

1996

The Effects of Presentational Mode and Gender on Rating Errors in Classroom Speech Evaluation

Nicole L. Turley

Eastern Illinois University

This research is a product of the graduate program in [Speech Communication](#) at Eastern Illinois University.

[Find out more](#) about the program.

Recommended Citation

Turley, Nicole L., "The Effects of Presentational Mode and Gender on Rating Errors in Classroom Speech Evaluation" (1996). *Masters Theses*. 1939.

<https://thekeep.eiu.edu/theses/1939>

This is brought to you for free and open access by the Student Theses & Publications at The Keep. It has been accepted for inclusion in Masters Theses by an authorized administrator of The Keep. For more information, please contact tabruns@eiu.edu.

The Effects of Presentational Mode And Gender On

Rating Errors In Classroom Speech Evaluation

(TITLE)

BY

Nicole L. Turley

THESIS

SUBMITTED IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS
FOR THE DEGREE OF

Master of Arts

IN THE GRADUATE SCHOOL, EASTERN ILLINOIS UNIVERSITY
CHARLESTON, ILLINOIS

1996

YEAR

I HEREBY RECOMMEND THIS THESIS BE ACCEPTED AS FULFILLING
THIS PART OF THE GRADUATE DEGREE CITED ABOVE

11 / 1996
DATE

[Signature] ADVISER

11 / 1996
DATE

[Signature] DEPARTMENT HEAD

THESIS REPRODUCTION CERTIFICATE

TO: Graduate Degree Candidates (who have written formal theses)

SUBJECT: Permission to Reproduce Theses

The University Library is receiving a number of requests from other institutions asking permission to reproduce dissertations for inclusion in their library holdings. Although no copyright laws are involved, we feel that professional courtesy demands that permission be obtained from the author before we allow theses to be copied.

PLEASE SIGN ONE OF THE FOLLOWING STATEMENTS:

Booth Library of Eastern Illinois University has my permission to lend my thesis to a reputable college or university for the purpose of copying it for inclusion in that institution's library or research holdings.

_____ Author _____ Date

I respectfully request Booth Library of Eastern Illinois University not allow my thesis to be reproduced because:

_____ Author _____ Date

Running head: THE EFFECTS OF PRESENTATIONAL MODE AND GENDER

The Effects Of Presentational Mode And Gender On
Rating Errors In Classroom Speech Evaluation

Nicole L. Turley

Eastern Illinois University

Abstract

There is extensive research on speech evaluation in the area of speech communication. This study explores the effects of presentational mode and gender on rating errors in speech evaluation. Subjects were students enrolled in an introductory speech course at Eastern Illinois University. After compiling 1072 speech evaluation sheets, a 2x2x3 factorial analysis of variance was conducted. Results concluded that raters in a pre-presentational mode will be more positively lenient than raters in a post-presentational mode and raters in a control group; female raters were more positively lenient than male raters in the traits of language, material, delivery, analysis, and voice; and females in a pre-presentational mode will display more positive trait errors than males in a control group in the traits of organization, material, and analysis.

The Effects Of Presentational Mode And Gender On
Rating Errors In Classroom Speech Evaluation

A central part of the speech communication curriculum is the process of evaluating oral presentations. Providing evaluations as accurately as possible is the goal. However, evaluating a speech is an act of judgement and along with judgement comes certain errors that can occur.

Before discussing such errors, one must understand the theory of speech evaluation and rating errors. The theory of speech evaluation explains the process of a rater evaluating a speech. According to Bock and Bock (1984), the central proposition of this theory is that, "the rater's ability to utilize cognitive, effective, and psychomotor cues in the speech evaluation setting will cause rating errors to occur (p. 337)." The rater has to understand and transfer what is said into an evaluation. Thus, rating errors will occur during this process. The theory of rating error (RE) has three constructs, which are, the act of speech evaluation (SE), the receiver component (RC), and the demand characteristics (DC), which contribute to the proposition.

The components of the speech communication process may affect the speech evaluation. Bock and Saine (1975) conducted research on the SE component. They expressed it as, $SE = f(S, M, C, R, F, RI, E, I, +e)$, where SE = speech evaluation, f = a function of, S = speaker, M = message, C = channel, R = rater (receiver), F = feedback, RI = rating instrument, E = the environment, I = interference, and

e = measurement error. The components of source, message, and receiver and specifically their effects on trait errors was investigated. Results showed that when a rater agreed with the speaker's views, the rater tends to differentially rate speakers on the basis of credibility or similarity (Bock & Saine, 1975, p. 236).

