.

A third observation from survey results perhaps substantiates Judge Miller's prediction that "inevitably we are coming to the recognition of this new form of information to the people." The survey showed only *one* judge objecting to the omnipresent pad and pencil reporting of his courtroom. The objections swelled to 45 for tape recording for radio, and to 57 for live radio and/or television.

Older methods of photography were more acceptable to the jurists, too. Forty-five judges objected to courtroom stills using existing light, but 57 objected to motion pictures using similar pattern; sixty would permit stills using existing light; only 48 would permit motion pictures

using existing light; and only 31 would permit "live" radio and/or television. Contrary to expected results, the jurists indicated equal acceptance to motion picture film and live coverage of the courtroom. Seven judges would permit both.

The modest reversal from the expected might be attributed to the wide publicity given in legal circles to the showcase live coverage of the Graham murder trial in Denver, Colorado.

There are other possible explanations. However, if one assumes merit in the "education" factor involved in the Graham case or in the individual education campaigns conducted by Illinois photographers and broadcast newsmen, the question arises as to their effect.

Did the judges who had been exposed to either demonstrations or discussions respond with significant difference from those who had no exposure? Did the judges who had been exposed to both demonstrations and discussions respond differently from those who had not been exposed?

To answer these two questions, a second tabulation of questionnaire responses was made separating them into three groups, based on the three survey measurements of exposure: exposure to either demonstrations or discussion, exposure to both, exposure to neither. Responses to items 2 through 10 were recorded for the three groups. Once again it should be noted that the questionnaire gave no indication as to what constituted "modern" radio and television coverage techniques, nor did it indicate the extent or specific context of discussions with persons in the radio-tv industry.

2. Do you object to the taking of "still" pictures, using existing light, in your court?

	Yes	*No*
Exposed to either	24 (75%)	8 (25%)
Exposed to both	7 (70%)	3 (30%)
No exposure	21 (62%)	13 (38%)

3. Do you object to the taking of motion picture film, using existing light, in your court?

	Yes	*No*
Exposed to either	27 (84%)	5 (16%)
Exposed to both	7 (70%)	3 (30%)
No exposure	30 (88%)	4 (12%)

4. Do you object to the taking of still pictures, using existing light, in the corridors outside your court?

	Yes	*No*
Exposed to either	4 (9%)	28 (91%)
Exposed to both	1 (10%)	9 (90%)
No exposure	2 (.6%)	32 (99.4%)

5. Do you object to the taking of motion picture film, using existing light, in the corridors outside your court?

	Yes	*No*
Exposed to either	8 (25%)	24 (75%)
Exposed to both	1 (10%)	9 (90%)
No exposure	10 (29%)	24 (71%)

6. Would you permit a tape recording to be made of proceedings in your court for use on a radio news program?

	Yes	*No*
Exposed to either	11 (35%)	20 (65%)
Exposed to both	4 (40%)	6 (60%)
No exposure	9 (27%)	25 (73%)

7. Would you permit "live" radio and/or television coverage of cases?

	Yes	*No*
Exposed to either	5 (16%)	26 (84%)
Exposed to both	4 (40%)	6 (60%)
No exposure	2 (.6%)	31 (99.4%)

8. Would you permit "live" radio and/or television coverage from the corridors outside your court?

	Yes	*No*
Exposed to either	19 (61%)	12 (39%)
Exposed to both	7 (70%)	3 (30%)
No exposure	12 (36%)	21 (64%)

9. Do you consider modern radio and television equipment "physically distracting" in a courtroom?

	Yes	*No*
Exposed to either	32 (100%)	0 .....
Exposed to both	10 (100%)	0 .....
No exposure	28 (90%)	3 (10%)

10. Do you consider modern radio and television equipment "psychologically disturbing" in a courtroom?

	Yes	*No*
Exposed to either	32 (100%)	0 .....
Exposed to both	10 (100%)	0 .....
No exposure	32 (100%)	0 .....

Summary of Tabulation

Because of the small numbers involved in this tabulation it was considered necessary to apply more rigorous statistical analysis to the results.[11] Mere numbers and percentages can be deceiving.

The statistical analysis showed responses to only Item 8 as significant, that is, as could occur by other than chance alone, more than five times in 100. Respondents who had been exposed to either demonstrations or discussions were more agreeable to "live" radio and/or television coverage from the corridors outside the courtroom. Significance does not extend into a comparison of *no-exposure* to *exposure to both.*

One should not over-emphasize the factor of statistical significance in this analysis, nor should he over-emphasize the rather consistent pattern favorable to photo-broadcast newsmen shown by a more casual observation of numbers and percentages.

Certainly one could not flatly accept the rigid statistical interpretation and say that education campaigns by photo and broadcast journalists in Illinois have had almost no effect. Equally certain, one cannot cite the percentages in Item 7, for example, and say "education" efforts have been about 40 percent effective in winning access to the courtroom with the new tools of reporting. Bare numbers are deceiving. A statistical interpretation prevents that deception. A realistic evaluation is in between.

Certainly such an evaluation would prompt most newsmen to express disappointment at the broad effectiveness of education campaigns to date. The disappointment might be tempered by the knowledge that there has been no major education campaign.

The same evaluation would suggest that the techniques used to date

[11]Chi-square formula was used, along with Yate's correction formula which was applied in all cases where at least one of the expected values was below five.

in the education campaigns have not been effective. As stated earlier, there was no effort made by this survey to determine what constituted the particular education efforts directed toward the individual judges.

Assuming that an education campaign might produce results favorable to equal access, the evaluation would suggest some approach to the judges other than those which have been used.

APPENDIX I

Canons of Courtroom Ethics for Press Photographers, adopted by the National Press Photographers Association.

General:

1. Have a conference with the judge who will preside. This conference should be held at least two or three days in advance of the trial. Discuss your problems with him, reach an understanding on the rules he has in mind, and then abide by them.

2. Court officers and bailiffs can be your greatest helpers. Be sure that they are acquainted with the rules and conditions of coverage set forth by the judge.

3. Dress conservatively and inconspicuously. Your cameras may tend to draw attention to yourself so it is important that your personal appearance present a good impression in conformity with your dignified behavior.

4. Do not move from one spot in the courtroom to another while the trial is in progress. Choose a good spot beforehand, then stay there until a recess. Variety in picture coverage may be obtained by changing lenses, if available. Put those lenses to work rather than your feet.

5. Don't work close to the subject. The effect of close-ups can be obtained by using telephoto lenses or by greater enlargement in printing.

6. Conduct yourself as a gentleman at all times. While in a trial courtroom, news photographers are under the jurisdiction of the court. Just as any other spectators, they may be held in contempt if they create a disturbance.

7. In the case of trials which have nationwide interest, the trial

Acknowledgment: Appreciation is extended to Percy Tannenbaum, Research Assistant Professor, Institute of Communications Research, College of Journalism and Communications, University of Illinois, for his assistance in the statistical analysis of this survey.

judge may require photographers to pool their pictures as a condition of coverage. Naturally this is distasteful, but at times unavoidable. Don't fight it. Your editor would rather have pooled pictures than none at all.

8. After the trial is over, show your appreciation to the judge by taking time to visit him in his chambers and thank him for his cooperation. This is good public relations as well as good manners.

Still Photographers:

9. Roll film cameras, because of their smaller size, are less conspicuous than most sheet film cameras, but the type of camera is of less importance than the manner in which it is used. Avoid the distracting motions of continued eye-level focusing and aiming. With a fixed subject, focus carefully once, then point the camera from waist level or from a table or railing for triggering. If, because of circumstances, eye-level aiming is necessary, movements should be slow and deliberate so as to minimize attracting attention.

10. Flash must not be used under any circumstances in a courtroom while court is in session. Even though the judge grants permission to use flash, do not use it. It will be distracting to the participants and spectators. If possible, measure the light in the courtroom and determine the correct exposure through tests before the trial.

Newsreel and TV Photographers:

11. Motion picture cameramen for television and theatre newsreels must use noiseless cameras that meet the highest standards of quiet operation—the only kind of coverage that can be tolerated under courtroom conditions.

12. All motion picture photography in courtrooms must be done with available, existing light, just as still pictures must be made without flash.

13. If sound-on-film recording is authorized by the trial judge, it must be accomplished with a bare minimum of cables and related equipment. Be careful to place microphones of a small type in inconspicuous places and to cover or conceal all cables.

14. When tripods are necessary, be certain to place yourself in a position of least notice to the spectators and trial officials, preferably in the rear of the courtroom. Under no circumstances should tripods be placed between spectators and the judge, jury or witnesses.

Conclusion:

As a representative of your news media at judicial proceedings your actions must be above reproach. With the trial judge's permission, news photographers may function on behalf of the public at a public trial, but only if their working does not interfere with the orderly processes of justice. In the interest of your employer and yourself, as well as your fellow members of NPPA, let these rules govern your work and behavior in a trial courtroom.

APPENDIX II

A CODE OF CONDUCT FOR THE BROADCAST OF PUBLIC PROCEEDINGS

Approved by the Board of Directors of the National Association of Broadcasters, June 20, 1958.

Broadcast newsmen are devoted guardians of our priceless heritage of freedom. They are particularly concerned with safeguarding freedom of speech and freedom of communications. They believe that the surest way to preserve these freedoms is to exercise them with vigor. They recognize that the vigorous exercise of freedom must be carried with a decent respect for the rights and opinions of others and for the established procedures of public agencies, judicial, legislative, and executive.

Public Hearings and Meetings

In keeping with these principles, broadcast newsmen, special events broadcasters, film cameramen and technical personnel who work with them will conduct themselves at public hearings in accordance with the following standards:

1. They will conform to the established procedures, customs, and decorum of the legislative halls, hearing rooms, and other public places where they provide broadcast coverage of public business.

2. At all public hearings they will respect the authority of the presiding officers to make appropriate rules of order and conduct.

3. Coverage arrangements will make maximum use of modern tech-

niques for unobstructive installation and operation of broadcasting equipment. Coverage will be pooled where necessary. Call letters should not be displayed in cases of multiple coverage.

4. In those many instances where commercial sponsorship of news coverage of public proceedings is desirable on economic grounds, commercials will be in good taste and will be clearly separated from the news content of the program. Broadcasters, of course, will honor to the letter any agreements with the presiding official regarding sponsorship.

5. Newsmen will present summaries of the proceedings, and will conduct interviews, or broadcast commentaries only during recesses, or outside the hearing room, or during appropriate portions of other proceedings in a manner that will assure that the broadcast does not distract from the public business.

In The Courtroom

The sanctity of public trial and the rights of the defendant and all parties require that special care be exercised to assure that broadcast coverage will in no way interfere with the dignity and decorum and the proper and fair conduct of such proceedings. In recognition of the paramount objective of just inherent in all trials, broadcast newsmen will observe the following standards:

1. They will abide by all rules of the court.

2. The presiding judge is, of course, recognized as the appropriate authority, and broadcast newsmen will address their applications for admission to him and will conform to his rulings. The right to appeal to higher jurisdiction is reserved.

3. Broadcast equipment will be installed in a manner acceptable to the court and will be unobtrusively located and operated so as not to be disturbing or distracting to the court or participants.

4. Broadcast newsmen will not move about while court is in session in such a way as to interfere with the orderly proceedings. Their equipment will remain stationary.

5. Commentaries on the trial will not be broadcast from the courtroom while the trial is in session.

6. Broadcasting of trials will be presented to the community as a public service, and there will be no commercial sponsorship of such trials.

7. Broadcast personnel will dress in accordance with courtroom custom.

STATEMENT of the OWNERSHIP, MANAGEMENT, and CIRCULATION

required by the Act of Congress of August 24, 1912, as amended by the Acts of March 3, 1933, and July 2, 1946 (Title 39, United States Code, Section 233)

Of JOURNAL OF BROADCASTING, published quarterly at Los Angeles, California, for Fall, 1958.

1. The names and addresses of the publisher, editor, managing editor, and business managers are:

Publisher, Association for Professional B'casting Education, 1771 N St., Washington 6, D.C.

Editor, Dr. Robert E. Summers, University of So. California, University Park, Los Angeles 7, Calif.

Managing editor, none.

Business manager, none.

2. The owner is: (If owned by a corporation, its name and address must be stated and also immediately thereunder the names and addresses of stockholders owning or holding 1 percent or more of total amount of stock. If not owned by a corporation, the names and addresses of the individual owners must be given. If owned by a partnership or other unincorporated firm,, its name and address, as well as that of each individual member, must be given.)

Association for Professional B'casting Education, 1771 N St., Washington 6, D.C.:

Glenn Starlin, University of Oregon, Eugene, Oregon, President.

W. Earl Dougherty, Station KXEO, Mexico, Mo., Vice President.

Richard M. Brown, Station KPOJ, Portland, Oregon, Sec'y-Treasurer.

Fred Garrigus, NAB, Washington, D.C., Executive-Secretary.

3. The known bondholders, mortgagees, and other security holders owning or holding 1 percent or more of total amount of bonds, mortgages, or other securities are: (If there are none, so state.)

None.

4. Paragraphs 2 and 3 include, in cases where the stockholder or security holder appears upon the books of the company as trustee or in any other fiduciary relation, the name of the person or corporation for whom such trustee is acting; also the statements in the two paragraphs show the affiant's full knowledge and belief as to the circumstances and conditions under which stockholders and security holders who do not appear upon the books of the company as trustees, hold stock and securities in a capacity other than that of a bona fide owner.

ROBERT E. SUMMERS, Editor

Sworn to and subscribed before me this 25th day of September, 1958.

[Seal] C. H. MANN,

Notary Public, Los Angeles, Calif.

My Commission expires April 4, 1960.

THE QUIZ PROGRAM: A NETWORK TELEVISION STAPLE

By Patrick E. Welch

The quiz program has received considerable comment in recent weeks, so this article by Patrick E. Welch is particularly appropriate at this time. The article is based upon a chapter in Mr. Welch's Ph.D. dissertation, "The Development of Audience Participation Programs on Radio and Television Networks Through the Season of 1956-57." Mr. Welch is Associate Professor of Radio-TV and Chairman of the Department of Radio-Television at the University of Houston. He received his Ph.D. from Ohio State University this year.

THE big news among cosmetics advertisers in 1955 was Revlon's phenomenal success with a brand new program called "The $64,000 Question." This new program captured the attention of viewers and amazed the advertising fraternity with its rise out of nowhere.[1]

"The $64,000 Question" was introduced to the network television audience on June 7, 1955, and almost immediately jumped into national attention. Within a period of only four weeks it was able to attract an audience larger than that of any other network television program on the air at that time. For the month of July, 1955, the American Research Bureau gave it the highest rating in the nation, 52.3; and estimated its audience to be 47,560,000 viewers.[2] The Pulse gave the program a rating of 35.1, which was the highest rating this research organization gave for July, 1955; and The A. C. Nielsen Company's "Top Ten TV Programs," for the two weeks ending July 23, 1955, placed it in the number one spot with a rating of 41.1 and a viewing audience of 13,423,000 homes across the nation.[3]

"The $64,000 Question" was not the first studio quiz program to be introduced to a national audience. It was not even the first such program to be introduced on network television. And it was certainly not a new idea in programming. There had been dozens of such programs on both radio and television prior to the summer of 1955. It was, however, the program that ushered in what might be called the modern era of the quiz, with its fresh staging and gimmicks—the isolation booth, "mood" music, armed guards, pretty hostesses to escort

[1] *Sponsor*, January 6, 1956, p. 108.
[2] *Broadcasting-Telecasting*, August 1, 1955, p. 36.
[3] *Broadcasting-Telecasting*, August 22, 1955, p. 36.

contestants, and so forth. Beginning with this modern era, contestants needed a strong heart to stand the insistent drum beat, the crescendo, the lowered lights, the sound-proof booth, and various other devices which were designed to heighten the tension.

Of all of broadcasting's sundry phenomena, the rise of the quiz program has been as astonishing as any. Although it all began with the introduction of "Professor Quiz" in 1936, the year 1938 will probably be remembered as "the quiz year" in network radio. Puzzler programs were the craze as new kinds of entertainers known as "quiz masters" flocked to the microphones inviting participation from the audience. Never had the "listeners' brains been so confounded and tickled by the voices that led them on in attention-compelling entertainment."[4] The year 1938 will doubtless also be remembered as the worst year since 1926 for noted singers, primarily because of the lower cost of intertainment involved with quiz programs.[5] Sponsors had found a form of entertainment using talent which was free, docile, and inexhaustible.[6]

Since 1936 several major changes have taken place in the basic quiz idea. The earlier programs of this type were simple in idea and production. However, through the years interest and suspense were added; larger and larger prizes were offered; contestant selection became a more and more complicated activity; variations were continually applied to the basic quiz theme; and major changes with respect to the master of ceremonies took place.

Quiz programs have always depended for their growth and popularity on the performances of personalities who are rarely reviewed by the critics. These personalities represent a major discovery by American broadcasting. They are known as contestants.

