


January 7, 1966



Dr. F. Earle Earle
Boston University
School of Public Communication
640 Commonwealth Avenue
Boston, Massachusetts 02215

Dear Earle:

I have finally received your four chapters from Klaus who has just recently gotten married (in Urbana, to Sultana Alam) and is probably too occupied or preoccupied with other things to write. And if I wait until I can give you detailed criticism I'll never get to writing this letter. But let me say that I read what you wrote and like it. I wish you wouldn't have to tie this to Berelson's book. There are enough major developments since that was published to warrant an essentially new approach. There is also a whole theory of communications (mine) in which content analysis plays a central rather than peripheral role (by virtue of my definition of communication being distinguished from other forms of social interaction in that it is interaction through messages), and that should also be written up in some form. Some of my own ideas along these lines are in the piece I am enclosing (may have sent it to you before).

These are things we should talk about. I also think it is time for a conference on the "state of the art" in content analysis, and if we can bring about such a conference, reflecting some of the major developments, this would give us a chance to assess the situation. IBM is interested in sponsoring conferences on computer application in the "humanities" (including the social sciences, as they define humanities), and we proposed to convene a small planning group here this spring to submit plans for such a conference, concentrating on content analysis. If this materializes, I hope you can attend.

We are well, and very, very busy. I hope you are receiving our newsletter, which should keep you posted on developments here.

With best regards.

Sincerely yours,

GG:kaf
enclosure

George Gerbner,
Dean

January 7, 1966

Dr. F. Earle Earle
Boston University
School of Public Communication
640 Commonwealth Avenue
Boston, Massachusetts 02215

Dear Earle:

I have finally received your four chapters from Klaus who has just recently gotten married (in Urbana, to Sultana Alam) and is probably too occupied or preoccupied with other things to write. And if I wait until I can give you detailed criticism I'll never get to writing this letter. But let me say that I read what you wrote and like it. I wish you wouldn't have to tie this to Berelson's book. There are enough major developments since that was published to warrant an essentially new approach. There is also a whole theory of communications (mine) in which content analysis plays a central rather than peripheral role (by virtue of my definition of communication being distinguished from other forms of social interaction in that it is interaction through messages), and that should also be written up in some form. Some of my own ideas along these lines are in the piece I am enclosing (may have sent it to you before).

These are things we should talk about. I also think it is time for a conference on the "state of the art" in content analysis, and if we can bring about such a conference, reflecting some of the major developments, this would give us a chance to assess the situation. IBM is interested in sponsoring conferences on computer application in the "humanities" (including the social sciences, as they define humanities), and we proposed to convene a small planning group here this spring to submit plans for such a conference, concentrating on content analysis. If this materializes, I hope you can attend.

We are well, and very, very busy. I hope you are receiving our newsletter, which should keep you posted on developments here.

With best regards.

Sincerely yours,

GG:kaf
enclosure

George Gerbner,
Dean

January 31, 1966

Dr. F. Earle Barcus
Boston University
School of Public Communication
640 Commonwealth Avenue
Boston, Massachusetts 02215

Dear Earle:

As I mentioned in my last letter to you, we are planning to convene a small group of key people to plan a major symposium on content analysis for next fall. The planning meeting has been set for March 18 and 19 here, and I am inviting you to attend. Others attending the planning session will be Phil Stone from Harvard, Oli Holsti from Stanford, Klaus Krippendorff and Lee Benson (History) from here, and a few others. I know you can make a major contribution to our planning, and hope you can attend. We will of course pay your expenses and a modest honorarium for your participation.

The session will be informal, and no special preparation will be necessary. We hope to make plans for a major symposium next fall, resulting in a "state of the art" type of publication, possibly with special emphasis on computer applications in content analysis. Let me know that you can come, and I shall follow up with further details.

With best regards.

Sincerely,

GG:kaf

George Gerbner,
Dean

January 31, 1966

Dr. F. Earle Barcus
Boston University
School of Public Communication
640 Commonwealth Avenue
Boston, Massachusetts 02215

Dear Earle:

As I mentioned in my last letter to you, we are planning to convene a small group of key people to plan a major symposium on content analysis for next fall. The planning meeting has been set for March 18 and 19 here, and I am inviting you to attend. Others attending the planning session will be Phil Stone from Harvard, Oli Holsti from Stanford, Klaus Krippendorff and Lee Benson (History) from here, and a few others. I know you can make a major contribution to our planning, and hope you can attend. We will of course pay your expenses and a modest honorarium for your participation.

The session will be informal, and no special preparation will be necessary. We hope to make plans for a major symposium next fall, resulting in a "state of the art" type of publication, possibly with special emphasis on computer applications in content analysis. Let me know that you can come, and I shall follow up with further details.

With best regards.