Raters bring their own ideas and thoughts into what they think a speech should be, which can alter the speech evaluation. Rating errors are most affected by the rater component of the process. This component can be displayed as $RC = f(S, M, C, aR, F, RI, E, I, + e)$, where RC = the rater component and aR = a weighting of the rater component relative to the other components. This was shown in past research finding that in organized speeches, males who have a high need for order, and male sources all received more positive trait errors than did unorganized speeches, males with a low need for order and females with a high need for order, and female sources (Bock & Munro, 1979, p. 371).

The very fact of who a speaker follows in giving a speech can have an effect on the evaluation. This can be described as a demand characteristic which is the third construct that is affected by rating error. It is also expressed as $DC = f(SC, Exp, + e)$, where DC = demand characteristics, SC = situational cues, and Exp = expectations. This construct can be illustrated in Bock, Powell, Kitchens, and Flavin's (1977) study on the impact of the following effect and sex on speech ratings. The following effect being defined in the study as, "An average

speaker might receive a lower rating when he is forced to follow an outstanding speaker since, when compared to the latter, his relative proficiency is obviously less" (p. 145). The results led to the following conclusions: (a) the following effect seemed to be a positive effect instead of a negative effect for average speakers especially for the females, and (b) outstanding speakers tended to be rated higher when following an average speaker. The demand characteristic may be in this case that the speaker is nervous following a superior speaker and causing the rater to expect a good performance or a poor performance.

In an attempt to anticipate and regulate the errors that can occur during evaluating a speech, research has been conducted on these errors. There are three specific rating errors that are due to the receiver component (leniency, halo, and trait errors).

Guilford (1954) explains that a leniency error occurs when the rater is either too easy (positive leniency error) or too hard (negative leniency error) on the speakers. For instance, Bock (1970) found that easy to persuade raters were more positively lenient in speech rating than hard-to-persuade raters.

Guilford (1954) defines halo error as the tendency for a rater to be either too easy (positive halo error) or too hard (negative halo error) on a specific speaker. One example of research conducted on the halo error shows that the speaking

performance of better known and better liked students were evaluated higher (Henrickson, 1940).

Other research on halo errors have been done including Barker's (1969) study showing that higher personal-social regard and higher academic regard by both instructors and students resulted in higher speech evaluations. Therefore, the halo error was demonstrated. Bock's (1970) study on conditions affecting halo errors and persuasibility showed no significant differences between easy to persuade and hard to persuade raters in the tendency to make halo errors.

Finally, Guilford (1954) explains the trait error as the tendency of the rater to be either too easy (positive trait error) or too hard (negative trait error) on a given trait (category) on the rating scale. Past research shows that when raters were sensitized to the task with the position of the speaker, the trait errors associated with the trait of "ideas" were more positive for a low credibility speaker (Bock & Saine, 1975, p.236). Additional research done on the trait error showed that trait errors on "bodily action" and "general effectiveness" were more positive when the speeches were viewed via videotape as opposed to face-to-face (Bock et al., 1976, p. 151).

For the purposes of this study, the effects of presentational mode and gender on rating errors in speech evaluation were isolated. The operational definition of presentational mode is the status of when the speaker rates another speech. There are two parts to presentational mode:

(a) The pre-presentational mode is when the speaker has rated speeches before giving a speech, and (b) The post-presentational mode is when the speaker has rated speeches after giving a speech. A control group was created in which no evaluators gave a speech. The control group only rated speeches.

Presentational Mode

One of the problems of evaluation is when students give speeches as compared with when they evaluate a speech. An example would be what is called "overlap." Barker, Kibler, and Hunter's (1968) study defined overlapping as the process in which (1) an evaluator evaluates the speaker during the speaker's presentation or (2) an evaluator critiques the previous speech during the next speech. Results from the study showed that a failure to listen critically to a set of speeches was found to inflate ratings, thus setting up a positive leniency error.

An important issue to discuss is the fact that people want to please other people when giving a speech. The general idea self-presentation motivations is that people put their effort into presenting themselves as favorably as possible (Schlenker, 1975). Self-presentation being the use of behavior to communicate some information about oneself to others (Baumeister, 1982, p. 3). Baumeister (1982) expressed that the reason for self-presentation is the desire of the speaker to please the audience and be guided by the audiences criteria of

favorability. For the purposes of this study, it is especially true when a speaker is going to be evaluated.