These real people, valued for their own sakes, have been infiltrating broadcasting for some time. Originally they were selected from people in the studio audience at random with no particular technique of selection. Sometimes the first few people to enter the studio were selected. Sometimes numbers were given to each person who entered the studio, and these numbers were later drawn from a hat to see who would participate. In "Dr. I.Q." assistants who were located at various locations

[4]Orrin E. Dunlap, Jr., "A Year's Round-up," *The New York Times*, January 1, 1939, p. 34.

[5]*Ibid.*

[6]George Joel, "Quid Pro Quiz," *Nation*, November 14, 1940, p. 475.

in the studio auditorium selected contestants more or less while the program was on the air.

Later, selection of contestants was made from the studio audience just long enough before the program went on the air to attempt to obtain some novelty values. Brief interviews and trial questions helped the producers decide which contestants to use, but not more than thirty minutes to an hour was spent with this procedure.

Today, selection of contestants is made far in advance of broadcast time. Potential participants write in giving qualifications and pictures. Unlike the early days, when practically anyone visiting the broadcast studio could become a contestant, today it is considerably more difficult to become a contestant on a good quiz program. One has to be more than a resident of Brooklyn or a grandmother to be welcomed to guest ranks. And this major change in selection of contestants all began with "The $64,000 Question." The era of big cash prizes and psychologically chosen contestants flowered in the summer of 1955; and with a corps of interviewers, and the casting techniques of the Broadway theatre, today's quiz contestant is a selective personality. Packagers and producers run complex, large staff operations for the express purpose of selecting a handful of intelligent, representative, charming people out of the tens of thousands who apply by way of letters, post cards, telegrams, visits, and recommendations. Even though the standards are high, the pool from which these packagers and producers have to draw is tremendous.

Through the years since 1936, variations have been continually applied to the basic quiz pattern. These variations may be listed in the following chronological order:

1. Single questions asked of each of a large number of contestants, as in "Dr. I.Q." in 1936.

2. The spell-down method of contest, as in "Spelling Bee" in 1936.

3. Questions concerning music, as in "Kay Kyser's College of Musical Knowledge" in 1936.

4. "Team" competition, as in "Battle of the Sexes" in 1938.

5. A series of questions of increasing difficulty to one contestant, as in "Strike It Rich" in 1940.

6. Several contestants competing as individuals in trying to be first to answer the same question, as in "Quick As a Flash" in 1944.

7. Teams of two contestants each, which in effect compete against one another for the chance to try for a jackpot question, as in "You Bet Your Life" in 1945.

8. The element of one person against another person, as in "The $64,000 Challenge" in 1956.

It should be particularly noted that of these eight variations, only one was introduced on the television networks. The first seven originated by way of network radio. Also, although it was missing in all of the earlier quizzes, several of them today are built to make comedy a basic essential.

Similar to this change in the selection of contestants, there has also been a change in the attitude expressed by the masters of ceremonies. The early day quiz master was not at all eager to shower contestants with cash if they could show even the smallest bit of knowledge. This "old-style" master of ceremonies often had an entirely different objective. All indications were that his aim was to see that only a certain limited amount of his sponsor's money was given away. It was as if he had it all planned just how often he wanted to permit the jackpot to be won. And if a particularly alert contestant threatened to upset his well-planned financial schedule, it was as if he had several sure-fire techniques to make certain that this contestant did not hit the jackpot.

One of these techniques might have been called the "filibuster" in which the master of ceremonies confused the contestant with rapid-fire chatter until the gong rang, ending the time to answer the question.

Another method might have been called the "soft death" approach. In this, the master of ceremonies repeatedly said, "Remember, you have only thirty seconds . . . You now have just fifteen seconds . . . oooh, there's the gong. Sorry, your time is up."

The "new-style" master of ceremonies of today doesn't have to be a character. He doesn't need a loose tongue to add to the already frightened state of the contestant. He doesn't have to have a personality which explodes sporadically like fire-works. He doesn't have to sing, nor does he have to dance, as he was once called upon to do. All he has to do is be friendly, reasonably intelligent, and have a certain amount of stage presence. Considerable responsibility has been lifted from his shoulders.

This is not to imply that the master of ceremonies of today is unimportant to the program. On the contrary, he is extremely important, but he does not have to be the star attraction. The program itself is the star attraction. Today's quiz programs rely on a format, not on a master of ceremonies. As a matter of fact, they are a triumph of format. They are built on the level of a pinball machine; the mechanism of each program, its dynamics, speed, energy, become supremely significant—how often contestants are changed, how often they return week after week, how often questions are missed, how often questions are answered correctly, how large the prize is. They are built on a foundation of suspense and continuity and are held together by a framework of tension.

There has been only one major study dealing with the psychological aspects of the quiz program. This is unfortunate since the psychological aspects are basic to an understanding of the significance of programs of this type. In any event, this single study was entitled "Gratification Study," and was conducted and written for publication by Dr. Herta Herzog with assistance from Dr. Hadley Cantril.[7] The program, "Professor Quiz," was analyzed because it was a type of highly successful quiz program regard by many as "educational."

This study consisted of eleven very detailed interviews with three men and eight women. The check-list covered the following points: (1) whether the listener to a given program was disappointed when he did not know the answer; (2) whether he liked the contest; and (3) whether he thought the program was educational.

Although this study was conducted over eighteen years ago, and although the program used was the first quiz program ever presented on a national network, there is still a considerable amount of information from it which can be applied to the quiz program of today. For example, the eleven interviews indicated that there were four main types of appeals to be found in "Professor Quiz." They were: (1) the competitive appeal; (2) the educational appeal; (3) the self-rating appeal; and (4) the sporting appeal.[8] All of these same appeals can be found in the quiz program of today.

---

[7]Paul Lazarsfeld, *Radio and The Printed Page* (New York: Duell, Sloan, and Pearce, 1940), p. 64.

[8]*Ibid.*, p. 65.

In addition, certain probabilities, which might also be applicable today, were included in this "Gratification Study" and can be summarized by the following list:

1. Women thought both soap operas and quiz programs were educational.
2. High school students thought quiz programs were educational.
3. Listeners wanted to beat the "college man."
4. Listeners were glad when questions were not too academic.
5. The program relieved listeners of their feeling of guilt "that they did not do anything to improve themselves," without involving any effort on their part.
6. A good score on a quiz program depended on "guess-work and luck," according to listeners.

As of the writing of this paper, there are a total of 15 weekly half-hour quiz programs scheduled on the television networks, and 11 daily half-hour quiz programs scheduled Monday through Friday.[9] It is actually difficult to find a time during the day or night when one network or another is not carrying a program of this kind. Some of these programs are good, and some are bad, but whether one likes it or not they have become a staple of the network television industry. The question many are asking today is "why."

Any meaningful answer to this question must be approached from two standpoints. First, from the standpoint of the sponsors; and second, from the standpoint of the audience.

For the sponsors, the answer is chiefly one of economics. Today's weekly budget of $25,000 might appear large, even for a leading network television quiz program, until it is compared with a budget of $100,000 a week for a dramatic or variety program which might not rank appreciably higher in ratings. It is this combination of cost and rating that is of primary importance to the sponsors.

Production costs for quiz programs are relatively low because the production set-up is relatively simple. Active participants, other than the non-professional contestants, are limited to a master of ceremonies, a director, an announcer, in some cases an office staff of research workers

[9] *Sponsor*, July 5, 1958, pp. 46-51.

and secretaries, perhaps a gag writer, possibly a few musicians, and a producer. Normally, there is not a great deal of rehearsal.

As far as ratings are concerned, most quiz programs fall into the "average" and below category, although a few do receive higher than "average" from time to time. "You Bet Your Life," "Twenty One," and "The $64,000 Question" have been found among the top rated programs in the country. A program does not really need a high rating if its costs are relatively low. As far as popularity is concerned, a quiz program is no different from any other program type. Its popularity depends on its quality—its demonstration of showmanship; good judgment in selecting colorful, interesting participants; genuine sympathy and comparable suspense—in other words, entertainment. There are those who maintain that entertainment, in the ordinary sense, is not included in quiz programs. Any such comment might be passed over as meaningless semantics. There may be more dramatic entertainment in a housewife's groping for an answer to a $30,000 question than in a Broadway play. It is possible that the various publics find many things entertaining outside the world of what is called "professional entertainment."

Why does anyone watch a quiz program? It may be as Gilbert Seldes has said, "People are interested in people."[10] It may be "the relief one feels at hearing again the simple accents of a human being, no matter what he may be saying."[11] Quiz programs tend to escape broadcasting's morbid fear of the possibility of impropriety. The producers take a chance on the decency of ordinary people. They run the risk of dullness; but if dullness comes, it at least comes naturally and spontaneously.

Each member of the audience is, in a sense, a contestant. The competition is two-fold—the actual duel between the contestant and the master of ceremonies, and the shadowy strife between the contestant and the listener. The satisfaction, the feeling of superiority, in answering a question that someone else cannot answer is undeniable.

Television network programming is placing more and more emphasis on low cost production, particularly shows with small casts and simple settings, and the quiz program is made-to-order. There is little reason to assume that this program type will not gain momentum during the

---

[10]Gilbert Seldes, *The Great Audience*, (New York, The Viking Press, 1951), p. 186.

[11]*Ibid.*, p. 205.

1958-1959 season, since more and more advertisers are becoming aware of both its economy and impact.[12]

The future of the quiz program is comparable to the future of any form of entertainment. The good, solid, well-structured programs will last, and the poorly presented imitations (of which there are too many today) will fall by the wayside. In any case, good, bad, or indifferent, the quiz program has become one of the most significant program types in network television programming, and should be with us for many seasons to come.

[12] *Sponsor*, May 3, 1958, p. 42.

COMMUNICATIONS ACTIVITIES OF WISCONSIN FARM FAMILIES IN WINTERTIME

By John E. Ross and Lloyd R. Bostian

Most information on audience behavior has been derived from studies of urban populations. But what has taken place in media behavior patterns among farm families? In a commendable joint effort, Station WBAY, Green Bay, Wisconsin, and the University of Wisconsin sought to find some answers to this question. The findings reproduced here are the result of a survey conducted in the early spring of 1957 by researchers Ross and Bostian; copies of the complete study are reportedly available without charge from WBAY-TV.

John E. Ross received his Ph.D. in Mass Communications in 1954 from the University of Wisconsin and is currently an assistant professor in the Department of Agricultural Journalism at that institution. Lloyd R. Bostian, an instructor in the same department, is currently completing his Ph.D. degree in Mass Communications and is writing his dissertation on the time use project, of which the study reported here is a part.

"AUDIENCE" is together the attraction and the nemesis of the mass media.

Large audiences, obtainable only through wide circulation, are the attraction. The nemesis is the unknown and fleeting character of the audience in both quantity and quality. This is particularly haunting to radio and television broadcasters, because of the ease of changing stations or tuning in and out.

Many valuable audience analysis projects have revealed characteristics of audiences. Not so many research projects have been done on the problem of total attention to the mass media in relation to total time use.

Because of a particular shortage of information on rural audiences, communications researchers in the Department of Agricultural Journalism at the University of Wisconsin surveyed farm family time use allocated to the mass media in relation to other time uses. The researchers also explored socio-economic factors to reveal reasons behind this time use. The time was winter—late February and March—mostly with dairy farmers.

The diary was the basic research tool. Five hundred twenty-three Wisconsin farm families were asked to record their total time use on diaries over a three-day period. Emphasis in the diary was placed upon the mass media (television, radio, and reading).

Table I.

All Mass Media
Alone and in Combination with Other Activities for Counties of High, Medium, and Low Urban Influence
Average Number Minutes

Men									Women								
High Urban			Med. Urban			Low Urban			High Urban			Med. Urban			Low Urban		
Week	Sat.	Sun.	Week	Sat.	Sun.	Week	Sat.	Sun.	Week	Sat.	Sun.	Week	Sat.	Sun.	Week	Sat.	Sun.
*242	231	195	208	214	177	256	240	248	330	259	206	367	272	193	336	271	265
** 24	23	19	21	21	18	25	24	25	33	26	21	36	27	19	33	27	26

*Average Minutes

**% mass media occupied of diary minutes tabulated

Data was tabulated according to time of day, day of the week, and in three levels of urban influence, for both men and women.

Urban Influence

A major starting point in the project was this—"urban influence will determine time use among farm families, including their use of the mass media." The degree that farm family was "under the wing" of the city would be a major factor in the way that family used its time.

To test this point, six counties, representing three levels of urban influence, were arbitrarily selected. Urban influence was measured by an index of urban factors, distance in time from larger cities, and availability of mass media.

Communities within these counties were also arbitrarily selected, which, as in the researchers' judgment, were representative of that county. Farmers on rural routes in these communities were randomly selected.

Urban influence proved to be of little influence on time use, as indicated by Table I.

The average time allocated to mass media was higher in the low urban areas than in the high urban areas.

The areas sampled are at saturation, as far as radio goes, and probably have been for some time. Only 3.5 per cent had no working radio set. One third of the families had a radio in the barn. Sixty-five per cent had car radios.

Television was nearing saturation, with 86 per cent of the families reporting at least one set (just over one per cent reported more than one set).

Seventy-four per cent took at least one daily newspaper; 76 per cent took at least one weekly newspaper. Ninety-six per cent took at least one farm magazine; (67 per cent took three or more farm magazines).

It is apparent, then, that the mass media have leaped any barriers of distance that once isolated farm families from urban patterns.

Average Minutes Allocated to Mass Media

Table II shows average time allocated to television, to radio, and to reading (newspapers and magazines) for all men and women sampled.

Table II.

Average Number Minutes with Individual Mass Media

	TV						Radio						Reading					
	Men			Women			Men			Women			Men			Women		
	Week	Sat.	Sun.	Week	Sat.	Sun.	Week	Sat.	Sun.	Week	Sat.	Sun.	Week	Sat.	Sun.	Week	Sat.	Sun.
*	99	115	113	165	135	125	88	79	52	123	103	61	40	37	32	39	34	26
**	44	50	60	50	50	59	39	34	28	38	38	29	18	16	17	12	13	12

*Average Minutes

**Per cent mass media occupied of total minutes tabulated

In terms of average time use, television was the leading medium.[1] Radio was second in terms of average time use. Reading was third. Women were heavier users of radio and television than men. There is some indication that men were heavier readers. Sundays were generally lighter days in attention to the mass media than other days.[2]

Participants with Mass Media vs. Non-Participants

Now, let's compare the mass media on another basis. The above cited figures are average times for all individuals in the sample. Obviously some people are heavy users of a given medium, others do not participate at all.

In table III, the first column gives the average for all individuals. The second column is the average for those who *did* participate on a given day.

TABLE III

Time Spent by Farm Operators in Communications Activities
Average Number Minutes

Time Use	Sample Average	Average Per Day of Participation
Television	102	148
Radio	79	146
Reading	38	69
Total Mass Media[3]	212	229

Proportionately the change is greater in both radio and reading than in television. This means that more people participated in television on a given day than the other media.

[1]Average time use is here computed by totaling the time allocated to television and dividing by the number in the sample. This figure includes those who did not watch television on a given day.

[2]These farm families spent a good share of their leisure time on Sunday in (1) church, and (2) visiting with friends.

[3]The sum of the three is not the same as the total because (1) some activities are shared, ie., reading while listening to radio, and (2) sample days are not necessarily the same, ie., one day may report no radio time, but have reading time, whereas mass media average is computed for both days.

Table IV.

Accumulative Percentage of Farm Operators Attending to Mass Media At Different Levels of Time (calculated in half hours)

	Half Hours*																						
Media	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22
Tel'v'n	31	36	45	54	65	75	82	88	91	93	95	96	97	98	99	100							
Radio	46	58	67	74	80	83	86	88	90	91	92	93	94	95	96	97	98	99	100				
Read'g	45	67	83	91	95	97	98	99	100														
Total	7	11	18	26	35	44	52	59	66	72	77	81	85	88	90	92	94	95	96	97	98	99	100

*To find the percentage of the sample in contact with the media at any given number of half hours, subtract the figure in the column preceding.

Eliminating the non-listeners to radio brings the average time spent listening to nearly that of television. Average time in reading changes from just over a half hour to just over an hour.

Some People Are Heavy Users of the Media

How extensively do people participate in the mass media? Some may watch or read all day, others only lightly. Table IV gives an indication of this total exposure to mass media for farmers in the sample.

Sixty-nine per cent of the sample watched television on any given day. Fifty-four per cent listened to radio, and fifty-five per cent read. Ninety-three per cent participated in at least one type of mass media.[4]

Time of Day

The time of day that an audience is tuned in has always been of critical interest to radio and television personnel. There has also been a marked degree of program specialization depending upon a particular audience listening at a particular time of day.

Agricultural programming has been governed by some "rules of thumb" in the trade on the time that farmers and their families have sets turned on.

This research gives us facts on listening time, not available in detail up to this time.

Graphs were plotted for the farmers and their wives for a number of different time use activities. Table V provides a detailed breakdown for television and radio, on weekdays.[5]

The column TV (or Radio) "Alone" refers to television viewing exclusively (with no other activity at the same time); the "Total" column refers to television viewing (or radio listening) in combination with other activities.