Sincerely,

GG:kaf

George Gerbner,
Dean

BOSTON UNIVERSITY

CHARLES RIVER CAMPUS



SCHOOL OF PUBLIC COMMUNICATION

640 Commonwealth Avenue, Boston, Massachusetts 02215

Communication Research Center

February 8, 1966

Dean George Gerbner
The Annenberg School of
Communications
University of Pennsylvania
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19104

Dear George:

Thanks for your invitation to the planning of the symposium on Content Analysis. I certainly am interested in attending, so let me know where and at what time. I presume I'd have to leave here on the afternoon or evening of March 17th.

I've been pretty snowed with teaching, writing, and administration of the Division recently, but will try like hell to get the North, Holsti, et al review to you by March 1. I have the book.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read "Earle B.", written in dark ink.

Earle

FEB:leg

February 28, 1966

AIR MAIL

Dr. Francis E. Barcus
Communication Research Center
School of Public Communication
Boston University
640 Commonwealth Avenue
Boston, Massachusetts 02215

Dear Earle:

I am delighted that you will be joining us here. As you see, we have assembled an interesting group of active young researchers, and it should be a fruitful meeting. It would be helpful if you could bring available copies of your thesis, and of your new manuscript, along with anything else that might be pertinent. Also, if you have an up to date vita and publications list, I would appreciate receiving it for the purpose of sharing background information with others. Familiarity with backgrounds and interests of participants might help interaction all around.

We are looking forward to seeing you here.

Best regards.

Sincerely,

GC:kaf
Enclosure

George Gerbner,
Dean

BOSTON UNIVERSITY



CHARLES RIVER CAMPUS

SCHOOL OF PUBLIC COMMUNICATION

640 Commonwealth Avenue, Boston, Massachusetts 02215

3/7/66.

George:

I hope you will be able to use this in AVCR & it's not too late. I thought it best to keep it fairly short and succinct.

Look forward to seeing you on the 17th. I am trying to gather materials and ideas which may make some contribution to the conference.

Bob.

March 28, 1966

AIR MAIL

Dr. F. Earle Barcus
Communication Research Center
School of Public Communication
Boston University
640 Commonwealth Avenue
Boston, Massachusetts 02215

Dear Earle:

Our letters will probably cross, but there are a couple of things I would like to mention as soon as possible. First of all, I read the articles you left with me and liked them very much. The "Role and Distance Between Ethnic Groups" study is sound and significant; it should take its place in the literature along side Berelson and Salter. The "Content Analysis of Interpersonal Behavior etc." paper is interesting. In this connection, I don't know if I have ever sent you a copy of the big final report of the education study. I know I have sent you the appendix. At any rate, Appendix IV-D is a type of interaction study that may be of some relevance.

I would like some reaction from you to the postscript of my last letter. I can see the possibility of combining the content analysis education research project under your direction with a visiting appointment here for next year, also including some help in the planning and conduct of the spring symposium and publications resulting from it. If this possibility holds some attraction for you you should let me know and prepare a draft proposal for the project as soon as possible. Then we can go on from there to further explore feasibility and the opportunities inherent in the proposition.

With best regards.

Sincerely yours,

GG:kaf

George Gerbner,
Dean

BOSTON UNIVERSITY

CHARLES RIVER CAMPUS



SCHOOL OF PUBLIC COMMUNICATION

640 Commonwealth Avenue, Boston, Massachusetts 02215

Communication Research Center

March 30, 1966

George Gerbner, Dean
Annenberg School of Communications
University of Pennsylvania
Philadelphia, Penn.

Dear George:

I am also glad to see activity in the field of content analysis. The conference, if it comes off, should be an interesting one and I particularly enjoyed talking with you and the other members of the conference.

It will be a couple of weeks before I can get to the proposal. I'll ~~read~~ it as soon as possible. I just returned from Mississippi in connection with the Parker petition against the renewal of license. Maybe you have read about it since the Circuit Court ruled in favor of the National Council and ordered FCC to give public hearing. My stay in Jackson was relatively quiet and tiring.

Spending the coming year at Annenberg would not seem possible to arrange at this late date. The following year I should be on sabbatical leave and would like to discuss the possibilities of further association then. An additional complication is the supporting grant from NIMH for our new master's program which I am slated to head. We will know definitely in about a week about this. If it is negative, it would give me additional freedom of decision for the coming year. Leave would have to be approved, of course, by the School. Let me give you a definite yes or no within two weeks. Right now it looks doubtful.

The additional expenses on my trip there are indicated below:

Air Fare Boston-Phil-Boston	\$42.45
Taxi fares	8.20
Miscellaneous, tips	1.85
total	\$ 52.50

OK

George Gerbner

2

March 30, 1966

The airline ticket is enclosed.

Sincerely,



F. Earle Barcus

FEB:leg

Enclosure

BOSTON UNIVERSITY

CHARLES RIVER CAMPUS



SCHOOL OF PUBLIC COMMUNICATION

640 Commonwealth Avenue, Boston, Massachusetts 02215

Communication Research Center

October 5, 1966

Dean George Gerbner
Annenberg School of Communication
University of Pennsylvania
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania

Dear George:

Enclosed is a copy of a letter sent to Lovett and Paisley plus my first draft of a proposal. Any comments you have to make--especially in conceptions of the problems and the study purposes--will be more than welcome.