The thought of being evaluated can have different effects on a speaker. The mere fact that others are present causes an increase in drive or arousal (Zajonc, 1965). Research has also concluded that speakers who knew they were going to be evaluated, emitted a greater number of dominant responses (Sajonc & Sales, 1966; Paulus & Murdock, 1971; Henchy & Glass, 1968).

Another concept that illustrates a presentational problem is Brenner's (1973) study that investigated the next-in-line effect. It was concluded that subjects tended not to recall material performed shortly before and just after their performance. This meaning that a speaker will be too consumed with anxiety before speaking, causing a lack of remembrance of certain facts discussed in those speeches. Bock and Bock (1984) took Brenner's (1973) study a little deeper and found that raters tend to be more positively lenient in the pre-positional stress condition.

Based on this research the following hypothesis was formulated:

H1: Raters in a pre-presentational mode will be more positively lenient than raters in a post-presentational mode and raters in a control group.

Gender

Gender differences in communication has long been an area of research interest. Almost every aspect of gender has been researched. One study explains that men have a much lower pitch than women and as a result receive more positive ratings from evaluations (Kramarae, 1981; Sargent, 1977). The studies go on to explain that a lower tone expresses more credibility and a more authoritative status. Thus, evaluators may see females less competent. Consequently, females may be evaluated harder. In fact, Miller and McReynolds (1973) found that male speakers received higher ratings on credibility than female speakers. Additionally, it has been found that although women tend to be more lenient than men, females overvalued males more than other females in speech evaluation (Barker, 1966).

There are other ideas that the gender of the rater, instructor and/or speaker play a role in how the speaker is evaluated. Research on the sex of the instructor determines how a rater evaluates a speaker (Bohn & Bohn, 1985; Bock & Bock, 1977). These studies concluded that in the presence of the male instructor, female raters were too hard on all speakers and in the presence of a female instructor, the male raters were too hard on all speakers. In addition, some research has shown that females will give more positive evaluations than males (Pearson, Turner, Mancillas, 1991). However, there is conflicting research on this subject (Hudson, 1992). It is shown that in the presence of a female instructor females rate only female speakers higher in the traits of language, analysis, and overall

score, they do not rate males higher in this circumstance and male raters will have the same rating tendencies as the female raters when instructed by a female instructor.

Therefore, the following hypothesis was generated:

H2: *Female raters will be more positively lenient than males raters.*

As stated before, some research has shown that females will give more positive evaluations than males (Pearson, Turner, Mancillas, 1991). Additionally, raters were found to be more positively lenient in the pre-presentational stress condition (Bock & Bock, 1984). Therefore, the following hypothesis was generated:

H3: *Females in a pre-presentational mode will display more positive trait errors than males in a control group.*

Method

Subjects

Participants in this study were students enrolled in an introductory speech course at Eastern Illinois University. Subjects were taken from 9 different sections. This population was primarily freshman and sophomore students. The course is a general education requirement consisting of a random sample of majors. One thousand seventy two speech rating scales were completed. There were 53 male raters and 82 female raters who completed the evaluations.

Rating Instrument

The instrument used was the Bock rating scale (see Appendix A) which has been tested and found to be both reliable and valid (Bock, 1972). Ratings were identified and quantified using Guilford's (1954) procedures.

Procedure

Subjects evaluated each other during a whole round of informative speeches. Instructors gave the students the following instructions: (1) Fill out a rating blank for each speaker, (2) Include a score in each category, (3) Fill in the speaker's name and gender of the speaker at the top of the page, (4) Fill in your (rater) social security number at the bottom of the page (for gender identification of the rater,) (5) Place the rating sheets in the order that they were given and hand them in at the end of each class period, and (6) The rating sheets will be held confidential and in no case will the speaker ever see the results. Speeches ranged from three to five minutes and two to three minute intervals were utilized for evaluations after each speech.

Four of the speeches were video-taped for the control group. These four speakers signed an informed consent form that stated that they were being video-taped during their speeches and they were not being graded from the video-tape (see Appendix B). Additionally, they were informed that the results of the speeches would be confidential.

Design

The design of the study was a 2x2x3 (gender of the speaker by gender of the rater by presentational mode) factorial analysis of variance. The independent variables were gender of the speaker, gender of the rater, and presentational mode. The dependent variables were leniency errors and trait errors. The statistical analysis used the procedures in the Number Cruncher Statistical System (Hintze, 1985).