Television was predominantly an evening medium. At the peak hours (8 p.m. to 9 p.m.) approximately one half of the potential audi-

[4]This is found by subtracting the per cent in the "0" column from 100 per cent.

[5]There are differences depending upon the day of the week, especially on Saturdays and Sundays.

TABLE V

Percent Total Sample Watching Television and Listening to Radio At Different Times of Day

Time Period	Men TV		Women TV		Men Radio		Women Radio	
	Alone %	Total %	Alone %	Total %	Alone %	Total %	Alone %	Total %
5:30-6 AM	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	.4	12.5	.8	6.5
6-6:30	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	.6	20.8	1.0	13.8
6:30-7	0.0	.3	0.0	.1	.1	22.4	.4	17.8
7-7:30	.9	1.4	.7	3.0	.8	20.2	.9	23.8
7:30-8	1.0	1.9	1.0	3.6	1.3	22.4	.9	27.3
8-8:30	.9	2.1	.9	4.9	1.3	15.2	1.0	23.8
8:30-9	.9	1.7	.7	4.4	1.3	11.8	1.0	18.3
9-9:30	.4	.4	.4	3.8	.5	7.5	.8	16.5
9:30-10	.8	.8	.9	5.7	.4	7.3	.4	14.7
10-10:30	.4	.5	2.6	9.8	.3	4.2	.8	15.3
10:30-11	.8	.9	2.6	9.4	.4	3.7	.8	12.9
11-11:30	.8	1.2	4.4	13.7	1.7	4.2	1.6	18.3
11:30-12 N	1.3	1.9	3.9	12.9	1.9	5.5	1.7	24.4
12-12:30 PM	1.0	11.2	1.4	17.3	.8	18.4	.7	24.1
12:30-1	3.2	13.2	3.5	13.0	3.2	15.2	2.0	20.9
1-1:30	3.2	4.8	4.3	10.5	1.5	3.2	.9	14.0
1:30-2	1.5	2.4	3.6	11.2	1.0	1.7	.9	10.9
2-2:30	1.3	1.8	4.4	12.4	.5	1.5	1.3	10.0
2:30-3	.8	1.2	4.6	12.9	.5	1.8	1.4	8.5
3-3:30	1.9	2.2	9.4	20.8	.6	3.0	1.6	7.3
3:30-4	2.2	2.4	9.4	20.8	.5	4.0	1.7	7.5
4-4:30	1.4	1.7	2.9	9.5	.9	5.8	.8	6.6
4:30-5	1.5	2.8	2.0	8.6	.6	6.6	.7	9.4
5-5:30	1.7	4.2	2.1	9.6	.5	8.5	.3	9.4
5:30-6	2.3	4.9	1.0	8.2	.5	9.6	.3	7.7
6-6:30	2.6	7.2	5.1	12.2	.5	14.4	.8	8.7
6:30-7	7.2	11.4	11.2	21.6	1.5	14.8	.9	7.5
7-7:30	19.3	22.9	21.7	35.9	.9	8.7	.5	5.1
7:30-8	28.7	34.7	29.6	45.1	1.0	4.9	1.0	4.0
8-8:30	38.4	44.2	36.7	53.2	1.8	2.7	.7	2.9
8:30-9	40.4	47.2	37.8	54.0	1.3	2.3	.7	2.3
9-9:30	34.7	38.8	31.9	42.4	1.3	2.4	.8	2.7
9:30-10	28.9	32.4	25.0	32.9	.6	1.7	.7	1.8
10-10:30	13.5	14.8	13.0	16.1	1.0	1.3	.1	1.0
10:30-11	6.9	7.7	4.7	6.0	.9	1.2	.3	.8
11-11:30	2.3	2.4	1.8	2.2	.5	.6	.3	.3

ence was watching. At noon approximately 10 per cent of the men were watching (farm television programs are generally scheduled at noon). Housewives were heavier daytime viewers than men. Housewives watched television in combination with other activities (usually work time activities) more than men.

Radio showed an entirely different picture. For men, radio listening closely paralleled chore time in the dairy barn plus meal time. Peak hours of radio listening were 6 a.m. to 8 a.m. for men. At noon between 15 and 20 per cent of the potential were listening to radio as compared to 10 per cent with television. Farm programs are generally in early morning hours and at noon.

With women also, radio was largely a daytime medium. As with men, the early morning hours were the strongest, but listening held up to some extent in the morning hours and peaked again at noon.

Television was generally an exclusive medium. That is, it took the total attention of the viewer. Radio was almost entirely a joint medium; people did other activities while listening. Radio was a more versatile medium in the sense that it followed the people through their workday—in the barn, the car, the kitchen and elsewhere.

Summary

Men spent about one-fifth of their waking time in contact with mass media; women about one-fourth of their time. This fact stands out as one of the most interesting in the study.

The impact of this mass media time is not known. It cannot help but be great. The high availability of the mass media, coupled with the existence of all-weather roads, puts Wisconsin dairy farmers in close contact with their urban neighbors and with the world beyond their fencerows.

In terms of time, television was the leading medium. The relative effect of the different media is not here ascertained.

The study also does not attempt to determine the reasons why people might pay attention to the different media, or what they hope to get from the media.

There is some indication that radio, in its use habits, is more similar to reading than to television. It can be hypothesized that radio and

reading serve similar purposes for farm people, television different purposes. Or, it might be that because of different natures of the media, farm people turn to them for different reasons.

Mass communications assume a leading role in the daily habits of farm people. But they do not fill the communications picture. There is also the area of person-to-person and person-to-group contact. The average farmer who attended church on Sunday, spent two hours doing so. The average farmer who visited (outside the family) spent almost three hours doing so.

Combine the mass media with the face-to-face contacts and you find that the farm operator spent over five hours of "communication" on the average sample day.

PUBLIC RELATIONS IN EDUCATIONAL TELEVISION

By Richard A. Sanderson

This is the report of a limited inquiry into public relations activities of educational television stations, showing how educational broadcasters have at least one problem in common with their commercial brethren —namely, the need to publicize their efforts.

Richard A. Sanderson commenced graduate study in television and film at the University of Iowa, later completing his M.A. degree in Cinema at the University of Southern California. Following a year as Film Supervisor at the University of Kentucky he returned to SC to begin work on a Ph.D. in Communications, on which he is presently engaged.

THE attention of educational telecasters, up to the present time, seems to have been concentrated on the programming of the educational stations and on the production of educational shows. It now may be time for educational telecasters to ask themselves if their products are reaching the maximum group within the potential audience. In performing their services for the public, have educational telecasters established a good two-way communication between the station and the public? Is the public fully aware of the offerings of such stations and are these stations performing services their publics need and want?

To answer these questions and solve the problems they imply, an educational station needs a well-organized and effective public relations program. A program which merely concerns itself with publicity releases and program logs will not solve these problems. But how can an educational station, operating on a small budget, organize and build an extensive public relations program which will maintain this two-way communications channel with its public?

An attempt was made to answer some of these questions by conducting a survey on the public relations policies and activities of educational stations now on the air. Questionnaires were sent to all educational television stations broadcasting on regular schedules prior to July, 1957. The results of this survey represent reports from nineteen stations and one educational network of three stations.

Seventeen of the twenty stations surveyed reported they had definite need for an organized, full-time public relations program. Some of these stations stated that this type of public relations program was needed to increase the amount of publicity and promotion for the station

and its programs. Two UHF stations surveyed said their public relations program was needed to promote conversion to VHF.

Two community stations said an effective public relations program was necessary to enlist public subscriptions which furnished their income. Another station indicated it was planning to start subscription drives and needed a good public relations program to accomplish its goals.

A few community stations felt their public relations program was necessary to compete for public attention, maintaining that educational television needed promotion as much as, or more than commercial television. One respondent replied that, "Not having a large budget for advertising and competing against three commercial stations, a public relations program is vital." This competition with commercial stations did not seem to be quite so sharply defined in other instances. Two stations had received help from commercial television and radio stations in promotional activities by means of spot announcements or special programs during fund raising campaigns. Another respondent stated, "Commercial TV has been most cooperative in promoting programs." From these instances it appears that educational television can and does receive help from commercial stations in public relation activities. Since an educational station usually fulfills different public needs than does a commercial station, it is reasonable to expect the two could exist in a cooperative atmosphere.

The importance of public relations activities for educational stations is reflected by the fact that eighteen stations reported personnel were specifically assigned to public relations work. However, only half of these stations had at least one person assigned to public relations in a full-time capacity.

The basis for any public relations program should be a definition of policies and objectives. Thirteen of the stations surveyed had a formal written statement of station policies and objectives. Six respondents of the remaining stations filled out the questionnaire indicating their station's objectives. These objectives as marked by respondents for nineteen stations were:

To provide a presentation of television fare not available on commerical stations. (18 stations)
Education of the general public. (16 stations)
Education of special interest groups. (15 stations)

Education through formal classroom TV. (14 stations)
A means of classroom instruction for the public for academic credit. (14 stations)
To provide an outlet for material to be presented to the public by civic and public institutions. (13 stations)
To make available the best material and presentation of certain subjects for classroom television. (11 stations)
To assist in alleviating teacher shortage. (8 stations)
To assist in alleviating crowded classrooms. (8 stations)

Two stations added objectives to the above list:
To provide educational services which cannot otherwise be provided, such as (1) pre-school education, (2) parent education, (3) education for home-bounds, etc.
To reflect the cultural, educational and spiritual life of the community.

A statement of station policies and objectives can assist the public relations director in determining the publics or audiences with whom he must deal. The enormous size of the potential audience for educational television can be realized from the estimates stated by fourteen educational stations. Some stations listed potential audiences by population, some by the number of sets reached. These figures totaled 5,028,500 sets plus 7,160,000 persons for just fourteen stations.

Commercial television stations are usually interested in the entire potential audience, attempting to reach as many persons in this audience as possible for most shows. But the educational telecaster may be concerned with only a small portion of this potential audience for a specific program. Thus, the public relations director of the educational television station finds he is communicating with segments of the public. He should be concerned with reaching all persons in these various segments, but in the process cannot afford to neglect other segments of the public whose interest may be aroused to make new viewers for the station. The public relations director is therefore involved in arousing, maintaining, and building the attention and interest of various groups within the potential audience.

Educational television stations are attempting to know their audience and to discover how programming is being received. Fifteen stations had taken some type of audience poll or survey or were in the process of

doing so. These surveys represented various methods: in-school count or survey of television use; survey of special series or programs; limited coincidental phone surveys; small surveys by students or classes; depth interviews by qualified persons; survey of certain group attitudes towards station programming; extensive survey of public opinion on educational television; interview and other types of surveys under special educational grants.

Once the audience is known, the public relations director's problem is to find the media through which he can best reach his publics. The media he uses would, of course, depend upon his needs and purposes. Outlets for public relations material listed by eighteen stations as being *most effective* for their purposes were:

Press (daily and weekly newspapers, etc.)—12 stations.
Personal contact (speeches and word-of-mouth)—4 stations.
The station's own programming ,spot announcements, etc.)
—2 stations.

Other effective outlets mentioned were: TV guides; mailing lists; monthly program bulletins; school journals; through schools, P.T.A. groups, and service clubs.

Use of the press by educational television in public relations matters was primarily for news releases and program logs. Some stations mentioned the use of daily suburban and weekly neighborhood papers, farm news, house organs, national publications, and the trade press.

Sixteen stations reported they furnished speakers on request. The frequency of these requests varied among stations from one speaker engagement per week up to as high as one per day in certain periods. Station WTTW in Chicago operated a speaker's bureau. Speakers and subjects were listed in a special pamphlet which explained the bureau and invited groups to call on the station for this service. Many educational stations had difficulty in providing speakers from their limited and busy staffs. To solve this problem WTTW, in addition to their own personnel, used many qualified persons from the area who were informed on station procedure, operation, function, etc., and were available to fulfill speaking engagements.

Face-to-face communication seemed to be very effective for some stations in their public relations work. Since the educational television audience is composed of small interest groups, it appears to be very

profitable for a public relations director to establish some sort of speaker's bureau in order to make personal contacts with the various interest groups.

Practically all stations surveyed used their own programming to promote the station and its offerings. This was usually done through special promotional and spot announcements placed throughout their programming. Station KQED in San Francisco carried a weekly program which was described as being basically a public relations program with a "guest interview" format. The program explained the operations of the station, gave station news, program previews, etc., within this format. This type of program seems capable of being an excellent "bulletin board" for the station to help inform and build interest. Its one weakness, however, is that is would probably not draw new listeners to the station, but merely capitalize on those who were already patrons.

This survey on public relations policies and activities of twenty educational television stations revealed seven major items which appeared significant in a majority of reports:

(1) Sufficient public or professional acknowledgment should be given persons or organizations assisting the educational station in its programming.

(2) An important phase of the educational station's operation is participation in some type of civic or institutional television workshop or training program for which station facilities are made available. These programs offer opportunities and means for good public relations.

(3) The proper handling of visitors at the educational station necessitates the use of a receptionist and guide. Visiting hours and the tours themselves should be designed to give the fullest view of the station and its operational procedures.

(4) Programming should include some shows in which the audience can in some way directly and actively participate. Some methods involve the use of study guides, and opportunities for additional information, telephone requests, etc.

(5) The publication of an annual progress report of some type has been found to be a useful tool for public relations.

(6) The most effective media for reaching the educational station's

audience have been found to be the press, personal contact, and the station's own programming.

(7) Many stations have conducted some type of audience survey or poll to determine audience opinion and reaction towards the station, the general programming or towards certain programs.

From the findings of this survey and from comments and materials submitted by the stations surveyed, there emerge a few suggestions which might help further the public relations programs of educational television stations:

(1) Schools, teachers, and students could probably be used even more extensively as promotional and public relations outlets.

(2) The public relations program of educational stations should capitalize on the effectiveness of direct and personal contact with their audiences by personally contacting various interest groups.

(3) The public relations department of an educational station, in order to function efficiently and accomplish its goals, must not be an isolated department devoted to the mechanics of publicity and program promotion. It needs to become an integral part of operations and planning. It should be a service for all departments of the station and become the link between them and their publics.

If the educational station is to be devoted to public service and wishes to provide this service to the largest number of persons possible, it should feel obligated to establish and maintain a two-way flow of communications between the station and its audiences. Only through understanding the needs and desires of its public, then attempting to fulfill these needs through programming and by giving its viewers a feeling of personal participation, can the educational station accomplish its complete objective.

THE FIRST YEAR OF THE CBS FOUNDATION NEWS AND PUBLIC AFFAIRS FELLOWSHIPS

By William C. Ackerman

The high esteem in which Harvard's Nieman Fellowships are held by the journalism fraternity recently prompted the establishment of a similar program for broadcasters. The initiative was taken by CBS Foundation Inc., the agency for making educational and charitable grants on behalf of CBS, Inc. and its divisions. The Foundation announced the inauguration of an annual program of CBS Foundation News and Public Affairs Fellowships at Columbia University. Since the program has now completed its first year of operation, it seemed appropriate to publish a special progress report in the JOURNAL.

William C. Ackerman has been Executive Director of CBS Foundation, Inc. since its establishment in 1954. He has been closely identified with the development of the CBS Foundation News and Public Affairs Fellowship plan since its beginning. Mr. Ackerman is also Director of Special Projects of CBS News.

THE idea of creating this unique group of fellowships, the first such project in the broadcast journalism field, had its roots in several broad and general considerations concerning education and communications.

First of all, there was the place these great and inter-related forces have assumed in our society.

Some historical eras bear single-phrase labels such as "The Age of Enlightenment," "The Renaissance," "The Era of Good Feeling." When historians come to put a summary label on the first-half of the 20th Century they will have a number of forces to consider, among them: the impact of the new science and technology, both in peace and in war; the new shapes and organizations of governments under the pressures of declining colonialism, rising nationalism, new ideologies; the general raising of living standards for heretofore less privileged people in many countries. Two other forces that will surely have a high place on any such list are: (1) the wider availability of education, and (2) the wider availability of mass communications.

As to education, the years since 1900 have seen a great *extension of opportunity*, from the primary grades through graduate study. We make great efforts as a nation to assure opportunity to our young people to go to school and college and to assure opportunity for the ablest of them to go on to advanced levels of study.

As to communications, we did not have radiobroadcasting until 1920, "mass" magazines in any number or present extent of circulation until the 1930's, or network television until the late 1940's. Clearly, this is the first century of mass communications.

Both education and communications have a common concern with news and public affairs. As both education and communications reach wider and wider audiences, this identity of interest has increased in scope and grown in degree. Education knows it can draw on communications more than ever before for extra-classroom information and insights into the world-at-large, as well as for in-classroom uses. The communications media know that the spread of education today has widened beyond anything previously known the audience for serious writing and serious broadcasting. Hence, to use only two of many examples, the *Saturday Evening Post* offers a series titled "Adventures of the Mind," written by eminent scholars in many fields; and CBS News produces "The Great Challenge," a series of symposium-discussions on leading issues confronting the Western World and its basic beliefs. National and international news reports—both the "hard" news and the background news—can be a part of the day-by-day education of students at all levels. This is not "formal" education, to be sure; but with it, formal education can become infinitely more meaningful and purposeful.

