Editor's Introduction: The Task and the Team

THE INCREASING USE of the audiovisual label over the last thirty years has created a term with varied meanings. Some have defined the audiovisual field by listing machines, by listing sensory experiences, or by indicating what audiovisual is *not,* i.e., whatever is verbal. As newer developments in technology have been applied to the problems of education, the audiovisual label has become less useful to describe the field with accuracy. A call for unity and direction has come from many sources within and without the audiovisual field. This monograph attempts to define the broader field of instructional technology which incorporates certain aspects of the established audiovisual field.

Definition

The task of defining a field is difficult. No one definition may be considered as *the* final definition. It is a reference point which may serve as a stimulus for further discussion and re-definition. If it is used to promote rigorous discussion among the personnel within the field, it will have served its purpose.

Chapter I discusses the climate which has given rise to the need for definition. In Chapter II the developments of the audiovisual field during the past thirty years are reviewed as a backdrop for the definition. A definition is stated in Chapter III. The rationale supporting the definition is outlined with particular reference to contributions from communication theory and learning theory. Models are used as reference points. Chapter IV applies the definition to the functions of personnel within the field, suggesting certain realignments based on new insights and directions derived from the definition.

Terminology

The undefined boundaries of the audiovisual field have been further complicated by the use of terms coined at random by manufacturers of devices and producers of materials. Many terms have been accepted regionally or within a specialized segment of the field. With this diversity of terms and multiple definitions, a universe of discourse is impossible. This monograph attempts to bring together and define the most widely used terms relating to instructional technology.

The definitions of approximately 900 key terms were selected from over 2,000 terms reviewed for possible inclusion. The criterion of utility was more important in the selection of terms than comprehensiveness. Terms in current usage were analyzed and reviewed by members of the Commission and the Advisory Committee of the Technological Development Project. The major objective of this section is to define each term so that unity might be achieved. This terminology should serve as a reference for all writers and speakers who communicate information about technology in education.

The Commission

The Technological Development Project of the National Education Association was supported by the United States Office of Education. It offered an opportunity to define the field and its related terminology. The Commission on Definition and Terminology was established to analyze the problem and to offer to the field a publication which would serve as a reference point for further discussion.

Donald P. Ely, director of the Audiovisual Center at Syracuse University, served as chairman of the Commission and as editor of this monograph. Members of the Commission included:

Henry A. Bern, research associate, Audiovisual Center, Indiana University

Samuel Cohen, administrative assistant, Hewlett-Woodmere Public Schools, Hewlett, New York

Sidney C. Eboch, director of audiovisual service, State College for Alameda County, California. (While serving on the Commission, he was research associate, Technological Development Project.)

James Q. Knowlton, assistant in research, Indiana University

Susan M. Markle, research associate, School of Education, University of California at Los Angeles. (Dr. Markle was associated with the Center for Programed Instruction in New York while serving on the Commission.)

Consultants to the project included:

Lee E. Campion, director of educational communications, State Education Department, Albany, New York. (He was formerly associate investigator in the Technological Development Project.)

Edgar Dale, professor of education, Ohio State University; James D. Finn, professor of education, University of Southern California. (Dr. Finn is principal investigator for the Technological Development Project.)

George Gerbner, research associate professor of communications, University of Illinois; A. W. VanderMeer, dean, College of Education, Pennsylvania State University.

Projects research associates at Syracuse University were Richard Michael and Don A. Nolder.

Acknowledgments

All Commission members have contributed to the content of this document but the editor assumes responsibility for the final product. Dr. Cohen prepared the draft for Chapter I and Dr. Bern authored Chapter II. Chapter III is a composite of the Commission's work, but the portion dealing with communication and learning models, as well as the development of the audiovisual model, is the work of Dr. Eboch. Chapter IV amalgamates ideas of Dr. Eboch, Dr. Charles F. Hoban, Jr., Dr. Cohen and other Commission members.

In the section on terminology the definitions for teaching machines and programed instruction were written by Dr. Markle. Don A. Nolder, research assistant, compiled the comprehensive list of relevant terms.

The editor is particularly indebted to the counsel of the Commission members without whom this monograph could not have been written. An indispensable contribution was made by Dr. Sidney C. Eboch who submitted major ideas regarding definition. Don A. Nolder collected and reviewed all terms that were potential entries for the terminology. And finally, to Mrs. Winifred Buck, secretary to the editor and typist for the final draft, goes an expression of gratitude for the patience, understanding, and professional competency to finish a monumental task.

DONALD P. ELY

Syracuse, New York
January 1, 1963