Also, is the time-table reasonable with regard to beginning the study pretty soon, or will we have to wait a while for funding?

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read "Earle".

F. Earle Barcus

FEB:leg

Enclosures

October 5, 1966

Mr. Joseph E. Lovett
Executive Assistant
Annenberg School of Communication
University of Pennsylvania
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania

Dr. William Paisley
Institute for Communication Research
Stanford University
Stanford, California

I have finally come up with a draft proposal for a sample survey of Content Analysis teaching in line with the task on which our committee agreed to work.

I'm sure that there are some flaws in it now--maybe even a new approach is necessary. (e.g. I toyed with a type of personal influence survey beginning with people we know and letting the sample mushroom according to leads given by them to others in teaching C.A. Another purpose such a study would serve is to give a kind of inventory of both teaching and ongoing research in C.A.)

In any event, this is a start and I urge you to give it a little of your time and feed your comments back to me by mid-October. As you can see from the time-table, I hope we can get a final proposal, some money and start collecting data by November 15.

Mr. Joseph E. Lovett
&
Dr. William Paisley

2


October 5, 1966

Some Questions I haven't quite resolved in my mind:

1. Is the scope of this proposal sufficient--i.e. should we be concerned with the state of current research in C.A. as well as teaching?
2. Is the procedure methodologically sound? Any better sampling suggestions?--(e.g. professional directories, etc.?).
3. Are purposes relevant to end product? Is a quantitative estimate what we need to get, or should we strive for greater depth in certain areas?
4. Suggestions as to attitude items? What are some relevant attitudes of instructors we might wish to tap?

Maybe we can get together one of these days!

Sincerely,


F. Earle Barcus
Associate Professor of
Communication Research

FEB:leg

Enclosure

October 11, 1966

Dr. F. Earle Barcus
School of Public Communication
Boston University
640 Commonwealth Avenue
Boston, Massachusetts 02215

Dear Earle:

I received your letter of October 5 and the draft proposal which apparently crossed my letter to you and the other chairmen. As you know from my letter, we have only \$1,200 in hand for your project, and I don't know where the rest might come from. Perhaps you have some ideas about applying for an outside grant, or perhaps we can tie it in with some other plans we briefly mentioned last spring. More specifically, I would like to know what your plans for next year are and when we could get together to chat about them.

As you know, we have a Colloquium series meeting Monday afternoons. Although we are fully booked for the fall semester, and fairly full even for the spring, there are a few open spring dates that I would like to try out on you. So unless you can suggest an earlier opportunity, or even aside from that, I would like to invite you to give a Colloquium to our students and faculty in the spring, in the meantime, please write me about your thinking concerning next year, and any ideas you might have for additional funding of your research project.

With best regards.

Sincerely yours,

GG:kaf

George Gerbner,
Dean

DRAFT

DRAFT
(Sept. 1966)

Proposal for a Survey of the
Teaching of Content Analysis in U.S.
Colleges and Universities

F. Earle Barcus

I. Problem

To survey relevant departments or schools in colleges and universities in the United States to determine the extent to which courses in content analysis are taught, the content emphases of the courses, and the attitudes of instructors toward content analysis as a research method.

II. Purposes

- A. To determine the rubrics under which teaching of content analysis is subsumed. (e.g. content analysis, documentary analysis in history; computer text analysis, etc.).
- B. To get a quantitative estimate on the extent to which content analysis is taught.
 1. In what departments or disciplines is CA teaching most likely to be found?
 2. At what level, graduate and undergraduate, is it taught?
 3. To what degree is CA taught as a single course as compared to the extent it is taught as a supplemental method in general research methodology courses?
 4. What proportions of various school or departments' students are exposed to formal teaching in CA? Are courses required or elective?
 5. How many graduate theses--MA or Ph.D.--from the departments are content analysis theses?
- C. To determine emphasis in content of courses devoted to content analysis (or emphasis given to content analysis in research methodology courses).
 1. "Traditional" content analysis vs. computer methods.
 2. Time devoted to methodological problems--sampling, classification, coding reliability.

3. Time devoted to CA literature--substantive findings of studies.

D. To determine procedures for teaching Content Analysis (individual and group projects, lecture, discussion, etc.)

E. To determine attitudes of instructors toward CA as a research method. (e.g. Is CA seen as a "dead" field as far as new developments?)

III. Procedures: Two methods of attack will be used to obtain data:

A. Method I: Catalogue Screening.

1. Draw a stratified random sample of 100 colleges and universities and obtain catalogues of courses.
2. Search all relevant departments* for possible courses in content analysis or research methodology courses which contain CA teaching.
3. Analyze course descriptions for content emphasis.
4. Follow-up letters (questionnaires) to instructors of courses.