As national and international affairs become more complex, and scientific developments more intricate and some potentially hazardous in an ICBM age, the need for informed reporting and analysis (as well as for instant communications) becomes ever more urgent. Can the writer or broadcaster handle today's news adequately without knowing the historical, economic and social forces which are *making* the news of the Middle East or of other developing situations he is reporting or analyzing? Communications agencies must therefore turn increasingly to the universities for help in the development of their personnel, if they are to fulfill faithfully the opportunity that is now presented to reach wider and wider audiences which are already prepared to see and hear the best-informed presentations today's media can provide.

In 1956 the Board of CBS Foundation Inc., the agency for making educational and charitable grants on behalf of Columbia Broadcasting System, Inc. and its divisions, decided to develop a project which would help promising people already engaged in radio and television news

and public affairs "meet their growing responsibilities in electronic journalism."

The central aim was defined as the "broadening and strengthening" of background for continued work in news and public affairs, through a year of additional study in the broad curriculum of a large university. While more detailed requirements for eligibility were prescribed, the purpose was to offer the Fellowships to men and women engaged in radio-television news and public affairs "who show promise of greater development and who seem most likely to benefit from the study year provided."

With this general purpose and approach, the Board announced on January 7, 1957 that CBS Foundation Inc. had established at Columbia University in New York a group of eight one-year fellowships for eligible persons in news and public affairs in the radio and television field.

The announcement made news in the broadcast journalism field because this was the first effort in radio-television to bring together a group of news and public affairs personnel for a program of individualized study and of coordinated discussion meetings. For some years fellowships with the same general end in view have been available for persons in the newspaper field under the Nieman Foundation at Harvard University. "Nieman Fellows" have become well known in many parts of the communications field.

Now the first year of the CBS Foundation Fellowships has passed and the record can be reviewed. The first eight CBS Foundation Fellows were chosen from a total of 140 applicants representing 35 states. The categories of candidates were as follows: 37 of the applications came from college and university teachers in the field of communications and from personnel at non-commercial stations licensed to colleges and universities; 59 came from commercial stations affiliated with CBS Radio or CBS Television but not owned by them; and 44 came from staff members of CBS Radio and CBS Television or from stations owned by them.

The "original eight" and the backgrounds with which they came to Columbia:

Ernest F. Andrews, Jr., Assistant Professor of Journalism, State University of Iowa, Iowa City, Iowa; also News Director, Radio Station WSUI.

William B. Crawford, television news writer, CBS News, New York.

William Arthur Eames, News Director, Station KBOI and KBOI-TV, Boise, Idaho.

William Ray Mofield, Director of News and Special Events and Assistant Manager, Radio Station WPAD, Paducah, Kentucky.

Joseph L. Morrison, Associate Professor of Journalism, School of Journalism, University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, North Carolina.

John Meredith Patterson, Assistant News Director, Stations WDBJ and WDBJ-TV, Roanoke, Virginia.

Robert Bruce Taber, news writer, CBS News, New York.

Avram Robert Westin, a director for CBS News, New York.

One of the Columbia faculty members most closely associated with the project says that "by their performance as students" the CBS Fellows "justified fully the confidence placed in them by the CBS Foundation." Five of the Fellows received the degree of Master of Arts; and another has begun work leading to this degree. One of the Fellows who lives in New York will return to Columbia on his own for more: a second year of study (in evening sessions) of the Russian language.

The Foundation did not request or in any way try to encourage the Fellows to become degree candidates. It was wholly the individual's choice to follow this road as a means of making maximum use of the fellowship year.

Theses for the Master's Degree ranged in subject matter from "The Atomic Age Comes to Paducah, Kentucky" to "Soviet Union Interference in Czechoslovak Affairs, 1941-1947."

The group came under the formal tutelage of some of Columbia's most eminent and stimulating teachers: Jacques Barzun, Dean of Faculties and Provost, who had general supervision of the project; Historians Allan Nevins, Henry Steele Commager, and Dumas Malone; the Director of the Russian Institute, Henry L. Roberts—to name only a few. Moreover, outside the formal classroom the group had dinner meetings and informal discussions with a total of 16 faculty members. These special seminars were organized and conducted by Professor Henry F. Graff of the Department of History, the University's liaison representative (or

"guide, philosopher and friend") for the group. Assigned books formed the basis of the discussions, which ranged over a wide variety of topics, as suggested by the following titles: Alfred North Whitehead, *Science and the Modern World*; George F. Kennan, *American Diplomacy 1900-1950*; Samuel Lubell, *The Future of American Politics*. To these seminars, held every other Tuesday night at the Men's Faculty Club, came representatives of the Departments of Public Law and Government, English, Sociology, Physics, Religion, Philosophy, Economics and History; Faculty members included Dean Barzun, Professors Eli Ginzberg, Polykarp Kusch (a Nobel Prize Winner in Physics), Paul Lazarsfeld, Nathaniel Peffer, Lionel Trilling and Mr. Samuel Lubell.

The year's program was not all academic. The Fellows attended several dinners at CBS headquarters at which policies and techniques of news-gathering and reporting were discussed with executives and correspondents of CBS News. Those who spoke or participated in discussions at these dinners included Sig Mickelson, Vice President of CBS, Inc. and General Manager of CBS News; John Day, Director of News for CBS News; Irving Gitlin, Director of Public Affairs for CBS News; Elmer Lower, Director of Operations for CBS News; and Ted Koop, Director of News and Public Affairs for CBS News in Washington; and CBS News staff members Edward R. Murrow, Howard K. Smith, Bill Downs, Robert C. Pierpoint, Alexander Kendrick, and Ralph Backlund. Ralph F. Colin, a member of the Board of CBS, Inc. and President of CBS Foundation Inc., was chairman and host at these dinner meetings.

Also on the informal side, one of the "broadcaster" members of the group of Fellows was the elected voice to make farewell remarks on behalf of the last class Allan Nevins taught at Columbia before his retirement last June—in his celebrated course in "The Literature of American History." Professor Dumas Malone, the biographer of Thomas Jefferson and former head of the Harvard University Press, had been close to similar groups of students, the Nieman Fellows from the newspaper field, when he was at Harvard some years ago. His interest in more academic training for journalists carried over, both formally and informally, to the CBS Fellows, several of whom were students in his courses.

A few comments from some of the 1957-1958 Fellows follow:

> "I was interested in learning that I knew even less than I thought I knew about a lot of things . . . For myself I think the big thing

was to gain new perspective, a broader and better one . . . to get out of the field for a while, to talk about books written not yesterday but two decades ago and to talk about them with cultivated men who are capable of taking the long, the broad, possibly the whole view: that was probably the big thing of the year."

From another:

"In the first weeks of the academic year, I was distressed to discover that although I thought I was well-read and well-informed and intellectually active, I was, in fact, not that at all. The requirements of daily work apparently sneak up and encroach on 'thinking time' without one's realizing it. It properly takes effort to prevent this from happening and proper conscious effort is just what I plan to make . . ."

From another:

"The Fellowship year has more than fulfilled my expectations of being intellectually stimulating."

From another:

"It has been my finest experience."

A second group of eight CBS Foundation Fellows enters Columbia this fall for the 1958-1959 academic year. This group is as follows:

Clayton Lee Edwards, News Supervisor, Radio Station WTAR, Norfolk, Virginia.

Bernard N. Eismann, CBS News, New York.

Randall Gover, Director of News, WWL-TV, New Orleans, Louisiana.

Edmonde A. Haddad, News Staff, Radio Station KNX, Los Angeles, California.*

Gerhard Schwartzkopff, CBS News, Bonn, Germany.

Guy Searls, CBS News, Hong Kong.

Donald H. Weston, News Directorfi KGVO and KMSO-TV, Missoula, Montana.

Walter E. Whitaker, Acting Director, University Broadcasting Services, University of Alabama, University, Alabama.

---

*Edmone Haddad is a recent graduate of the University of Southern California with a major in Telecommunications, and began his association with KNX while a student.

An average of approximately $8,000 has been set by the Foundation for each fellowship to cover all tuition, fees and special arrangements at Columbia University, living expenses, transportation, etc. Some variations have been authorized on the basis of size of family, since several recipients had families to bring to New York and establish. In all, in 1957-1958, ten children spent the year in New York because of their fathers' study programs.

A CBS Foundation Fellow chooses individual courses which, in the opinion of the Fellow and of University representatives, can contribute most advantageously to a broadening and strengthening of his background for continued work in news and public affairs. The courses are not, therefore, limited to any general field; they have ranged over such varied fields as diplomatic history, economics, modern languages, Far Eastern affairs, political science, American Constitutional history, sociology, etc.

While the Fellows are expected to meet the attendance standards of the courses in which they enroll, no final examination or paper or report is required for those who are not degree candidates. The year is intended to be one in which promising people can, through detachment from their routine work, find both formal and informal opportunities to build up their knowledge of particular subjects and, at the same time, increase their understanding of the potentialities of radio and television as media for news and public affairs programming.

The requirements for applicants, as stated in the announcement folder for the 1958-1959 Fellowships, are as follows:

1. Qualification in one of the following categories:
   A. News and public affairs staff employees of (1) the CBS Radio Network and its six owned stations; (2) the 196 U.S. stations affiliated with CBS Radio, but not owned by it; (3) the CBS Television Network and its five owned stations; (4) the 183 U.S. stations affiliated with CBS Television, but not owned by it.
   B. Regular members of the staffs of non-commercial radio and television stations licensed to colleges and universities who are engaged for a substantial portion of their time in news and public affairs programs.

C. Teachers of courses in radio and television news and public affairs techniques at colleges and universities.

An applicant must be fully employed in one of Categories A, B and C, and must have sufficient full-time experience in the field to indicate ability and promise of greater development.

2. A statement by the applicant's employer promising the applicant his present job, or an equivalent job, at the end of the fellowship year.
3. A statement covering the applicant's personal history; educational background; experience in news and public affairs; and the studies the applicant desires to pursue and the relation of these studies to work performed or contemplated.

The procedure for naming the Fellows has been in the hands of the following Selecting Committee, which has made the choices of both the first-year and second year groups:

On Behalf of the Public:

Lewis W. Douglas, Chairman of the Board, Mutual Life Insurance Company of New York; former American Ambassador to Great Britain; former Member of Congress and Director of the Budget; former Principal, McGill University.

Joseph E. Johnson, President, Carnegie Endowment for International Peace; former Professor of History, Williams College; former officer of U.S. Department of State and adviser to U.S. delegations to the U.N.

Byron Price, former Executive News Editor, Associated Press; Assistant Secretary-General, United Nations; U.S. Director of Censorship, World War II; awarded special Pulitzer citations for creation and administration of press and broadcasting wartime codes (1944).

On Behalf of Columbia University:

Dr. Jacques Barzun, Dean of Faculties and Provost.

Dr. John A. Krout, Vice President.

On Behalf of CBS Foundation Inc.:

Sig Mickelson, Vice President of CBS, Inc. and General Manager of CBS News, and a member of the Board of CBS Foundation Inc.

Edward R. Murrow, news and public affairs broadcaster.

Mr. Johnson has served as Chairman both years. One of the features of the selecting process has been that the 20 finalists have been invited to New York on an expense-paid basis for interviews with members of the Selecting Committee. In each of the two competitions so far held, all of the invited finalists were in New York on the same day and each finalist had two interviews with different groups of members of the Selecting Committee. This procedure was decided upon to give the Committee an opportunity to judge among candidates not only from written material but also by informal discussion with them and on a basis affording comparability.

The Foundation plans to continue the program on the basis on which it has been conducted so far and to announce before January 1, 1959 the availability of 1959-1960 fellowships.

In announcing the plan of fellowships in January, 1957, Mr. Colin said:

> "We believe that the radio and television personnel who wark in the area of news and public affairs will play increasingly important roles in determining the growth of radio and television as informational media. It is important, therefore, that such personnel have as broad a background and as complete a training as possible.
>
> "CBS Foundation feels that through this fellowship plan it can make a real contribution to the industry by increasing the abilities of the fellowship-holders to meet their growing responsibilities in electronic journalism."

President Grayson Kirk of Columbia University viewed the plan as "indicative of the ever-increasing sense of responsibility which our important news and information organizations are bringing to their work in these days when national and world events move at an almost bewildering pace."

Continuation of the original program without change is perhaps the best evidence that the promise of the plan is, in the belief of its founders, being realized. Members of the Board of CBS Foundation Inc., besides Mr. Colin and Mr. Mickelson, are the following who are Directors of CBS, Inc.: Dr. Leon Levy, of Philadelphia; Millicent C. McIntosh, President of Barnard College; and Dr. Frank Stanton, President, CBS, Inc.

TELEVISION PRODUCTION TRAINING

By Jack Warfield

For many years, there has been controversy between the so-called "liberal arts" and the "vocational" approach to broadcasting instruction. In this article, Jack Warfield points out that the resulting compromise has been unsatisfactory, and offers a partial solution.

Dr. Warfield writes from a background of more than twelve years at the Universities of Virginia, West Virginian, and Arkansas, Albama College, Pasadena Playhouse, and in commercial TV and film production in Los Angeles. He is currently Assistant Professor in the Department of Telecommunications, University of Southern California, and Coordinator of KUSC-TV, the student-operated closed-circuit station. He received his Ph.D. in 1935 from the University of Utah.

TELEVISION production training in many colleges and universities today poses a unique, and unresolved, problem. In an effort to avoid the stigma of being overly "vocational," administrators of broadcasting instructional programs in liberal arts colleges have tended to reduce "laboratory" aspects of production to an irreducible minimum, and to attempt to make courses in TV production conform generally to the standard pattern of lecture class schedule. On the basis of discussions with many network and local station TV producers and with students receiving training in colleges from coast-to-coast, there seems little doubt that there is a need today for improved techniques in television production training if colleges seriously hope to develop a "professional" objective.

Generally speaking, TV production classes in too many institutions meet once or twice a week for less than two hours per meeting. With the limited technical staff available in most schools, this means that the instructor must spend valuable class time to setting up and warming up equipment and organizing the class with relatively little time to devote to actual student practice in the use of that equipment. And if classes meet for only an hour or even less, the period ends before anything constructive may be accomplished.

Where it is possible for a single individual to operate a small radio station and perform all duties for a limited time, at least six or more persons are required to put one picture on the television screen. This requires a degree of teamwork and production "know-how" which can be achieved only through much experience in studio practice and full knowledge of and practice in the use of studio equipment. There is no

substitute for learning by *doing* in television production. And the *time* involved for learning and practice greatly exceeds that for comparable work in radio. Yet, frequently, television production courses may be given the same amount of units of credit, the same amount of class hours of instruction, and, more significantly, the identical amount of studio practice.

The situation is further complicated by the fact that few, if any, institutions are staffed with trained personnel to provide technical crews for operational purposes in production classes. Hence, it usually is necessary for the instructor to concentrate on training students to serve as a technical crew operating the studio equipment *at the same time* the students are presumably learning production techniques. Needless to say, it is not surprising that few productions—the end product of classes in TV production—are truly "finished" products.

Experienced derived from a number of TV production training experiments in which the author has participated offer interesting possibilities which might prove of value in curriculum-planning or revision.

In July 1953, the Pasadena Playhouse conducted a special experiment in production training. A two-week professional TV training program was organized in which concentrated work in production was offered under the tuteledge and supervision of instructors obtained from the television industry in Hollywood. A limited number of courses was offered and all work was geared to the ultimate aim of presenting a single hour of closed-circuit telecasting on the final day of the short-course. Students came from all parts of the nation and represented radio and television stations, advertising agencies, public relations firms, staff writers from various organizations, and sales and management personnel. A total of eighty hours was devoted to instruction, operation and performance during the two weeks. The results of this limited experiment were highly satisfactory in establishing the value of the instructional techniques used and their application with professionals. This program then served as the basis for a greatly expanded and more ambitious program later on.

The same year, 1953, the United States Air Force contracted with the Pasadena Playhouse to provide specialized instruction in television studio engineering and production for a group of 39 untrained enlisted personnel. In this program, the group was to receive a total of six hundred hours of instruction over a fifteen-week span, of which the final

one hundred hours were to be devoted to a two-hour station operation on a closed-circuit to be viewed (and judged) by military and professional civilian personnel.

Twenty-one of the men spent five hundred hours at National Schools in Los Angeles in various phases of television studio engineering, and the remaining eighteen men spent an equal amount of time at the Playhouse in studio production. The entire group then spent one hundred hours in combined operation, at the Playhouse, in which over sixty persons participated. The entire operation was confined to one studio, measuring about forty by thirty-five feet, with two camera chains, fifteen shows, and over a dozen sets.

