

Communications Media Receive New Leaders

by REX BEST

After a call for additional applications delayed initial decisions for selecting communications media heads on Wednesday, April 13, 1977, appointments were made a week later on Wednesday, April 20, 1977. Following a lengthy interview session of all applicants, the Communications Board selected student leaders for the *Hilltop*, the *Laurel*, *WVMH-fm*, and the *Cadenza* for the 1977-78 school year.

In action by the Board, the *Hilltop* leadership position went to Debbie Clary, a rising senior biology major, and Janice Taylor, also a rising senior and biology major. Both Ms. Clary's and Ms. Taylor's backgrounds found them experienced in working in the newspaper field, having served on the *Hilltop* staff in various capacities over the past two years. The new co-editors cited changes in news coverage and more student input as some of the innovations they hoped to bring to the 1977-78 *Hilltop*.

After Clary and Taylor had been elected by acclamation, the Board interviewed applicants for the position of manager of *WVMH-fm*. Mike Mitchell, a rising senior history major was selected for that top post. Mitchell, possessing an extensive background in radio broadcasting, pointed to changes in programming as just one area he hoped to improve upon as manager of the radio station. Mitchell's appointment was unanimous save one abstention.

Further action by the Board concerned positions for editorship of the *Cadenza*, and co-editorship of the *Laurel*. Brenda Ennis, a rising senior English major was selected by a close

margin to head that job. The co-editorship of the *Laurel* went to Cheryl Aldridge, a rising junior home economics major, and Melinda Brown, a rising junior mathematics major. Ms. Ennis' credentials for editorship of the *Cadenza* included her role as assistant editor of the 1977 *Cadenza*, as well as having served on the *Laurel* staff in previous years. Ms. Aldridge and Ms. Brown served as copy and layout workers, respectively, on the 1977 *Laurel*. In addition, Ms. Aldridge served as a reporter for the 1976-77 *Hilltop*, as well as a member of the 1976 *Laurel* staff. The *Laurel* co-editors won their position by a unanimous vote, with the exception of one abstention.

In final action by the Board, chairman Walter Smith thanked each applicant for their concern for the communications media on the Mars Hill College campus, and for their willingness to get involved. Thank you's also went to the current editors and managers of the student media for their diligence in upgrading the printed media and *WVMH-fm* during the year.

Current members of the Communication Board who were present at the April 20, 1977 meeting included John Campbell, *Hilltop* advisor; Betty Hughes, *Cadenza* advisor; John Gullick, *Cadenza* editor; Kirk Hall, sophomore class representative; Margaret Douth, *Laurel* co-editor; Jonathan Riddle, *Hilltop* co-editor; Julia Storm, non-voting representative for the *Laurel*; Rex Best, *Hilltop* co-editor; Neil Moore, manager of *WVMH-fm*; Dr. Bill Hutt, faculty representative; Martha Kimsey, senior class representative; Phil West, *WVMH-fm* advisor; Steve Webb, SGA President; and Walter Smith, Board Chairman and Advisor to the *Laurel*.



Newly elected student communications leaders are (l-r): Janice Taylor, Debbie Clary, Brenda Ennis, Cheryl Aldridge, and Melinda Brown. (Photo by Sam Tunstall)

Schubert Sees Liberal Education as Essential

Editors' Note:

Kirk Hall, sophomore English and History major, conducted the following interview with Dr. Joseph Schubert, chairman of the English Department, in partial fulfillment of the English competence.

by KIRK HALL

Hall: To begin with, I'd like to find out a little about your life. Where have you lived, gone to school, things like that?

Schubert: Well, mostly east Florida, east Tennessee, New York, Louisiana, Texas for my schooling. As far as living, I've lived in Illinois, Japan, Puerto Rico, Colorado, and that's just about it. And North Carolina.

Hall: What were you doing in Japan?

Schubert: I was a photo-intelligence officer. I lived two years over there.

Hall: How did you like military life?

Schubert: Very well. In fact, I had a lot of advantages, a lot of breaks, and a lot of positive experiences. I dropped out of grad school because I wasn't sure I was on the right track. And for some reason, I wanted to go into the military as a drastic change from school to see if I could make it. I went in as an airman and went through officer's training school, then through Russian language school, then through photo-intelligence school, and was sent to Japan for two years. Practically anything I wanted or asked for I got. I was very pleased with that and never got any bad reactions at all. It was a very positive thing.

Hall: My father was in the military. That kind of life seems totally different from the life of a college professor.

Schubert: Oh, yeah, but I enjoyed it. The restrictions that were put on me in the military were ones that had their place. I felt that anything that was done had a purpose. A lot of people don't think that. A lot of people don't agree with the method at getting at the purpose, but for me it was kind of a situation that worked well for me. For others it might not, but for me, it was quite comfortable.

Hall: You have some seminary background, don't you?