B. Method II: Mail Screening.

1. Draw a stratified random sample of 100 colleges and universities (independent from III A above) and mail a short screening questionnaire or postcard questionnaire addressed to department head of relevant departments.*

*Relevant departments are those which are seen as most likely to offer such courses. Generally speaking, these are departments of Social Sciences and humanities as well as some professional schools in field of communication. A partial listing follows:

sociology	communication	social relations
social psychology	language	history
psychology	education	
journalism	english	
broadcasting	speech	
film		

2. Determine from questionnaires which departments are giving courses in content analysis or research methods courses which contain CA teaching.
 3. Follow up questionnaires to instructors of courses.
- C. Sample: Source for selection of both samples would be the directory: American Colleges and Universities and/or the College Blue Book (omitting from the universe certain technical schools of engineering, etc.). Stratification would be in proportion to size of college and geographical location.

Although two samples of 100 institutions are called for (basic sampling units), the final sample would consist of relevant departments within the institutions--presumably 5 to 10 times the number of institutions sampled.

- D. Catalogue Screening Procedures: Catalogue screening would be done before mail screening so that intelligence gained from this phase would be used in forming mailing lists of departments in mail screening. Catalogue descriptions of all relevant courses along with instructors names (if given), addresses, etc. would be put on punch cards for analysis and use as mailing list.
- E. Mail Screening Procedures: A short one-page questionnaire (or post-card reply form) would contain basic questions as to what research methods courses are offered by the department, which involve teaching of CA, instructors' names and titles for follow-up questionnaires, whether courses are required or elective, and # of students enrolled in courses. Department would also be asked to send catalogue of courses currently offered.
- F. Follow-up Questionnaires: Although a good deal of statistical data can be obtained from the screening methods above, the questionnaire to instructors could be used to obtain much more detailed data such as the following:
1. Course outlines and/or course descriptions
 2. Course bibliography, texts, or readings utilized.
 3. Kinds of projects or problems assigned (re: individual projects, class projects)
 4. Conduct of course (lecture, lecture-discussion, seminar).

It would also contain questions as to content emphasis: e.g. proportion of time in course devoted to:

1. History, development of content analysis.
2. Reliability and validity problems.
3. Sampling problems.
4. Development of categories, classification systems.
5. Coding and coder training.
6. Analysis of substantive findings.

Also included in the questionnaire would be questions as to how instructor would characterize his approach or major disciplinary emphasis of course, such as:

1. CA as a tool in mass communication research
2. Psycholinguistics
3. Sociological studies
4. Computer analysis of text, style
5. history & historiography
- 6.
- 7.

To attempt to measure instructor attitude, such items as the following might be useful:

1. CA seen as a useful scientific method for drawing inferences about behavioral problems.
2. CA seen as an adjunct to social research--e.g. the coding of open-end responses.
3. Purpose of the course in instructor's view.
4. How might students benefit from study of CA?

IV. TIME TABLE

A.	Final proposal and beginning of field work by	Nov. 15
B.	Catalogue screening completed by	Jan. 1
C.	Mail screening returns analyzed by	Feb. 1
D.	Follow-up questionnaires returned by	Mar. 1
E.	Analysis of questionnaires completed by	May 1
F.	Report by	June 1

V. BUDGET

Supplies, Equipment:

500 post-cards request ^{ing} catalogues (at 4¢)	\$ 20.00
500 mail screening letters and return envelopes (10¢)	50.00
300 follow-up questionnaires and return env. (15¢)	45.00
Supplies and printing	50.00
Analysis cards	<u>40.00</u>
Sub-total, supplies, equip.	205.00

Personnel:

Research assistant	1,000.00
Typing	150.00
Clerical (mailing, etc.)	200.00
Supervision, analysis and report writing	<u>1,000.00</u>
Sub- Total, pers.	\$2,350.00
Total	\$2,555.00
add 10% contingency	<u>250.00</u>
Total estimated cost	\$2,805.00

BOSTON UNIVERSITY

CHARLES RIVER CAMPUS



SCHOOL OF PUBLIC COMMUNICATION

640 Commonwealth Avenue, Boston, Massachusetts 02215

Communication Research Center

October 13, 1966

Dr. George Gerbner, Dean
Annenberg School of Communications
University of Pennsylvania
Philadelphia 19104

Dear George:

I have just destroyed another letter ^{to you} which was in the out-box after I received your letter of October 11. The proposal and your letter about the conference plans did cross in the mail.

On the Proposal: I think I shall sit tight for a week to see if I get any response from the CA Education Committee before proposing changes or attempting to seek additional funds for the study. Had I known of the budget limitations, the proposal would undoubtedly have been designed differently. Perhaps I have overpriced it, or perhaps something approximating that study could be done at less cost. If I do not get reactions soon, I shall call Paisley and talk it over with him.

At the moment I do not have in mind any sure possibilities for additional funding aside from small support (\$200-\$300???) from our own Research Center research funds. With this and a matching amount from funds you might make available we possibly could boost the \$1200 to \$1800 or \$2,000. Does this sound like a possibility?