The instructional portion of the production program was handled by nine members of the Playhouse staff, eight members of the National Schools staff and eleven members of the television industry. In addition, twelve guest speakers from local stations and TV networks were brought in to cover allied and current topics and problems. Courses offered at the Playhouse included everything from the History of Television to Management.

The final outcome was that in the space of fifteen weeks, willing but uninformed and inexperienced men had been taken step-by-step to the final production which they themselves had created. This experiment, too, proved extremely satisfactory and was highly praised by the Air Force officials involved.

The following summer, the Playhouse offered still another professional television program, this time as a six weeks affair. This program was organized as a short version of the United States Air Force program. Four weeks were devoted to instruction and practice and two weeks to program building for an hour of station operation over a closed-circuit.

As in the two-week program, selected courses were offered. Again, some television industry personnel were used as instructors and guest speakers. The students ranged from professionals in various phases of the working radio and television industry to college men and women. The results were excellent as many returned to their jobs better equipped to cope with production and others obtained new jobs as production personnel.

A somewhat different technique was used in experiments at Columbia College of Radio and Television in Los Angeles. Here, twenty-five men

met once a week, four hours at a time, for twelve weeks. The entire time was devoted to creating an hour and a half of station programming. The men created three separate shows with commercials, stations breaks with public service announcements and commercials, and a regular station opening and sign-off. The main body of programming consisted of a complete fifteen-minute news show, a thirty-minute quiz show, and a thirty-minute dramatic show.

No separate courses or lectures were offered and no industry personnel participated. The twelve-week class was under the direct supervision of the author and the school engineer. The students created, organized, and produced their work themselves and operated their own equipment for each other.

The resulting close-circuit operation was geared to the same studio techniques used in the Playhouse programs and achieved a success comparable to the afore-mentioned training schedules.

In all of the above training programs the course work, research, practice, and project aims were alike. The basic difference came in the time elements and necessary condensation and high-lighting for shorter versions of the Air Force program.

The results of these experimental programs brought out some factors worth the consideration of all teachers of television production.*

1. It was found that trained or untrained students required the same number of hours of theory and practice for their results. It should be pointed out that the number of hours were production hours and not classroom hours.
2. Television production does not fit the normal fifty-minute class schedule. The time consumed in setting up equipment and cleaning up after production leaves too little time for practical work.
3. Group learning produced quicker and more concrete results than individual learning. Teamwork is an all-important asset in any

*There are a few problems that appeared in the experiments noted above. The most notable were such things as studio availability, proper supervision, student loads, availability and schedules of guest speakers from the industry, maintenance time to keep equipment at peak capacity and efficiency, and scheduling of adequate and equal studio time for all production teams. These problems are naturally emphasized in the Liberal Arts institution but should not discourage the teacher nor influence the results. These are occupational hazards encountered in all television production and are circumvented by careful planning and team work between department and administration.

production work and essential in television. Knowing, understanding, and being able to do the other fellow's job creates smooth operation. Every member of a class in television production should go through the operation mill from cameraman to director.

4. Opportunities to create, produce, and test theories and program types are unlimited.
5. More time must be allotted to the practical work to allow operational training and production creativity.
6 The influence of working professionals as lecturers, instructors, and guest speakers is invaluable to the student's drive and creative results. Every effort should be made to provide this stimulus.
7. Production courses are best organized into a lecture-lab system. In a semester, for example, a minimum of one hour of lecture and three hours of lab or studio work per week would approximate a concentrated two-week professional program as outlined early in this paper.

Successful television production depends upon knowledge of the subject, the ability to apply this knowledge practically, and a strong sense of teamwork. If nothing else, the above experiments emphasize the imperative necessity of "learning by doing."

This is not to say that the purely "vocational" approach should be adopted in place of the "liberal arts" approach. Rather, it is submitted that coursework in television production in the curriculum deserves further review and consideration to strengthen and improve the equality of such courses. If the so-called "trade schools," the armed services, or industrial plants are able to achieve better results than the liberal arts college or university, it might be conceivable that these specialized agencies have discovered something in instructional techniques that would be worth investigating.

The experiments noted above provide ample testimony of the need for adequate studio time and practical application of classroom theory and discussion. Broadcasters have established a high set of production standards in this country. Colleges and universities cannot afford to lower these standards through inadequate or inept training techniques. To maintain these standards requires the fullest expression and utilization of production "know-how" of teaching faculties and studio facilities

in order to train and develop graduates who can not only maintain high production standards but constantly work to improve them in and out of professional ranks—the chief *raison d'etre* of production work in the liberal arts program.

In short, this cannot be accomplished by academic lecture and demontration alone. The student must "get his hands dirty" and he must have ample studio time in which to get them black with practical experience.

OUTLINE OF THE USAF TELEVISION PRODUCTION TRAINING COURSE

I. TV Operations and Procedures — 24 hours
- History of TV
- Influence of TV on Other Media
- Comparative Analysis
- TV Code
- Studio Plans and Procedures
- Station Organization
- Station Management
- TV Terminology
- Studio Equipment
- Production Planning
- Administrative Aspects
  - Traffic, Programming, Station Logs, Budgets, Rating Cards, Talent, Labor, Unions.
- Station Methods and Problems
  - Consumer Motivations, Surveys, Market Analysis, Advertising Laws, FCC Regulations, Public Service Problems.

II. Programming — 36 hours
- Types of Programs
  - Live—Forums, panels, interviews, women and children's shows, sports, dramatic, musical, variety, audience participation.
- Film—Kinescope, Music, Tape.

III. Producer — 12 hours
Writer, script, continuity acceptance, budget, pesonnel, casting, rehearsal, technical aspects of production, camera time.

IV. Director — 26 hours
Theory, stage techniques, script, casting, lighting, rehearsal time, dry-runs, on-camera, production jobs, types of shows.

V. Announcing — 6 hours
Personality, salesmanship, enunciation and pronunciation, educational background, showmanship.

VI. The Art Director — 10 hours
Duties and background training, TV grey-scale, organization and personnel, graphic arts, art room and equipment.

VII. Scenic Art and Scene Shop Practice — 86 hours
Fundamentals of scene design, set design for TV, functions of the designer, set dressing, special effects, process backings, scrim projection, painting (color, tone, value) techniques, costume design and procurement, make-up techniques.

VIII. Preparation of TV Programs — 14 hours

IX. Films for TV — 8 hours
Types and theories, film cameras, types and methods of recording, editing, cutting, splicing, moviola, slides, film production, animation.

X. Lighting — 6 hours
Equipment used, styles for program types, light meter application, application of techniques and equipment.

XI. News and Special Events — 10 hours

Many man-hours went into the application of the above in addition to the creation, preparation, and production of the final two hours of programming. There were several hours spent in class-room instruction in non-television fundamentals as theatre speech, stage acting techniques, etc.

INSTRUCTION IN RADIO AND TELEVISION IN TWENTY-FIVE SELECTED UNIVERSITIES

By Harrison B. Summers

The mushroom growth of radio and television instruction taking place since the end of World War II has left in its wake a patch-work quilt of academic programs in colleges and universities from coast to coast. The importance of trying to answer the question "Where are we going?" indicates a need for realistic stock-taking and thorough curriculum evaluation.

In keeping with its policy of seeking to advance the field of knowledge as to education for broadcasting, the JOURNAL *presents a special report on the current state of the curriculum which, it is hoped, will prove of value to all those interested in education for broadcasting.*

Dr. Harrison B. Summers is a pioneer teacher of broadcasting, initiating the first course to be offered by Kansas State College in the early 1930s. He is currently in charge of radio and television instruction in the Department of Speech at Ohio State University.

IT is doubtful whether any other discipline in American universities shows variations from school to school in the objectives, organization and content of instruction as great as those which characterize instruction in radio and television. The differences which exist are the result of a number of causes; the fact that broadcasting is a relatively new area of instruction, the rapid changes which have taken place in the broadcasting industry in recent years, the absence of textbooks in many potentially important areas of instruction, the wide differences in the backgrounds and consequently in the interests of those in charge of instruction, and the varying types of departmental organization in which instruction is provided, all doubtless are important factors. Regardless of cause, the variations in the patterns of instruction which exist in different schools suggest strongly that as yet the men responsible for instruction in radio and television have come to no final collective decisions as to either the purposes and objectives of instruction on the one hand, or the types of courses which should be offered to provide a well-rounded program of undergraduate instruction, on the other.

The purpose of this paper is not to consider either the causes for the variations noted or the requirements of a balanced program. Its intent, rather, is to call attention to the extent to which programs of instruction in radio and television differ from one another, in various major universities. The information presented has been assembled from official university bulletins, from replies to a questionnaire study conducted by Harold F. Niven, now of the University of Washington, during the autumn of 1957, and from replies to an additional questionnaire

Table I.
Quarter Hours of Credit Available to Undergraduates in Courses in Eleven Major Categories

	R-TV Sp'ch	Gen'l Prod'n	Tech'l Prod'n	Pract Exper	R-TV Wrt'g	R-TV News	Spec'l Forms	TV Films	Bus's Adv'g	Prgm'g Plan'g	Cont't	Total
Alabama	4.5	16.5	—	16.5	12	4.5	3	3	18	4.5	27	109.5
Boston	15	22.5	7.5	4.5	12	4.5	—	9	19.5	4.5	16.5	115.5
Denver	27	20	—	20	16	10	—	—	10	5	17	125
Florida	4.5	21	—	4.5	9	4.5	—	—	4.5	—	10.5	58.5
Georgia	24	—	—	5	3	10	—	—	5	—	10	57
Houston	22.5	32	16.5	33	31.5	9	9	12.5	13.5	4.5	22.5	206.5
Indiana	3	12	—	—	6	21	—	4.5	4.5	—	13.5	64.5
Iowa	9	16.5	—	4.5	9	16.5	—	9	—	6	3	73.5
Kansas State	6	16.5	—	—	16.5	4.5	7.5	—	12	4.5	10.5	78
Kansas U	12	10.5	—	12	4.5	4.5	—	—	4.5	4.5	4.5	57
Miami	4.5	18	1.5	9	4.5	6	—	—	—	—	15	58.5
Michigan State	3	15	6	3	3	4	—	3	6	—	12	55
Michigan U	4.5	18	—	3	12	3	—	—	—	4.5	10	55
Misouri	3	11	—	—	3	14	—	3	4	—	6	44
New York U	12	30	9	—	27	6	—	—	3	3	21	111
No. Carolina	—	12	—	—	9	—	—	—	—	—	13.5	34
Norwestern[1]	12	20	—	6	16	—	—	—	4	8	24	90
Ohio State	3	10	—	5	5	8	—	3	8	6	14	62
Oklahoma	3	16.5	—	9	3	9	—	—	15	4.5	13.5	73.5
So. California	9	12	6	4.5	6	3	—	—	16.5	4.5	22.5	84
Stanford[2]	—	14	—	6	7	—	—	—	—	3	13	43
Syracuse	9	13.5	—	—	9	6	—	—	4.5	4.5	18	64
Texas	9	13.5	4.5	18	9	4.5	4.5	—	4.5	4.5	27	99
Washington	8	8	3	17	12	9	—	3	8	3	3	74
Wayne State	15	10.5	16.5	18	6	4.5	—	—	—	4.5	4.5	79.5
Average	9	16	3	8	10	7	1	2	7	3	14	79

[1]Summary for Northwestern does not include courses in broadcast news and in broadcast advertising offered in the School of Journalism.

[2]Summary for Stanford does not include courses offererd only in the special Summer Institute.

study of various aspects of radio and television instruction conducted by the writer in the spring of 1958.

The twenty-five universities for which information is given were chosen on a more or less arbitrary basis as representative of schools offering a substantial number of courses in broadcasting, with both geographical distribution and type of departmental organization of instruction considered. The schools considered in this paper include the following:

A. Schools with radio-TV instruction in independent department:

University	*Department*	*College*
Alabama, University of	Radio and Television	Arts and Sciences
Boston University	Radio and Television	Public Relations, Comm'ns
Denver, University of	Radio and Television	Arts and Sciences
Houston, University of	Radio and Television	Arts and Sciences
Indiana University	Radio and Television	Arts and Sciences
Miami, University of	Radio-TV-Film	Arts and Sciences
New York University	TV-Motion Pic's-Radio	Arts and Sciences
North Carolina, U. of	Radio-TV-Motion Pic's	Arts and Sciences
Northwestern University	Radio and Television[1]	School of Speech
Southern California, U. of	Telecommunications	Arts and Sciences
Syracuse University	Radio and Television	School of Speech

B. Schools with radio-TV instruction not a separate department:

University	*Department*	*College*
Florida, University of	Journalism and Comm'ns	Arts and Sciences
Georgia, University of	Journalism (Speech)	School of Journalism
Iowa, University of	Speech (Journalism)	Arts and Sciences
Kansas State College	Speech (Journalism)	Arts and Sciences
Kansas, University of	Journalism - Speech[2]	Journal'm; Arts & Sciences
Michigan State University	Speech	Communications Arts
Michigan, University of	Speech	Arts and Letters
Missouri, University of	Journalism - Speech[2]	Journal'm; Arts & Sciences
Ohio State University	Speech (Comm-Jour-Ed'n)	Arts and Sciences
Oklahoma, University of	Speech (Jour-Drama)	Arts and Sciences
Stanford University	Speech and Drama	Arts and Sciences
Texas, University of	Drama (Speech)	Fine Arts
Washington, University of	Communications	Arts and Sciences
Wayne State University	Speech	Arts and Sciences

[1]In addition to courses offered in the Department of Radio and Television at Northwestern, a substantial number of courses in radio-TV is offered in the School of Journalism.

[2]At both the University of Kansas and the University of Missouri, radio-TV instruction is offered jointly by the School of Journalism, and by the Department of Speech in the College of Arts and Sciences.

The list of schools shows the wide diversity of departmental organization in which instruction is provided. In schools in which courses in radio and television are not grouped in an independent department, the department named is that in which most of the instruction in broadcasting is centered, with additional courses in special fields of broadcasting also offered in departments given in parentheses.

Courses offered, by major categories. The types of courses offered, and the quantity of course offerings in each of eleven major categories, are summarized in Table I. For purposes of comparison, total credits offered in various fields have been expressed in terms of quarter hours, since some schools operate on a quarter basis and others on a semester basis. In this and later tables, only those courses are considered which are offered during the regular academic year from September to June, and only courses which are open to undergraduate students.

The headings used in the table require some explanation. "Sp'ch" includes those courses in microphone speech, in announcing, or in radio or television acting—the "performance" courses providing training for work before the microphone or camera. "General Production"—the second column—includes courses in radio and television production and directing; in addition, it includes those courses giving "first experience" in studio work to students. "Technical Production" is used to include courses in the handling of studio or of control room equipment, or courses in lighting, set design, and the like, for television. "Practical Experience" includes workshop courses, or course listings under which credit is given for station experience or interneships. The headings "Radio-TV Writing" and "Radio-TV News" are self-explanatory. "Special Forms" includes courses in sports broadcasting, in radio and television musical programs, and in the planning of women's programs. "Film" includes only those courses relating to the production or scheduling of films for television; a substantial number of courses in motion pictures offered at such schools as Miami, North Carolina and New York University are not included in the summary. "Business-Advertising" includes all courses relating to business or advertising aspects of broadcasting, including those dealing with station management, station operations and procedures, etc., as well as courses in broadcast advertising. "Programming, Planning" includes courses dealing with station programming or with the planning and development of individual programs for broadcast. Finally, the heading "Con't"—an abbreviation for "content"—designates those courses of a "content" or theoretical nature,

dealing with the structure of the industry, program analysis audience research, social aspects of broadcasting, broadcasting history, radio and television in education, and the like.

Table II gives a breakdown of types of courses offered in the various universities in greater detail. Classification of courses in both tables has been difficult; in many instances, it is probable that certain courses have been assigned to categories to which they do not actually belong. Information on course offerings has been taken from current bulletins of the various schools, except in two cases in which the most recent bulletin available was a year or two old. Since course titles are not always an accurate guide to course content, classifications have been based principally on course descriptions given in bulletins, rather than on titles. In addition, copies of the two tables have been submitted to representatives of each of the 25 universities included in the analysis, with a request that any major errors be corrected. In a number of cases, fairly extensive changes have been made in the figures presented, on the basis of information provided by these representatives of the different schools.

The summaries provided in Tables I and II indicate that in the eleven schools having separate Radio and Television departments, courses in broadcasting open to undergraduates average 96 quarter hours per school—the equivalent of two full years of college work. In eight schools in which most of the instruction in broadcasting is offered in a Department of Speech, the average is 65 quarter hours, and in the five schools in which radio and television courses are provided primarily in a School of Journalism or a School of Communications the average is 58 quarter hours. Surprisingly, in schools of the third type, an average of more than 10 quarter hours of work is offered in speech or microphone techniques—while in those schools in which instruction in broadcasting is given primarily in a Department of Speech, an average of only about 5.5 quarter hours is devoted to courses in radio speech, announcing, or microphone performance.