Schubert: New Orleans and Southwestern.

Hall: Have you ever considered going into the

ministry?

Schubert: Mainly, it was sticking to church related education. Religious education, music. At one time, I was a member of the Ministerial Association, but that was at a time when there was a trend saying that any person who is going to be in a church related function should go through and be ordained. I went along with that for a while, but I felt it wasn't what I agreed with. And so I didn't follow that path, although I was a licensed minister.

Hall: What advice would you give to an undergraduate who wants to go into seminary?

Schubert: I am prejudiced here. Probably the one thing that I would give is that they should not major in religion. I feel the liberal education with a broad background is essential. You have to meet all kinds of people. You cannot just deal with religion. I advise an English major because that's what I had. I was going to seminary, and I said I was going to have to handle a language effectively. Now, there are other majors like history, and philosophy, and I can see that as a valid major. I feel that if they do that, as much English study as they can get or language study is what they need.

Hall: So you feel that English is the best all round major.

Schubert: For anybody going into church work, religious education, or the ministry. Now, music is kind of a different thing. They still have a need for it. I get very very upset at ministerial students in the seminary who can't handle language. Many ministers just didn't understand words. I would get into systematic theology courses with them, and I would be making A's and they would be making B's and C's. They're going to preach to me? They couldn't understand the stuff. They couldn't understand the language. When they got up to preach, some language habits bothered me, so it cut off what they were saying. It was a blocking of communication.

Hall: Could you tell me something about your dissertation? Didn't it have something to do with transformation grammar?

Schubert: Yes. I used transformation grammar as a basis. The main thrust was to look at the comparison between the person's own oral with his own written language. I didn't want to compare him with other people. I wanted to see if

his own oral language and his development had any relationship to his own written language. All studies that had been done had taken people as a group and analyzed samples of a lot of students' writing. They made a composite set of data, I think. Then they analyzed the oral sample and made a composite set of data on that and compared the two. I didn't believe that was valid. I wanted to have student John Jones give me an oral sample and then give me a written sample. I wanted to see how his own oral compared with his own written.

Hall: How well has the competency program worked, as far as the English department is concerned?

Schubert: Well, we're very pleased with it in the department. The major thrust over the last two to three years has been to agree upon within the department the exact methods of evaluation or shall we say the agreed upon methods of evaluation. Right now we're moving out from that. We've stated our competency. We're pretty well set on that. We know what we want the student to be able to do. For example, in 213/214 a student examines a topic in depth, learns and gathers all the information he can for that and puts it together. Now, there are many other ways he can meet that competency. It might be in the biology program.

Hall: Students that I've been talking to say that the seniors only had to take 111/112 and got only four hours for each. Now we have to take everything through 216, and we only get two hours for 111 and 112.

Schubert: Well, keep in mind that some of the things that were in 111 and 112 are now moved up to the sophomore level. When you get a course and the student has four hours credit writing on a course, and he does half of it well, and half of it not well, he flunks the course. My rationale is that he does well on a two hour course and gets credit for it. I feel that if you look at the number of hours of English when I came here in '67, you had twelve hours English and four hours math; you've still got twelve hours English and four hours math. The only difference we've hit on is that we feel that we've got such a problem in our society with the students being able to handle oral and written language, not literature. We hope that when they leave here, they will be respectable

users of the English language.

Hall: There has been a lot of news recently about students who graduate from high school that can't read or write effectively. What do you think is the major cause of this?

Schubert: Well, it's not open education. It's not methods. It's not the sense that was written about in the current issue of the "National Observer", comparing an open school with a more traditional school. The problem as I see it is that the country and the school itself have not been clear in their own minds exactly what teaching is or what competency is, and what level each teacher is responsible for. What I'm saying is this: when a ninth grade teacher has a ninth grade group, what is it that the tenth grade teacher can be assured of? Everybody wants to teach mythology, everybody wants to teach creative writing, everybody wants to teach all these things. That's fine. You can use any material you want, but exactly what is the ninth grade student held responsible for? And what is the tenth grade teacher going to build upon? No one has sat down and said this is your responsibility. I do not see that in the classrooms in the public school; I see certain teachers taking responsibility, but not the schools with the principal's push.

Hall: What advice would you give parents who have children in school?

Schubert: About what?

Hall: About English.

Schubert: The same advice I give my sister who has four kids. Don't be apologetic about going to the school often and making sure about what's being done. The old saying, a squeaky wheel gets the grease, might apply here. I think having some books around that the student wants to read will help greatly. Reading aloud at home helps also. There's a lot on T.V. that isn't good. It's not necessarily bad, it's just worthless. I think this business of immersing the student in books and reading aloud is very very important.

Hall: Do you feel the English language is dying?

Schubert: Changing. Change doesn't necessarily mean deterioration. When they lose exactness in the words, I think yes. It's not that it's dying.

Hall: Thank you.