On the Colloquium Series: I wouldn't mind participating in this if you feel there is some topic of wide enough interest to talk about that I might handle. For me that would probably be in one or two areas: 1) some aspect of content analysis, 2) something connected with a monograph of about 50 pages which I now have completed in draft form. It is called "Toward a Definition of Communication" (for the present, at least), and contains such headings as:

The field of communication
The process of communication
Types of communication
Functions of communication
The Institutions of communication
Values in communication
Education for communication

I don't know how good it is. I've tried to say some things I'm not completely sure of, and am setting up an informal faculty colloquium to test it. (I'll send you a copy when typing is completed). If either of the above areas sound feasible to you, perhaps we can work something out for a Spring semester colloquium.

On Plans for Next Year: Right now my thinking for next year involves the weighing of several factors and offers some tough choices. In general, I am happy here with my teaching assignments and research opportunities. The atmosphere is good and I like my colleagues. We have a good deal of autonomy in the division and a small but impressive group of graduate students in Communication Research. In addition, I now have a son in High School, a daughter at Wheaton College close by, and a wife who would not like to leave Boston.

All of those things are powerful forces to keep me here. Now let me reveal the prime dissonant factor.

Unless we can come up with some kind of outside support for faculty in the division, I see little prospect for any but token increases in salary. BU generally, and this school in particular, does not pay senior people very well as compared with other schools and with junior faculty salary levels. Moonlighting is the rule with a majority of the faculty. My dilemma is simple. Without substantial salary increase I can neither afford to stay here nor go elsewhere. In short, my decision conflict is created by lack of any encouraging prospects for money here on the one hand, and the positive professional situation on the other.

Next year I have decided not to apply for sabbatical leave. I believe I will stay here if either of two possibilities eventuate: 1) our Mental Health--Communication Research training grant is approved (in which case I shall receive a salary increase of \$4,000-\$5,000), or 2) outside sources of research and/or consulting money are forthcoming.

I don't know if this tells you precisely what my plans are for the next year or not. It does outline my present thinking as directly as I know how to put it.

I suppose, in effect, I am asking whether and how you can help resolve my conflict (or add to it?). Although we did chat about some sort of position that I might fill there, I'm a little fuzzy now on what it was we talked about specifically. Do you have anything definite in mind at this time? Do you want to explore it further?

There certainly should be a good possibility of getting together at your convenience. This semester I can get free on Mondays or Fridays fairly easily.

Sincerely,



F. Earle Barcus
Assoc. Prof. of Comm.

*(Type-overs are mine
don't blame my secretary!)*

November 7, 1966

Dr. F. Earle Barcus
Associate Professor of Communications
School of Public Communication
Boston University
640 Commonwealth Avenue
Boston, Massachusetts 02215

Dear Earle:

I have been holding your letter of October 13 in hopes of being able to give positive reply to the questions you raise, but the time is not yet. I am confident that the exciting and open-ended opportunities for further development here, and the attractions of Philadelphia itself, are sufficient to resolve such doubts as you or Faith might have, once we can define a challenging role and position for you. That is what will take a little more time.

In the meantime, I would be very much interested in your monograph "Toward a Definition of Communication," even in rough draft form. Could you send me a copy?

On the matter of the CA proposal, I cannot assure you of any more money than is now allocated, but urge you to re-design the study and start it before time slips away. We need to make firm commitments soon. Maybe we can help by doing some of the work here, and perhaps some money will become available later in the year, but I cannot be sure of that.

Let me hear from you soon. I will be in touch with you again about Colloquium and other things.

Sincerely yours,

GG:kaf

George Gerbner,
Dean

BOSTON UNIVERSITY

CHARLES RIVER CAMPUS



SCHOOL OF PUBLIC COMMUNICATION

640 Commonwealth Avenue, Boston, Massachusetts 02215

Communication Research Center

November 9, 1966

Dean George Gerbner
Annenberg School of Communication
University of Pennsylvania
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania

Dear George:

Here's the paper I was talking about in my last letter to you.

I hope you have some time to look at it and give me judgments on where you think it's weak and strong; also what I have omitted as important considerations in the "definition".

By the way, do you have a reprint of your article in the June 1966 Journal of Communication?

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive that reads "Earle" with a small "1966" written below it.

F. Earle Barcus

P.S. Should I continue to write you with regard to the CA conference or to Bernard Wishey?

EFB: bdf
Enc.

November 22, 1966

Dr. F. Earle Barcus
Communication Research Center
School of Public Communication
Boston University
640 Commonwealth Avenue
Boston, Massachusetts 02215

Dear Earle:

Many thanks for sending me your paper. I think it's very useful. Perhaps the "Approaches" section needs strengthening (or cutting out), because you don't really discuss approaches.

Enclosed is copy of my "Definition" piece.

You should write Wisky with a copy to me.

Best regards.