If courses are lumped into two general categories—those dealing with studio work or with writing on the one hand, and those dealing with business operations, programming and various "content" subjects on the other, the analyses indicate that in the average school, approximately 30 per cent of all courses offered to undergraduates are courses dealing with "theoretical" aspects of broadcasting—with 70 per cent

TABLE II — Radio-TV Course Offerings Open t

	AlaU	Bost	Denv	FlaU	GaU	Hous	IndU	Iowa	KStC	Kan
R-TV Speech	—	—	—	—	5	—	—	9	6	4.5
R-TV Announcing	4.5	7.5	12	4.5	—	13.5	3	—	—	—
R-TV Acting, Performance	—	7.5	15	—	19	9	—	—	—	7.5
Intro to Studio Operations	12	15	5	—	—	4.5	3	1.5	—	1.5
Radio-TV Production	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	9	—
Radio General Production	—	3	10	9	—	4.5	4.5	—	3	4.5
TV General Production	4.5	4.5	5	12	—	13.5	4.5	6	—	4.5
Radio-TV Dramatic Production	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	4.5	—
Radio Dramatic Production	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
TV Dramatic Production	—	—	—	—	—	9.5	—	9	—	—
Control, Equip't Operation	—	3	—	—	—	13.5	—	—	—	—
TV Art, Design, Lighting	—	4.5	—	—	—	3	—	—	—	—
Sound, Music in Production	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Workshops, Gen'l Experience	12	4.5	10	—	5	33	—	4.5	—	12
Workshops for non-Majors	4.5	—	—	4.5	—	—	—	—	—	—
Interneships, etc.	—	—	10	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
General Radio-TV Writing	9	3	6	—	3	9	—	—	4.5	4.5
Radio Writing, Generally	—	—	—	4.5	—	13.5	3	—	7.5	—
TV Writing, Generally	—	—	5	4.5	—	9	3	—	—	—
Radio-TV Dramatic Writing	3	9	5	—	—	—	—	9	4.5	—
Radio-TV News Preparation	4.5	4.5	5	4.5	10	4.5	9	7.5	3	4.5
On-the-Air News Practice	—	—	5	—	—	4.5	12	9	1.5	—
Radio-TV Sports Programs	—	—	—	—	—	4.5	—	—	3	—
Radio-TV Women's Programs	3	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	4.5	—
Radio-TV Musical Programs	—	—	—	—	—	4.5	—	—	—	—
Use of Films in TV	3	4.5	—	—	—	4.5	4.5	—	—	—
Production of Films for TV	—	4.5	—	—	—	8	—	9	—	—
Station Management	4.5	4.5	3	—	—	4.5	—	—	4.5	—
Operations, Procedures	4.5	6	2	—	—	4.5	—	—	3	—
Business, Sales, Advertising	9	9	3	4.5	5	4.5	4.5	—	4.5	4.5
Promotion, Publicity	—	—	2	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Programming, Pgm Planning	—	4.5	—	—	—	4.5	—	—	4.5	4.5
Planning Individual Programs	4.5	—	—	—	—	—	—	6	—	—
Radio Station Programming	—	—	5	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
TV Station Programming	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Introd'n Radio-TV: Industry	9	4.5	5	4.5	—	4.5	3	3	3	4.5
TV Theory, Problems	—	—	7	—	5	4.5	—	—	3	—
Audience Analysis, Research	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	4.5	—
Program Analysis, etc.	—	—	—	—	5	—	—	—	—	—
Radio-TV Dramatic Programs	—	4.5	—	—	—	4.5	—	—	—	—
Criticism, Aesthetics	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Social Aspects, Ethics, etc.	4.5	4.5	—	3	—	4.5	—	—	—	—
Laws, Regulation, Policies	—	—	—	—	—	—	3	—	—	—
Radio-TV in Education	4.5	—	—	—	—	4.5	4.5	—	—	—
Radio and TV History	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Foreign B'c'g, Propaganda	—	3	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Seminars, Proseminars[1]	9	—	5	3	—	—	3	—	—	—

[1]Only those seminars and proseminars which are open to undergraduates are included in the tabulation.

ıdergraduates in Twenty-five Selected Universities

iam	MSU	MchU	Mo·U	NYU	NCar	NwnU[3]	OSU	Okla	SCal	Stan	SyrU	TexU	Wash	Wayn
—	—	4.5	3	—	—	—	3	—	—	—	4.5	—	6	6
—	3	—	—	6	—	6	—	3	6	—	4.5	9	—	—
4.5	—	9	—	6	—	6	—	—	3	—	—	—	2	9
—	3	4.5	2	9	—	8	—	9	6	—	4.5	—	—	4.5
—	—	4.5	—	—	6	—	—	—	6	—	—	—	—	—
4.5	6	4.5	3	6	6	4	3	—	—	7	4.5	4.5	5	3
9	6	4.5	6	9	—	8	7	—	—	7	4.5	9	3	3
—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
—	—	—	—	6	—	—	—	3	—	—	—	—	—	—
4.5	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	4.5	—	—	—	—	—	—
1.5	3	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	6	—	—	—	—	12
—	3	—	—	6	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	4.5	3	4.5
—	—	—	—	3	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
4.5	—	—	—	—	—	—	5	6	—	6	—	18	17	18
—	3	3	—	—	—	—	—	3	4.5	—	—	—	—	—
4.5	—	—	—	—	—	6	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
4.5	3	3	—	4.5	9	4	3	3	3	3	4.5	—	—	—
—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	6	3
—	—	4.5	—	—	—	—	2	—	—	—	—	4.5	3	3
—	—	4.5	3	22	—	12	—	—	3	4	4.5	4.5	3	—
6	4	3	8	6	—	—	6	9	3	—	6	4.5	3	4.5
—	—	—	6	—	—	—	2	—	—	—	—	—	6	—
—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	4.5	—	—
—	3	—	3	—	—	—	3	—	—	—	—	—	3	—
—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
—	3	—	—	3	—	—	3	4.5	3	—	—	—	—	—
—	—	—	—	—	—	4	2	—	3	—	—	—	3	—
—	3	—	4	—	—	—	3	7.5	7.5	—	4.5	4.5	5	—
—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	3	3	—	—	—	—	—
—	—	4.5	—	—	—	4	—	—	4.5	—	4.5	—	—	—
—	—	—	—	3	—	4	2	4.5	—	3	—	4.5	3	4.5
—	—	—	—	—	—	—	2	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
—	—	—	—	—	—	—	2	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
4.5	3	4.5	3	6	9	—	3	3	9	3	—	9	3	—
—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	4.5	—	4.5
—	—	—	—	—	—	4	—	—	4.5	4	—	4.5	—	—
3	—	—	3	—	4.5	—	3	4.5	4.5	—	4.5	—	—	—
—	—	—	—	—	—	—	3	6	—	—	—	4.5	—	—
—	3	—	—	3	—	4	—	—	4.5	3	—	—	—	—
3	3	3	—	—	—	8	—	—	—	—	4.5	—	—	—
4.5	—	—	—	6	—	—	2	—	—	3	—	—	—	—
—	—	—	—	—	—	4	3	—	—	—	4.5	4.5	—	—
—	—	3	—	6	—	4	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	4.5	—	—	—

[3]Courses offered in Northwestern University's School of Journalism, including substantial offerings in news broadcasting and business aspects of broadcasting, not included in this summary.

consisting of studio practice or writing coures. Courses in production, including workshops and other types of experience, make up more than one-third of all course offerings in the 25 schools considered, a somewhat greater total number of hours than is represented by all business and advertising, programming, and "content" courses combined.

Registration in radio-TV courses. The questionnaire study made in the Spring of 1958 provides information as to total registration in radio and television courses during the 1957-58 academic year (Summer quarter not included), and estimates of the proportion of all registrations representing registrations by undergraduate major students, by other undergraduates, and by graduate students. The figures given below refer only to registrations in those courses which are open to undergraduate students; graduate-only courses are not represented in the totals.

	Total Reg'n	Percentages Maj	Oth	Grd
Alabama	560	60%	39%	1%
Boston	939	95	5	—
Denver	240	80	10	10
Florida	154	100	—	—
Georgia	200	80	10	10
Houston	817	95	—	5
Indiana	500	60	27	13
Iowa	400	75	15	10
Kansas State	560	80	15	5
Kansas U	332	60	35	5
Miami	793	80	20	—
Michigan State	900	80	10	10
Michigan U	507	25	50	25
Missouri	230	77	13	10
New York U	380	55	45	—
No Carolina	250	75	15	10
Northwestern	860	67	23	10
Ohio State	590	60	25	15
Oklahoma	180	85	13	2
So California	800	60	25	15
Stanford	156	20	72	8
Syracuse	446	70	30	—
Texas	no inf	93	7	—
Washington	640	65	35	—
Wayne State	458	80	5	15
Average	495	71%	22%	7%

In the 25 schools collectively, a little more than three-fourths of all

undergraduate registration represents registration by radio-TV major students. Such a situation is certainly to be expected when a high proportion of all of the courses offered are on an advanced level and open only to students who have already had considerable training in the broadcasting field. However, it is interesting to note that in some schools, a very substantial proportion of undergraduate students registered in radio-television courses were students doing major work in fields other than broadcasting.

Number of undergraduate radio-TV majors. The questionnaire study conducted in the spring of 1958 also provided information as to the number of undergraduate majors in radio and television, during the academic year of 1957-58. The figures below will not necessarily be complete for the several schools reporting, since respondents were asked to give only the number of students doing major work in broadcasting under the supervision of the reporting department—and in some cases, students may be doing the equivalent of major work although supervised by a different department. For example, although the Niven study reports that a number of undergraduates at Northwestern were doing major work in radio and television under supervision of the Medill School of Journalism, the figure given for Northwestern below includes only those students whose major work is supervised by the Department of Radio and Television in the School of Speech. Michigan supplied no information on the number of radio-TV majors, since at that university there is no formal "major" in radio and television. At Texas the 55 students listed as majors are in the Department of Drama, in the School of Fine Arts, not counting others who may be supervised by the Department of Speech.

Alabama	60	Missouri	65
Boston	95	New York U	106
Denver	65	No Carolina	60
Florida	18	Northwestern	200
Georgia	65	Ohio State	81
Houston	200	Oklahoma	45
Indiana	86	So California	130
Iowa	75	Stanford	35
Kansas State	83	Syracuse	130
Kansas U	34	Texas	55
Miami	185	Washington	125
Michigan State	190	Wayne State	46
Michigan U	no inf	Average	93

Table III.

Specific Radio-TV Courses Required of All Undergraduate Radio-TV Majors; Quarter-Hours in Each Category

	Total Hrs	Specific Hrs	Sp'ch	Prod'n	Writ'n	News	Film	Bus's	Prgm'g	Cont't
Alabama	45	34.5	—	4.5	3	—	—	9	4.5	13.5
Boston	43.5	43.5	—	19.5	—	—	—	10	4.5	9
Denver	65	37	6	8	3	5	—	5	—	10
Florida	34.5	34.5	—	21	9	—	—	4.5	—	—
Georgia	25	25	—	5	—	5	—	5	5	5
Houston	36	18	3	3	3	—	—	3	—	6
Indiana	45	45	3	12	6	6	—	4.5	—	13.5
Iowa	—	15	4.5	6	—	—	4.5	—	—	—
Kansas State	33	18	7.5	—	4.5	—	—	—	—	6
Kansas U	30	24.5	4.5	7.5	4.5	—	—	4.5	—	4.5
Miami	45	15	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	15
Michigan State	36	24	—	15	—	—	—	—	—	9
Michigan U	—	22.5	4.5	13.5	—	—	—	—	—	4.5
Missouri	16.5	10.5	—	3	—	7.5	—	—	—	—
New York U	48	30	—	9	9	—	—	—	—	12
North Carolina	28.5	19.5	—	6	4.5	—	—	—	—	9
Northwestern	40	34	—	12	—	—	—	—	4	18
Ohio State	28	21	3	5	3	—	—	—	2	8
Oklahoma	36	15	—	9	—	—	—	3	—	3
So. California	45	30	3	3	3	—	—	7.5	4.5	9
Stanford	27	27	—	8	7	—	—	—	—	12
Syracuse	40	36	4.5	9	4.5	—	—	4.5	4.5	9
Texas	43.5	43.5	4.5	4.5	4.5	4.5	—	4.5	4.5	16.5
Washington	31	31	—	8	6	3	—	8	3	3
Wayne State	—	none	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Average	40	26	2	8	3	1	—	3	1	8

Specific course requirements for radio-TV majors. Both from the questionnaires returned in the Spring of 1958 and from current bulletins of the several universities studied, information was secured concerning the specific courses in broadcasting which are required of all undergraduate majors in the field, or at least of those majors whose work is supervised in the department providing information. Table III gives an analysis of these specific course requirements for undergraduate majors, in the several schools. The same general categories are used as those in Table I, except that the "general production," "technical production" and "practical experience" categories are combined under the single heading of "production." The first column in the table shows the minimum number of quarter hour credits in radio-TV courses which must be taken to satisfy major requirements (in several schools, major students must also take a certain amount of non-broadcasting courses in Speech or in Journalism), and the second column gives the total number of quarter hours represented by specific courses in broadcasting, which must be taken by *all* major students.

At Iowa, Michigan and Wayne, where work in radio and television is a part of a major in Speech, there is no "total requirement" of radio-television courses for students who wish to "concentrate" in the broadcasting field; the table gives for Iowa and Michigan the courses which must be taken by all students with a "concentration" in broadcasting as part of the general Speech major. Wayne has no requirement of specific courses in the broadcasting field for such students. At Miami, each student doing major work in the Department of Radio-TV-Film must take 15 quarter hours in specific "content" courses, as shown in the table, and in addition, specified minimums of laboratory work in any two of the three areas in which work is offered in the department—radio, television or films.

Relations with university-owned broadcasting facilities. Of the 25 universities considered in this report, seven operate television stations, and seven others have active television production centers which provide live or filmed programs for educational or commercial stations. Nineteen of the schools operate either AM or FM radio stations, or both; seven universities have student-operated carrier-current radio stations.

The relationships existing between these stations and the programs of instruction for undergraduate students vary widely. At Missouri, North Carolina and Wayne, the same individual who manages the university

(or community) television station also has charge of the program of instruction of students in broadcasting. Similarly, at Indiana, Iowa, Miami and Southern California, television production centers are under the same supervision as is the program of student instruction.

The men who handle instruction in broadcasting for students at Houston, Indiana and Wayne give half or more of their total time to production of television programs or to supervision of operations of university radio stations. This applies to practically all instructors in radio-television at the three schools. At Iowa, Miami, Michigan, Michigan State, Missouri, Oklahoma, Southern California, Syracuse and Washington, some members at least of the instructional staff give a portion of their time to the production of television programs, and at Indiana, Kansas, Washington and Wayne, certain members of the instructional staff are responsible for supervision of operations of university-owned radio stations. At Texas, which has no broadcasting station of its own, a considerable number of the men who give instruction in broadcasting courses also serve on the staff of the university radio-television production center which produces programs carried on commercial stations throughout the state.

Opportunities for student experience in broadcasting. In practically every one of the 25 universities considered in this summary, opportunities for students to gain practical experience in broadcasting are excellent In eight schools—Boston, Houston, Kansas State, North Carolina, Northwestern, Southern California, Syracuse and Wayne—FM radio stations are maintained as an integral element in student instruction, with station staffs made up primarily or entirely of students, working under faculty supervision. In five other schools, carrier current stations are similarly operated as a means of providing station experience for students. In these thirteen universities, practically every radio-TV major student is given opportunity to participate in actual broadcasting activities, with many of the better-qualified students holding executive or administrative positions on station staffs. In addition, in practically every one of the institutions which maintain television stations, television production centers or AM radio stations, a considerable number of advanced undergraduate students are used as part-time employees of these university stations or production centers. Incidentally, no less than 20 of the departments responsible for radio-TV instruction are engaged in production of radio or television programs carried over the facilities of either educational or commercial stations, or both.

An important aspect of student experience is the employment of radio-television major students by commercial stations in the area in which the individual university is located. No less than 24 of the 25 schools considered in this summary report that some of their students are employed in commercial broadcasting operations, either on a part-time basis during the regular school year, or on a full-time basis during the summer months—and the average number of students so employed is 24 per school, or nearly 27 per cent of all students listed as radio-TV majors. The combination of commercial station experience by these students, part-time experience on the staff of educational stations, or experience on student-operated FM or carrier current stations, indicates that in the 25 universities under consideration, students have ample opportunity to secure practical experience in broadcasting.

Contacts with commercial broadcasting. The fact that in most of the schools considered in this study, there is a reasonably direct connection between the program of student instruction and the operation of university-owned radio or television stations or television production centers indicates that in these schools at least, students and instructors alike are in fairly close contact with educational broadcasting operations. One of the purposes of the study made in the Spring of 1958 was to determine whether an equally close relationship exists between the program of instruction, and the activities of commercial broadcasters. Of course, except in the case of the University of Missouri, the university-owned stations so closely related to the program of student instruction are not commercial stations. However, in other respects, there seems to be at least as close a relationship between instruction and commercial broadcasting as there is between instruction and educational broadcasting.