Sincerely yours,

CG:kaf
Enclosure

George Gerbner,
Dean



BOSTON UNIVERSITY

CHARLES RIVER CAMPUS

SCHOOL OF PUBLIC COMMUNICATION

640 Commonwealth Avenue, Boston, Massachusetts 02215

Communication Research Center

January 12, 1967

George Gerbner, Dean
Annenberg School of Communication
University of Pennsylvania
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19104

Dear George:

I found your brief statement on Graduate Education in Communications interesting and well stated. It is addressed to some problems we have been discussing with regard to goals for our own school.

One of the problems, as I see it, is to identify purposes and functions at the various levels--the emphasis at the BA, MS, and Ph.D. levels. Inevitably, a Ph.D. program does seem to change the focus or emphasis of the master's program.

I am not yet convinced that an interdisciplinary approach at the master's level is a valid or workable one. Currently, I view the master's as the professional degree with both the BS and Ph.D. being highly interdisciplinary and either pre- or post- professional.

I talked last night to Dr. Merry from the Harvard Business School and I'm not sure our problem in communications education is entirely different from theirs. Certainly I agree with the statement that we should not teach what practitioners should or could learn anyway on the job. But at some level, students do need training in how to look at new problems which are practically oriented in the institutions of communication. (e.g. what are the FCC rules and regulations which affect the local radio or TV broadcaster? What publications should one go to to get market or audience data? Where can one keep up on the latest AV and TV-Film production techniques? What are the most recent research and statistical techniques? How can one utilize computers? and so on).

Perhaps we are talking about the same thing. In any event, your idea of bringing together those people who are interested in exploring interdisciplinary approaches to graduate education

Broadcasting & Film • Communication Research • Journalism • Public Relations

George Gerbner

2

Jan. 12, 1967


is a good one and should be carried through.

Ultimately, we all realize, I think, that the operational definition of communications education lies not in such statements of goals but in the backgrounds of faculty and the curricular requirements which a school sets for its students. In this respect, your experiment in combining the social scientific with the communication arts is worthwhile and I'm interested in what your experience has been or will be. We do not yet seem prepared to do this at our school. Except for a few core areas, the graduate divisions in our school remain fairly separate and specialized.

Thanks for sending it.

I am pulling the sample for the CA education study now that I have received the \$600 advance to begin this work. I shall send one sample list to Joe Lovett for a catalogue screening and work on the mailing for the other sample during the between-semester break.

Sincerely,



Earle

FEB:leg

P.S. Attached to the check was a form "Request for payment in cash and/or advance allowance for travel". It is not clear whether I sign this and return to you or I keep it for records. Would you let me know?

FEB

BOSTON UNIVERSITY

CHARLES RIVER CAMPUS



SCHOOL OF PUBLIC COMMUNICATION

640 Commonwealth Avenue, Boston, Massachusetts 02215

Why Interdisc?

Communication Research Center

January 12, 1967

George Gerbner, Dean
Annenberg School of Communication
University of Pennsylvania
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19104

Dear George:

I found your brief statement on Graduate Education in Communications interesting and well stated. It is addressed to some problems we have been discussing with regard to goals for our own school.

One of the problems, as I see it, is to identify purposes and functions at the various levels--the emphasis at the BA, MS, and Ph.D. levels. Inevitably, a Ph.D. program does seem to change the focus or emphasis of the master's program.

I am not yet convinced that an interdisciplinary approach at the master's level is a valid or workable one. Currently, I view the master's as the professional degree with both the BS and Ph.D. being highly interdisciplinary and either pre- or post- professional.

I talked last night to Dr. Merry from the Harvard Business School and I'm not sure our problem in communications education is entirely different from theirs. Certainly I agree with the statement that we should not teach what practitioners should or could learn anyway on the job. But at some level, students do ~~not~~ need training in how to look at new problems which are practically oriented in the institutions of communication. (e.g. what are the FCC rules and regulations which affect the local radio or TV broadcaster? What publications should one go to to get market or audience data? Where can one keep up on the latest AV and TV-Film production techniques? What are the most recent research and statistical techniques? How can one utilize computers? and so on).

Perhaps we are talking about the same thing. In any event, your idea of bringing together those people who are interested

in exploring interdisciplinary approaches to graduate education

Broadcasting & Film • Communication Research • Journalism • Public Relations

George Gerbner

2

Jan. 12, 1967

is a good one and should be carried through.

Ultimately, we all realize, I think, that the operational definition of communications education lies not in such statements of goals but in the backgrounds of faculty and the curricular requirements which a school sets for its students. In this respect, your experiment in combining the social scientific with the communication arts is worthwhile and I'm interested in what your experience has been or will be. We do not yet seem prepared to do this at our school. Except for a few core areas, the graduate divisions in our school remain fairly separate and specialized.

Thanks for sending it.

I am pulling the sample for the CA education study now that I have received the \$600 advance to begin this work. I shall send one sample list to Joe Lovett for a catalogue screening and work on the mailing for the other sample during the between-semester break.

Sincerely,



Earle

FEB:leg

P.S. Attached to the check was a form "Request for payment in cash and/or advance allowance for travel". It is not clear whether I sign this and return to you or I keep it for records. Would you let me know?

FEB



913-UN 4-3751

C 355
THE UNIVERSITY OF KANSAS · LAWRENCE, KANSAS · 66044

WILLIAM ALLEN WHITE SCHOOL OF JOURNALISM

September 17, 1967

Prof. F. Earle Barcus
Associate Professor of Communication Research
School of Public Communication
Boston, University
Boston, Mass.

Dear Prof. Barcus;

I'm sorry this will not arrive by Sept. 15, but I was out of the city until almost that date and then plunged into enrollment of students.

In 1965 Prof. Roy Carter, Robb Pierce and I did a study for the USIA of four Latin American Newspapers. It was a study which sought to compare press opinion on certain number of topics with the public opinion as reflected by USIA surveys on the same topics. I did all the content analysis--the scanning and coding of newspapers.

The results of this study have never been published, partly because of USIA restrictions (which have now lapsed, I think) and partly because Dr. Carter has been in Chile for a year and a half.

I think Robb Pierce, asst. prof. of Journalism, Louisiana State University Baton, Rouge, La., would have some interesting comments on content analysis and on the project we did. He is doing his PH.D. dissertation on the results.

I would very much like to attend the National Conference on Content Analysis and will see if the Dean can find the money. It would help if I were invited by you or someone in some formal way to participate. Then I could get my travel paid by the University Graduate School and the School of Journalism could pick up the tab for my other expenses. By participation, in the conference, I don't mean that you ask me to present a paper or anything, just invite me to "participate in the program," or "present the results of research," at the conference to fulfill the letter of the graduate school's law on faculty travel.

By the by, on the information George Serbner sent out from Philadelphia, the dates from the conference are listed as November 16-18. On your letter you say October 16-18. I assume the October dates are correct but would appreciate confirmation.

I'm rushing to get this off to you but if it would be useful I'll write a page on my impressions of content analysis. I have been wrestling with a project--trying to use content analysis to assess the press coverage both in Latin America and here in the U.S. at the Latin American Summit Conference in April. I haven't gotten very far and would appreciate any help I could get at the conference.

Give Joe Taylor my best, if you know him. He's a good guy.

J. Lawrence Day
ASSISTANT PROFESSOR

BOSTON UNIVERSITY

CHARLES RIVER CAMPUS



SCHOOL OF PUBLIC COMMUNICATION

640 Commonwealth Avenue, Boston, Massachusetts 02215

Communication Research Center

October 11, 1967

Dear George:

Two things immediately:

1. I'm enclosing a request from Prof. Day at Kansas (and my reply) which should explain itself.

2. Also enclosed is the reservation form. I'm sending it this way because Mr. Jack Levin will be sharing accommodations with me. We shall probably drive to Philadelphia to save him some money. Perhaps he should be sent a copy of the advanced program and put on your mailing list as well. Address:

Mr. Jack Levin
Sociology Department
Boston University
Boston, Mass., 02215

I am preparing a supplemental mailing list from response to my follow-up questionnaire mailing, who were not on the final list I sent you.

Also send about 15 extra programs which should meet my needs for late correspondence, etc. on the study.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read "Earle".

F. Earle Barcus

FEB:lec

Dr. George Gerbner, Dean
Annenberg School of Communication
University of Pennsylvania
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania

October 12, 1967

J. Laurence Day, Asst. Professor
William Allen White School of Journalism
The University of Kansas
Lawrence, Kansas

Dear Prof. Day:

I guess you'd say I did ignore your letter--but not completely intentionally. I goofed. The Conference dates are November 16-18, not October 16-18. But there is still some time left.

The initial Conference program has now been printed and mailed from Annenberg. I have been routinely sending names of those wishing more information to George Gerbner for addition to the central Conference mailing list.

As to the formal invitations. I'll not promise anything, because such would have to come from the Conference director. I'm sending your request to him and he should be in contact with you.

Thanks for the questionnaire and Robb Pierce's name as a follow-up.

Sincerely,

FEB:lec

F. Earle Bascus
Associate Professor

October 20, 1967

Dr. F. Earle Barcus
School of Public Communication
Boston University
640 Commonwealth Avenue
Boston, Massachusetts 02215

Dear Earle:

As you see from the enclosed, I sent an invitation to Laurence Day. We are also sending one to Jack Levin, and 15 extra programs to you under separate cover. As soon as you send me the supplemental mailing list, we'll mail out copies to them.

With best regards.

Sincerely yours,

GC:kaf
enclosure

George Gerbasi,
Dean

BOSTON UNIVERSITY

CHARLES RIVER CAMPUS



SCHOOL OF PUBLIC COMMUNICATION

640 Commonwealth Avenue, Boston, Massachusetts 02215

Communication Research Center

August 8, 1968

Dr. George Gerbner, Dean
Annenberg School of Communication
University of Pennsylvania
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania

Dear George:

Enclosed is the original revised copy for the article on Education in Content Analysis. I have gone over it fairly carefully and have made some pencil corrections and insertions where I thought necessary. Most of these are fairly minor. I did, however, add a couple of inserts right at the end. They are not long however, and considering the restraint that I showed throughout the text, I assumed that you would not object to these small additions.