For example, one of the universities—Missouri—operates a commercial television station. Eight others maintain radio or television production centers, which develop programs for use on commercial stations on a systematic basis, and in most cases, these production centers are operated by the same department which is responsible for student instruction. In 22 universities giving information on this subject, 77 of the 131 full-time instructors in radio and television have each had two years or more of experience as members of staffs of commercial stations or networks, or in fields directly connected with commercial broadcasting, such as work in advertising agencies—and a number of additional members of instructional staffs have had some commercial

Table IV.

Estimates of Percentages of Present Radio-TV Major Students Who Will be Engaged in Each of Nine Types of Activity, Five Years After Graduation

	Com'l Radio	Com'l TV	Educ'l Radio	Educ'l TV	Allied[1] Fields	Tch'g[2] R-TV	Other Tch'g	Non-Bcg Work	Not[3] Empl'd
Alabama	30%	10%	1%	1%	18%	1%	1%	18%	20%
Denver	20	20	2	10	5	10	3	20	10
Florida	50	24	1	2	10	1	1	1	10
Houston	10	40	—	20	10	5	—	10	5
Iowa	5	10	—	5	10	25	5	15	15
Kansas State	49	20	1	—	10	—	—	10	10
Kansas	70	15	1	1	5	1	—	2	5
Miami	10	40	—	5	25[4]	—	—	5	15
Michigan State	16	21	3	8	23	4	2	9	14
Missouri	20	40	—	—	15	5	—	10	10
New York U	25	10	—	—	10	10	10	20	25
North Carolina	15	30	5	10	5	5	10	10	10
Northwestern	15	20	5	5	20	5	—	5	25
Ohio State	15	20	5	5	10	5	5	20	15
Oklahoma	30	35	—	—	5	5	—	10	15
Stanford	3	7	7	5	3	5	5	36	29
Syracuse	10	20	—	10	20	10	—	10	20
Texas	20	15	1	2	5	1	1	5	30
Washington	40	30	—	4	8	—	—	8	10
Wayne State	10	15	15	10	5	25	5	5	10
Average	23%	23%	2%	5%	11%	6%	3%	12%	15%

[1]Includes work in advertising agencies, in film production, in package agencies, etc.

[2]Includes teaching in which *some* use is made of knowledge of radio and television, as well as actual teaching of courses in broadcasting—on either the college or the high school level.

[3]Consists primarily of housewives, not gainfully employed outside of the home.

[4]Miami's 25% estimate of "allied fields" employment includes those employed in film production, not necessarily for television.

broadcasting experience, though not as much as two years. Courses relating to the business aspects of broadcasting—to station management, sales, and the like—are provided in 19 of the 25 universities. In 21 of the schools considered, instructors in broadcasting regularly attend meetings of the commercial broadcasters in the area—meetings of state associations of broadcasters, BMI program clinics, meetings arranged by the Radio Advertising Bureau or the Television Advertising Bureau, or meetings of local Radio-Television Executives Clubs—and in a few of the schools, special broadcasters meetings on programming are held on the university campus. A number of schools—the exact number was not determined—hold active or associate memberships in state broadcaster association organizations. In all but one of the 25 schools, instructors in radio-TV courses regularly visit commercial stations in their several areas, both to keep alive their contacts with commercial broadcasters and to observe production techniques used on local commercial stations. In 15 of the 25 schools, managers or program directors of commercial stations have been used, within the past two years, to teach special courses as a part of the program of instruction in broadcasting. And in all but one of the 25 reporting institutions, it is a standard practice to bring managers or other members of staffs of commercial stations to the campus for special lectures on various aspects of commercial broadcasting, for the benefit of undergraduate students in radio and television, with an average of 17 such lectures scheduled in each reporting school during the period from September 1957 to June 1958. And finally, instructors in broadcasting in the schools surveyed report that approximately 3 out of 5 of their major students are expected to be working in the commercial broadcasting field, five years after the completion of their baccalaureate degrees—as compared with only 7 per cent who are expected to be working in educational radio or television.

Expected future occupations of undergraduate radio-TV majors. This last figure is based on information given in reply to one of the questions in the study made during the Spring of 1958, in which representatives of the different universities were asked to estimate the proportions of radio-TV undergraduate major students who would be engaged in each of nine types of activity, five years after graduating from the university. The representatives of five of the schools refused to make an estimate, since they had no information which would serve as a guide. Figures for the remaining 20 institutions are given in Table IV, below.

The figures in Table IV indicate that there is a tremendous variation as to proportions of present radio-TV majors who are expected by their instructors to be engaged in each of the types of activity indicated. At Kansas, 70 per cent, and at Florida, 50 per cent of all present students are expected to be working in commercial radio; at Iowa and at Stanford, no more than 5 per cent are expected to find employment in commercial radio broadcasting. The proportions expected to be working in commercial television range from a high of 40 per cent at Houston and at Missouri to a low of 7 per cent at Stanford. In all of the 20 schools reporting, the combined estimate is that roughly 70 per cent of all present major students will be working in commercial or in educational broadcasting or in directly allied fields—including the teaching of broadcasting—five years after graduation, while 30 per cent will be engaged in other types of work, or in the case of housewives, not working for profit outside of the home.

Whether these figures represent even a good guess is problematical. At least two studies have been made of the activities of radio-television major students, after their graduation from college. In a study made at the University of Alabama and reported in the Southern Speech Journal in the Autumn of 1955, it was found that only 28 percent of all former Alabama radio-TV majors were employed by either commercial or educational radio stations, and an additional 11 per cent were employed by television stations or in other aspects of the broadcasting industry, with 26 per cent employed in other industries, and 11 per cent unemployed. However, this study, actually made in 1952 during the Korean War, found 24 per cent of former Alabama majors in the armed services; if after their discharge these men in service found civilian employment in the same ratios as those in civilian occupations at the time of the study, it would be expected that 51 per cent of all Alabama radio-TV majors would be working, after graduation, in positions connected with broadcasting, and 49 per cent would either be working in other fields or would be housewives not gainfully employed, or otherwise unemployed.

A similar study conducted at Ohio State University in the Spring of 1956 shows amazingly similar results. This study indicates that of the radio-television majors at Ohio State who had graduated five years or more prior to the time the study was made, about 15 per cent were not gainfully employed; another 30 per cent were in occupations in no way directly related to broadcasting, ranging from sales to the ministry,

and from newspaper work to teaching; and about 5 per cent were engaged as teachers in positions in which some knowledge of broadcasting was involved. The remainder, or only 50 per cent of all those who had received bachelors degrees as radio-television majors, were working in the broadcasting industry with the number working in radio and in television approximately equal. Only about 5 per cent, incidentally, were engaged in educational broadcasting.

The Alabama and Ohio State studies suggest that of students who do major work in radio and television while in college, approximately half will not make broadcasting their life work. This of course is at variance with the estimates made by representatives of the 20 reporting universities—but for practical purposes, the estimates are of greater importance, since they probably constitute the basis upon which programs of undergraduate instruction in broadcasting are planned in the several schools.

Types of students and course programs in broadcasting. From the estimates in Table IV and information supplied concerning registration in courses, it seems evident that any course program in radio and television should meet the needs of three types of undergraduate students. First, there are those non-broadcasting majors who in most schools account for from 20 to 30 per cent of all registrations in radio-television courses. Most of these students presumably are preparing themselves for professional work in fields such as politics, law, the ministry, public relations, home economics, and the like, in which basic training in performance aspects of broadcasting, in the planning and writing of talk materials for broadcast, and possibly in the planning of simple programs for radio and television will have direct vocational values. Second, there are those students who do major work in radio and television—from 30 to possibly as high as 50 per cent of all majors—who for one reason or another either never work professionally in broadcasting, or leave the broadcasting field for other types of work within a year or two after graduation from college. For the benefit of these students, many at least of the courses they take in radio and television should have substantial "carry-over" values for those other fields, whatever they may be, in which they finally engage; in other words, as many as possible of the broadcasting courses they take should deal with basic theory applicable to all forms of communication, and should not be courses of too technical a nature.

Finally, there are those students who are definitely the "professionals" in broadcasting; students who take major work in radio and television, and who plan to and do make broadcasting their life work. For these students, courses should give necessary professional training for the fields in broadcasting in which they are likely to engage. But since these students who remain in broadcasting work may find themselves in any of a score or more of types of work in the field—some as station managers, some as program directors, some working in sales, some as newscasters or announcers or as "on-the-air personalities," some as actors or entertainers, some as writers, some as producer-directors, and others in the miscellany of jobs ranging from traffic to film editing—and particularly since at the time of graduation from college most of these students do not know in what type or types of work they will ultimately engage in the industry, the type of professional training provided for radio and television "professionals" must necessarily be broad and general, rather than concentrated in a few major fields.

Presumably, the interests of all three of these types of students have been considered by the colleges and universities which offer major work in broadcasting, in planning their course programs in the field. But an observer from another field of endeavor, after examining the typical program of courses provided, might be tempted to inquire whether sufficient attention has been given to the needs of the first two types of students who register in courses in broadcasting, and indeed, whether the courses offered, and in the proportions in which they are provided, actually give adequate professional training to those students who will make broadcasting their permanent careers. Apparently our universities are providing ample training for work in program production—an aspect of broadcasting in which opportunities for employment are certainly not unlimited—but often at the expense of broad, general training in other aspects of radio and television, in which professional opportunities may be greater.

Perhaps the time has come when universities generally might profit by a reappraisal of their objectives in offering courses in radio and television, and a modification of their course offerings in the broadcasting field, more effectively to meet the actual needs of their students.

DOCTORAL DISSERTATIONS IN RADIO AND TELEVISION AT GERMAN UNIVERSITIES, 1920-1957

ONE year ago, the *Journal* published a list of 202 doctoral dissertations on various non-technical aspects of broadcasting. These represented all those known to have been completed at American universities from 1920-1957. In this issue, the *Journal* presents another such listing, of doctoral dissertations covering a similar period from German universities.

Although German colleges and universities offer no degrees in broadcasting, radio (and, recently, television) have occupied considerable attention of students in other disciplines since 1920. Law and jurisprudence, in particular, tend to dominate the field of academic research into broadcasting in Germany, a development quite unlike the pattern of graduate study in the United States.

The current list includes 121 dissertations selected from a more comprehensive tabulation compiled by Winfried B. Lerg and published in three parts in *Publizistik*, a German journal of communications (Vol. II, Nos. 1-3, 1957). Eliminated from the original Lerg compilation were all items of a purely technical or engineering character, those dealing with redio equipment and manufacturing rather than broadcasting, as well as those concerning point-to-point communication.

Unlike American universities where microfilming is relatively new (with only 70 broadcasting dissertations from the 1957 list currently available on microfilm), German practice is to use microfilming as much as possible so, with few exceptions, all of the dissertations on the following list are available from the parent institutions in microfilm form. German universities also require that all dissertations be privately published, and the original listing in *Publizistik* provided complete reference to printer and details of publication. In view of the probability that the majority of these printed copies would no longer be available through usual bookseller channels, this compilation does not include publication information. Interested persons are referred to the aforementioned issues of *Publizistik* (available from the publisher, B. C. Heye & Co., Bremen, Germany) for the complete citation.

Extreme care has been exercised to translate the German titles into idiomatic English. The translator admits to having taken some liberties in rephrasing certain titles to avoid overly-awkward construction. Any inaccuracies which may have resulted from such "free" translation notwithstanding, the following list is presented in the hope that it may prove interesting and useful.

Each item lists the name of the author, title of the dissertation, number of pages in the dissertation itself, a shortened version of the name of the university (Münster instead of Westfalishe-Welhelms-Universität Münster), the degree area (Philosophy, Law, Commerce, etc.), and the year in which the degree was awarded. Following each citation is the standard microfilm reference number for that dissertation. Persons desiring to order microfilm copies of any items on this list are urged to check carefully with their local university librarians to ascertain full name and address of the institution in question.

E. FRANCK LEE
El Camino College
Los Angeles, California

A. RADIO

I. JOURNALISM

Blum, Klaus. *Opera on Radio: Phenomenology and History of a New Art Form.* 195 pp. Cologne, Philosophy, 1951. U51.5546

Donnepp, Albert. *Sports and Radio: A Contribution to Communications with Special Reference to its Development from 1924 to 1939 on Central German Stations.* 278 pp. Münster, Philosophy, 1950. U50.6870

Drescher, Willibald. *Sports on German Radio.* 88 pp. Würzberg, Philosophy, 1941. U41.567

Eckert, Gerhard. *Adaptation of Literary Material for Film and Radio Drama.* 272 pp. Berlin, Philosophy, 1936. U36.556

Eckert, Gerhard. *Radio as a Means of Guidance.* 272 pp. Berlin, Philosophy, 1941. U41.553

Freiberg, Harald. *The German Radio System with Special Reference to Entertainment Programming.* 86 pp. Cologne, Economics and Social Science, 1929. U30.4274

Kriebel, Karl. *The Problem of Language Instruction on Radio, with English as a Demonstration Example.* 94 pp. Erlangen, Philosophy, 1943. U43.1792

Heinrichs, Heribert. *School Radio: Origin, Development, Programs and Publicity Procedures of German Rural Radio with a Survey of Foreign Rural Radio Service.* 235 pp. Leipzig, Philosophy, 1943. U43.4266

Hirsch, Rosemarie. *Danish Radio and Adult Education.* Berlin, Philosophy, 1945. U44.1089

Jedele, Helmut. *Reproduction and Original Production on the Radio.* 103 pp. Mainz, Philosophy, 1952. U52.6348

Koska, Boleslav. *Radio as an Instrument of Public Opinion Formation.* 192 pp. Frankfurt, Economics and Social Science, 1950. U50.2203

Mehnert, Gerhard. *Criticism of Radio Drama.* 237 pp. Leipzig, Economics and Social Science, 1948. U45/48.8218

Riedler, Rudolf. *Radio-Journalism as a Distinct Communications Phenomenon.* 170 pp. Munich, Philosophy, 1952. U52.7659

Röllig, Gottfried. *Latin America and International Shortwave Radio: An Inquiry into the Role of Radio Journalism and Its Influence upon the Development and Orientation of a Continent.* 328 pp. Leipzig, Philosophy, 1943. U43.4292

Rohnert, Ernst (Theodor). *Nature and Potentialities of the Radio Drama.* 223 pp. Munich, Philosophy, 1947. U45/48.10845

Schelkopf, Anton. *Radio in Our Time.* 126 pp. Munich, Philosophy, 1942. U42.5603

Stohl, Herta. *Wireless News Service for Economic and Political Purposes (Its Development and Organization in Germany).* Berlin, Political Science, 1931. U31.1075

Stokinger, Jörg. *Radio as a Medium of Mass Communications, and the Problem of Its Organizational Forms with Respect to the Reciprocal Effect of These upon the Public.* 128 pp. Tübingen, Law and Political Science, 1953. U53.8517

Szendrei, Alfred. *Radio and the Cultivation of Music.* 202 pp. Leipzig, Philosophy, 1931. U31.5737

Wegmann, Ludwig. *Concerning the Question of Radio Drama.* 55 pp. Münster, Philosophy, 1953. U35.9006

Winkin, Friedrich. *Rapid News Transmission in Serving the Press and the Economy.* 106 pp. Breslau, Law and Political Science, 1934. U35.517

Wolf, Dietrich. *The Overseas Service of the German Radio and German Language News Broadcasts on Foreign Radio.* 101 pp. Leipzig, Philosophy, 1040. U40.5252

II. SOCIOLOGY

Ernst, (née Siemon) Lena-Renate. *Research into the [Social] Effects of Radio: Theory and Practical Application.* 162 pp. Munich, Philosophy, 1951. U51.7549

Goetzfried, Rita. *Radio Paris.* 103 pp. Bonn, Philosophy, 1939. U40.1278

Haubrich, Sophie. *French Provincial Radio.* 98 pp. Bonn, Philosophy, 1940. U40.1283

Kuhlmann, Herta. *The Woman and Radio, with Special Reference to Women's Programs.* 180 pp. Berlin, Philosophy, 1942. U42.531

Maletzke, Gerhard. *Radio and the Man of Today.* 105 pp. Hamburg, Philosophy, 1950. U50.3435

Merkle (nee Röckl), Elizabeth. *The Relation of Youth to Newspaper and Radio.* 99 pp. Munich, Philosophy, 1954.

Markle, Ludwig. *Audience Mail and Audience Opinion (based in particular upon an Investigation of the Bavarian Radio).* 113 pp. Munich, Philosophy, 1952. U52.7647

Reinhard, Christel. *Radio for Youth: Its Composition and Its Objective, with Special Reference to Its Journalistic Aspiration.* 130 pp. Munich, Philosophy, 1938. U38.7822

Rüffler, Hans. *Radio: Its Economic, Social and Cultural Significance.* 255 pp. Nuremburg, Economics and Social Science, 1953. U52.8122

III. HISTORY

Bausch, Hans. *The Role of Radio in the Party Politics of the Weimar Republic 1928-1933.* 317 pp. Tübingen, Philosophy, 1956.