Actually, I felt that the editing which you did, in many cases improved the copy and made it tighter. As I read over the old report I found a great deal of excess verbiage, and had a strong urge to edit it much more objectively when I originally wrote it. ^{How}

So, I guess this winds up this particular project. Good luck in getting the whole book published and let me know when you think it will be out. I might even want to buy a copy myself!

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read "Earle".

F. Earle Barcus
Associate Professor

FEB:lec

Dictated by Dr. Barcus; transcribed and ~~signed~~ in his absence.

BOSTON UNIVERSITY



CHARLES RIVER CAMPUS

SCHOOL OF PUBLIC COMMUNICATION

640 Commonwealth Avenue, Boston, Massachusetts 02215

Communication Research Center

George:

Enclosed are galley proofs for the Appendix and the Bibliography on the book. My editing marks are on the first galley. The second is unmarked. I believe that I received the bibliography by mistake...at any rate, I had no way to check all of the entries.

I'll be on sabbatical in Tokyo starting in June or July. Anyone you would like me to say hello to?

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script, reading "Gale Brewer".

minutes of the Executive Committee, 2/15/72 (HH absent):

minutes of 2/8/72 approved.

2. Cutler material passed on to WM.

3. Cutler material in circulation (LG took at meeting). Will discuss next week the possibility of a meeting with the Committee (and with CRW), and/or a faculty seminar.

4. Overall budgetary and developmental plans discussed.

5. Lunch meeting with Dick Chalfen. Courses discussed: 1) film lab, possibility of working with Sol, eventually taking over (feeling expressed: willing +, eager -).

2) intro. to visual comm.

technology for Ph.D. students: the use of film, tv, etc. in communications research.

3) photography in comm. rsch.

4) the ethnography of visual

communications: media use, people's use of comm. media (home photography, movies), "sociovidistics," sociolinguistics, ethnographic film.

5) communications and social

order: the study of social order as revealed through patterns of communications and communications disturbances.

6) willing to teach undergraduate

survey, but not at all happy at the prospect of a large lecture course.

On the question of interest in ASC vs. other possibilities, Dick indicated that he felt the attraction of ASC was that there would be "few battles to fight" because there was already an interest in the kind of research and approach to communication he wished to pursue, and colleagues with whom he could work on these.

Larry Gross
Secretary

UNIVERSITY INTRAMURAL CORRESPONDENCE

*The Annenberg School
of Communications*

September 28, 1973

Suzy:

Please tell him about our deadlines.

G.

BOSTON UNIVERSITY

CHARLES RIVER CAMPUS



SCHOOL OF PUBLIC COMMUNICATION

640 Commonwealth Avenue, Boston, Massachusetts 02215

Communication Research Center

September 24, 1973

Mr. George Gerbner
Editor, Journal of Communication
The Annenberg School of Communication
University of Pennsylvania
3620 Walnut Street, C5
Philadelphia, Pa. 19174

Dear George,

I read the original manuscript on Carney's book for U. of Manitoba Press and I'd be happy to review it for the Journal. Let me know the deadline, please.

Thanks for your letter and answers to my questions.

I don't know of any live manuscripts to send you at this time but will keep on the trail. Bob Smith in our Broadcasting Department is doing some work on symbols and myths which sounds interesting to me.

I'm looking forward to seeing the final issue "under new management."

Sincerely,

F. Earle Barcus
Professor of
Communication Research

*I have a copy
already so you can
keep the review copy.*

BARCUS

October 1, 1973

Dr. F. Earle Barcus
School of Public Communication
Boston University
640 Commonwealth Avenue
Boston, Massachusetts 02215

Dear Dr. Barcus:

Thank you for agreeing to review the Carney book for the Journal. Our next deadline for articles and reviews will be January 1; we would be happy to see your review any time before then.

Sincerely,

Susan Schmidt
Associate Editor
Journal of Communication

SS:skd

December 21, 1973

Dr. F. Earle Barcus
School of Public Communication
Boston University
640 Commonwealth Avenue
Boston, MA. 02215

Dear Earle:

Thank you very much for your review of the Carney book. We received it in good time.

Enclosed is a list of new books available for review. Let me know what you might be interested in -- first-come-first-served.

Also, please let me know if you are working on an article that I might see in the foreseeable future.

With best regards.

Sincerely yours,

George Gerbner

CG:kas
encl.

March 21, 1979

Dr. F. Earle Barcus
Professor, School of Public
Communication
Boston University
640 Commonwealth Avenue
Boston, MA 02215

Dear Earle:

Your letter of February 12 and review of
Manuscript #1621 just came across my desk with-
out indicating a response, so I don't know if
I have acknowledged it before. At any rate, I
want to thank you for the thoughtful review.

With best regards,

Sincerely yours,

George Gerbner
Editor

P.S. Incidentally, I just now received a review
copy of your book on children's television--two
years too late.

GG:ab