Elven, Gisela. *Silesian Radio 1924-1939 with Special Reference to Its Political and Nationalist Functions.* 242 pp. Leipzig, Philosophy, 1945. U44.6136

Lüder, Elisa. *On the Historical Development of the Swiss Radio.* 127 pp. Leipzig, Philosophy, 1942. U43.4277

Pohle, Heinz. *German Radio as an Instrument of Politics: Organization and Political Programming of German Radio from Its Inception to the Beginning of the Greater German Radio.* 480 pp. Hamburg, Philosophy, 1955.

Reichert, Hans Ulrich. *The Struggle of German Radio for Autonomy.* 463 pp. Heidelberg, Philosophy, 1955.

Schreiber, Hans-Joachim. *The Historical Development of Radio in Bavaria, 1922-1949.* 352 pp. Munich, Philosophy, 1950. U50.6528

Schuster, Hermann. *Wireless Telegraphy and Neutrality, with Special Reference to the World War.* 140 pp. Tübingen, Political Science, 1924. U24.8698

Stehmann, Otto Paul. *History and Significance of the Leipzig Transmitter: a study of Radio Journalism.* 108 pp. Leipzig, Philosophy, 1939. U39.6859

IV. ORGANIZATION

Abath, Jürgen. *Organizational Forms of Radio Broadcasting Stations: A Description of the Organization of German Radio from Its Inception to the Enactment of a Federal Radio Law.* 205 pp. Göttingen, Law and Political Science, 1953. U53.3072

Freund, Martin. *German Radio: Its Corporate Foundation and Organization.* 100 pp. Würzburg, Law and Political Science, 1933. U33.4680

Fuhr, Ernst Wolfgang. *Control of Radio in Switzerland, Great Britain and the U.S.A.* 107 pp. Mainz, Law and Political Science, 1952. U52.6023

Gerken, Erich. *Greater-German Radio and National-Socialist Law.* 110 pp. Kiel, Law and Political Science, 1939. U39.5609

Klinge, Erich. *The Organization of Radio as a Legal Problem.* 124 pp. Mainz, Law and Political Science, 1955.

Kühnau, Helmut. *The Legal Foundations of the Major Radio Systems and the Legal Character of Their International Broadcasting Agreements.* 68 pp. Cologne, Law, 1943. U43.3662

Reidemeister, Gert. *Organizational Forms of Broadcasting of the Various Radio Systems.* 141 pp. Munich, Political Science, 1950. U50.5730

Rollwage, Gustav. *French Radio Law: An Investigation of Legal Policy in the Development of French Radio as a Public Service.* 61 pp. Erlangen, Law, 1937. U37.2562

Springer, Franz. *The Political Principles of Radio Law in the United States of America, Italy, England, and Soviet Russia.* 48 pp. Erlangen, Law, 1936. U36.2500

Ulfers, Georg. *Development, Structure, and Organization (with a brief reference to Financing) of the German Radio News Service.* 163 pp. Hamburg, Law and Political Science, 1928. U29.2930

Ziegler, Eberhard. *German Radio Past and Present: Its Corporate Foundation and Its Organization.* 154 pp. Heidelberg, Law, 1950. U50.3676

V. LAW

Adler, Otto. *Civil-Law Protection against Interference in Radio Reception.* 116 pp. Frankfurt, Law, 1932. U33.5597

Albus, Josef. *The Rights of Performing Artists on Radio.* 97 pp. Cologne, Law, 1934. U34.4368

Becker, Bruno. *Radiobroadcasting as Reflected in the Newspaper Law of the German Reich, with Recommendations for Broadcasting Regulation through a Radio News Law.* 96 pp. Frankfurt, Law, 1931. U43.2159

Berckhoff, Hans-Otto. *Reproduction by Radio, the Licensing of an Author's Rights.* 35 pp. Cologne, Law, 1937. U37.6050

Bley, Kurt. *On the Foundations of Radio Law.* 56 pp. Erlangen, Law, 1935. U35.6834

Bobsin, Peter. *Legal Rights in the Radio Broadcast, with Special Regard to [the Rights of] the Individuals Participating in the Broadcasts.* 88 pp. Cologne, Law, 1955.

Buse, Felix. *Current Legal Status of Literary and Musical Copyright and Its Bearing upon Radio.* 207 pp. Frankfurt, Law, 1926. U27.1236

Dawid, Heinz. *Radio and Copyright.* 106 pp. Berlin, Law, 1935. U35.6135

Dickertmann, Harald. *The Law of Radio Interference (together with a compilation of pertinent literature).* 125 pp. Freiburg, Law and Political Science, 1932. U32.2441

Enk, Rudi. *Police Protection against Radio Interference.* 88 pp. Cologne, Law, 1931. U32.4669

Escheback, Alfred. *Copyright Protection in Radio.* 66 pp. Leipzig, Law, 1932. U32.5447

Folkerts, Hero. *Legal Relationships Between the Telegram-Service Contract and Radio Entertainment.* 62 pp. Cologne, Law, 1924. U24.4763

Germar, Gerrit von. *Copyright Problems and Radio.* 219 pp. Hamburg, Law, 1955.

Grolmann, Wilhelm v. *Structure and Development of Copyright Provisions in German Law, Especially with Respect to Radio.* 107 pp. Kiel, Law and Political Science, 1928. U28.3662

Harder, Otto. *Civil-Law Protection of Radio Facilities and Their Operation.* 97 pp. Königsberg, Law and Political Science, 1931. U31.5017

Hegendorf, Albert. *The Law with Respect to the Broadcasting of Economic News. An Examination of the Legal Basis of Broadcasting Economic News in Germany.* 124 pp. Leipzig, Law, 1929. U29.4105

Heinsen, Hans. *Civil-Law Rights of the Radio Listener in Cases of Interference in Radio Reception.* 57 pp. Göttingen, Law and Political Science, 1932. U32.2927

Hengstberger, Klaus-Georg. *The Tax on Radio Reception.* 144 pp. Heidelberg, Law, 1956.

Herlein, Ernst. *International Law and Radio.* 60 pp. Würzburg, Law and Political Science, 1931. U31.7227

Hille, Karl-Heinz. *Radio and the Rights of the Public and the Individual.* 108 pp. Leipzig, Law, 1930. U30.4701

Jobe, Hans Christoph. *Radio Copyright Law.* 86 pp. Heidelberg, Law, 1951. U51.4209

Hoechstetter, Otto. *Contributions to the Development of Radio Law.* 73 pp. Erlangen, Law, 1929. U29.1304

Höfig, Gernot. *Regulations of Collision in Telecommunications Law: a Critical Consideration of the Facts Relating to Electrical Interference in German Telecommunications Law Contrasted with Legal Status in Other Countries.* 111 pp. Frankfurt, Law, 1938. U38.2633

Holtzke, Walther. *The Specific Penal Provisions in the Communications Act of January 14, 1928.* 41 pp. Cologne, Law, 1933.

Iserloh, Hans. *Civil Law Protection Against Radio Interference.* 67 pp. Erlangen, Law, 1935. U35.750

Jahn, Eberhard. *Is the Radio Listener Sufficiently Protected Against Private Interference with His Reception?* 53 pp. Kiel, Law and Political Science, 1933. U33.6652

Kessler, Karl. *The Unification of News Services under the German Postal Statutes.* 152 pp. Heidelberg, Law, 1945. U44.4609

Kirschbaum, Ernst. *On the Admissibility of Radio Broadcasts from the Court Room.* 32 pp. Bonn, Law and Political Science, 1934. U34.3208

Knöpfke, Friedrich. *Copyright Implications of Radio Broadcasting of Stage Plays.* 50 pp. Breslau, Law and Political Science, 1927. U27.728

Kolbeck, Erich. *Tape-recording of Orchestral Works and the Legal Rights of the Artists Involved.* 56 pp. Cologne, Law, 1953. U53.5605

Krell, Erwin. *The Legal Development of Radio throughout the World.* 109 pp. Munich, Law, 1950. U50.5614

Kübler, Klaus-Joachim. *Magnetic Tape and Copyright.* 121 pp. Gottingen, Law and Political Science, 1952. U52.2693

Laue, Heinrich. *Civil Law Protection against Radio Interference from Electrical Installations.* Halle, Law and Political Science, 1932. U32.3490

Legler, Karl. *"Local Usage" Regarding Paragraph 906 BGB (Code of Civil Law) as Illustrated by the Problem of the Protection Against Radio Interference.* 26 pp. Leipzig, Law, 1933. U33.3905

Mann, Wolfgang. *Does German Copyright Law Protect the Author [of Literary Works] in Relation to Radio Broadcasting?* 61 pp. Kiel, Law and Political Science, 1930. U30.4058

Mardersteig, Hellmut. *Radio Waves, Especially as Treated in International Law: a Study of Legal Theory, with Background of Technology and Legal History.* 294 pp. Kiel, Law and Political Science, 1950. U50.4255

Nebelung, Guenter. *Legal Protection against Radio Interference Originating from Electrical Installations.* 45 pp. Breslau, Law and Political Science, 1931. U31.1624

Pakuscher, Ernst-Karl. *Radio and Phonograph Records and Reform of the German Copyright Law.* 141 pp. Munich, Law, 1952.

Platz, Karl. *Legal Basis in the Use of Telecommunications Facilities.* 28 pp. Giessen, Law, 1934. U34.6477

Poos, Walter. *Interference in Radio as a Legal Problem.* 36 pp. Göttingen, Law and Political Science, 1932. U32.3008

Quast, Gernot. *Historical Development of the Law in Telegraphy, Telephony and Radio.* 74 pp. Marburg, Law and Political Science, 1939. U39.6933

Ratzkowski, Kurt. *Study of Copyright Law in Radio.* 58 pp. Königsberg, Law and Political Science, 1929. U29.3965

Reininger, Georg. *Copyright Protection in German Radio.* 87 pp. Erlangen, Law, 1928. U28.1490

Runkel, Hans. *Civil Law Protection of the Radio Subscriber against Interference of All Kinds.* 47 pp. Cologne, Law, 1928. U28.3869

Schefe, Robert. *Copyright Protection in Radio Broadcasting.* 43 pp. Rostock, Law and Economics, 1935. U35.9042

Schenkel, Karl. *Criminal Law as Applied to Radio.* 110 pp. Leipzig, Law, 1930. U30.4771

Schulze, Walter. *The Law of International Radio and Other Electrical Communication.* 81 pp. Jena, Law and Economics, 1936. U36.5376

Sluzewski, Franz W. *Criminal Law in Germany, Austria and Switzerland pertaining to Radio.* 68 pp. Erlangen, Law, 1937. U37.2584

Steffens, Arnold. *Radio and Copyright Law.* 64 pp. Cologne, Law, 1933. U33.1268

Steinberg, Arthur. *Copyright Protection in the Radiobroadcasting of Literary and Musical Works.* 54 pp. Cologne, Law, 1926. U26.4294

Vogt, Bruno. *Development of Radio Law in the Two Zones of Germany since 1945.* 107 pp. Hamburg, Law and Political Science, 1950. U50.3150

VI. ECONOMICS

Braune, Gerd. *Influence of Records and Radio on the German Musical Instrument Industry.* 146 pp. Nuremberg, Commerce, 1933. U34.5180

Dahmer, Karl-Friedrich. *Radio: an Economic Study of the Significance and Organization of Radio Communications and the Radio Industry.* 152 pp. Marburg, Philosophy, 1925. U32.6225

Geldrich, Stefan. *Inquiries into the Economic Problems of Radio.* 168 pp. Innsbruck, Law and Political Science, 1942. U42.3809

Glässer, Erich. *Radio Advertising in Germany.* 86 pp. Nuremberg, Commerce, 1932. U34.2315

Gut, Hans. *Market Regulations in the German Radio Economy up to 1945: a Contribution to the Legal History of the German Economy.* 136 pp. Freiburg, Law and Political Science, 1946. U45/48.3090

Hausler, Fritz. *Economic Significance of German Radio.* 79 pp. Berlin, Philosophy, 1927. U27.240

Höckel, Alfons. *The German Broadcasting Industry.* 150 pp. Heidelberg, Law and Economics, 1937. U37.5425

Klöcker, Ernst. *The Radio System in Germany and the Economic Importance of Radio.* 78 pp. Erlangen, Philosophy, 1928. U28.1621

Köstermann, August. *The Economics of the German Telegraph, Telephone and Radiobroadcasting Systems since the World War.* 81 pp. Münster, Law and Political Science, 1927. U27.4897

Krell, Hermann. *The Operational Economic Structure of the Bavarian Broadcasting System.* 148 pp. Munich, Political Science, 1953. U53.6915

Laurisch, Gerhard. *Radio as an Employer.* 112 pp. Leipzig, Political Science, 1933. U33.4154

Lehmann-Horn, Gunther. *Market Conditions in Radio: a Study of Sales Policy Relating to the Manufacture of Radio Sets, Programming, and Broadcasting Systems.* 79 pp. Berlin, Political Science, 1935. U33.4154

Lindemann, Lucia. *Radio and Radio Advertising in Industrial Enterprise.* 142 pp. Leipzig, Philosophy, 1945. U44.6161

Seidel, Gotthard. *Wireless News Media and Their Economic Importance.* 142 pp. Breslau, Law and Political Science, 1926. U26.708

Vollman, Heinz. *Requisite Conditions for the Growth of Radiobroadcasting and the Radio Industry: a Legal-Economic-Sociological Investigation.* 265 pp. Munich, Engineering, 1936. U36.8462

Wipplinger, Hans. *Radio Statistics.* 97 pp. Munich, Political Science, 1937. U37.7797

B. TELEVISION

Pampel, Gottfried. *Television and the Law [Right of Privacy] Regarding One's Own Picture.* 58 pp. Heidelberg, Law, 1955.

Pischutta, Joseph. *Television as an Advertising Medium in the U.S.A.* 67 pp. Nuremberg, Economics and Sociology, 1956.

Schlötzer, Hans. *Legal Questions in Television.* 166 pp. Mainz, Law and Economics, 1954.

Sczygiol, Peter. *The Journalistic Element in Television Broadcasting.* Munich, Philosophy, 1954.

NEWS NOTE: THE HILL-ELLIOTT BILL*

Of special interest to students of broadcasting is the omnibus Federal aid to education bill, principally sponsored by Senator Hill and Congressman Elliott of Alabama (H.R. 13247), passed by both Senate and House. The appropriation is $3 million for fiscal 1959 and $5 million for each of the three succeeding years. Title VII provides for research and experimentation in more effective utilization of television, radio, motion pictures, and related media for educational purposes, as follows:

PART A — RESEARCH AND EXPERIMENTATION

Functions of the Commissioner

Sec. 701. In carrying out the provisions of this part the Commissioner, in cooperation with the Advisory Committee on New Educational Media, shall (through grants or contracts) conduct, assist, and foster research and experimentation in the development and evaluation of projects involving television, radio, motion pictures, and related media of communication which may prove of value to State or local educational agencies in the operation of their public elementary or secondary schools, and to institutions of higher education, including the development of new and more effective techniques and methods—(1) for utilizing and adapting motion pictures, video tapes and other audio-visual aids, film strips, slides and other visual aids, recordings (including magnetic tapes) and other auditory aids, and radio or television program scripts for such purposes; (2) for training teachers to utilize such media with maximum effectiveness; and (3) for presenting academic subject matter through such media.

Grants-In-Aid; Contracts

Sec. 702. In carrying out the provisions of section 701, the Commissioner—(1) may make grants-in aid, approved by the Advisory Committee on New Educational Media, to public or nonprofit private agencies, organizations, and individuals for projects of research or experimentation referred to in section 701; (2) may enter into contracts, approved by the Advisory Committee on New Educational Media, with public or private agencies, organizations, groups, and individuals for projects of research or experimentation referred to in section 701.

*Reprinted by the JCET Educational Television Factsheet and Boxscore, September, 1958, pp. 4-6.

JOURNAL OF BROADCASTING

INDEX
to
VOLUME II, 1958

Published by
THE ASSOCIATION FOR PROFESSIONAL BROADCASTING EDUCATION
University of Southern California
Los Angeles 7, California

INDEX TO VOLUME II (1958)

TITLE INDEX

AUTHOR INDEX

BOOK REVIEW INDEX

PURPOSE OF THE ASSOCIATION FOR PROFESSIONAL BROADCASTING EDUCATION

The purpose of this organization is to secure mutual advantages that flow from a continuing relationship between broadcasters and institutions of higher learning which offer a high standard of training and guidance for those who plan to enter the profession of broadcasting.

These are the fundamental objectives of the Association:

To improve the services of broadcasting.

To facilitate exchange of information on broadcasting.

To bring together to their mutual advantage those in broadcasting and those in institutions of higher learning.

To facilitate employment at maximum effectiveness for those who meet the standards of institutions of higher learning and of broadcasting.