Results

The results of the seven analyses of variance indicated the following relationships.

The significant results in Table 1 indicate there is a significant main effect of gender of the speaker. In addition, there is a significant interaction effect between the gender of the rater and condition. The analysis indicates that in the trait of organization, females were evaluated higher. Also, females evaluated others higher in the post-presentational mode than males in the control group for the trait of organization.

The significant results in Table 2 show that there are significant main effect gender of the speaker; gender of the rater; and condition for the trait of language. The analysis shows that (a) Females were rated higher than males, (b) Female raters evaluated others higher than males, and (c) Subjects in the pre-presentational mode rated higher than the control group.

The analysis shown in Table 3 on ratings for material indicated that there is a significant main effect of the gender

of the rater. There was a significant interaction between the gender of the speaker and condition. The analysis shows that female evaluators rated others higher than males. Additionally, females were evaluated higher by raters in the pre-presentational mode than males were evaluated by the control group.

Table 4 shows that there are significant main effects of the gender of the speaker; gender of the rater; and the condition for the trait of delivery. Females were found to be evaluated higher than males. Females were also found to evaluate higher than males. Additionally, subjects were evaluated higher in the post-presentational mode than in the control group.

The significant differences in Table 5 imply that there is a significant main effect for the gender of the rater. There is also a significant interaction effect between the gender of the speaker and condition in the trait of analysis. The analysis indicates that females evaluate others higher than males evaluate. In addition, females received higher scores from evaluators in the pre-presentation mode than males received by the control group.

The significant results in Table 6 indicate that there is a significant main effect of the gender of the rater for the trait of voice. Results concluded that females rated higher than males.

Table 7 shows that there is a significant main effect of the gender of the speaker in the overall analysis of

evaluations. It was found that overall, females were rated higher than males. Additionally, a significant interaction effect was found between the gender of the rater and the condition. Results showed that females rated higher than males in the post-presentational mode.

The results in Table 8 indicate that there was a significant main effect in the condition. Results concluded that evaluators in the pre-presentational mode rated others higher than evaluators in the control group.

Hypothesis One

The first hypothesis states that raters in a pre-presentational mode will be more positively lenient than raters in a post-presentational mode and raters in a control group. These findings support the hypothesis in that rates in a pre-presentational mode were found to be more positively lenient than raters in a post-presentational mode and raters in a control group.

Hypothesis Two

The data indicates that hypothesis two is partially supported. Hypothesis two states that female raters will be more positively lenient than male raters. The findings only found supportive results in the traits of language, material, delivery, analysis, and voice. In the overall total, there seemed to be no significant difference.

Hypothesis Three

Hypothesis three states that females in a pre-presentational mode will display more positive trait errors than

males in a control group. Data shows this hypothesis was partially supported. Results concluded that there was a significant difference in the traits of organization, material, and analysis. There showed to be no significant difference in the traits of voice, delivery, and language.

Discussion

There are two implications that can be extracted from this study. One implication is oriented towards the frame of mind one is in while evaluating someone else before having to present a speech. The process of cue utilization was shown to be important. It was shown that in the pre-presentational mode, the rater's will block cues. Thus, raters will have a more positive leniency than raters who do not have to give a speech. Second, it seems that women and men speak and evaluate differently. Thus, women and men's results will be different.

The central proposition of the theory of speech evaluation and rating errors also seems to have explanatory power. The reduction of cue utilization was present. The anxiety of waiting to give a speech can cause a person to process fewer cues when evaluating. This is compared to the person who does not feel the anxiety of having to give a speech, which was manipulated by the control group. Thus, raters in a control group may process more cues and be more negatively lenient. This was demonstrated in hypothesis one which corresponds with the results of Bock and Bock's (1984) study that found raters to be more positively lenient in the pre-positional stress condition.

The idea of reduction in cue utilization was also present in hypothesis three. A rater needs to read more cues when evaluating the traits of analysis, material, and organization than delivery traits (voice, delivery, and language). This was also shown in Brenner's (1973) study that found that a speaker will be too consumed with anxiety before speaking causing a lack of remembrance (reduction in cue utilization) of what certain facts that were discussed in those speeches. It is harder to process content traits than delivery traits in this state of anxiety as was shown in hypothesis three. Again, due to the anticipation of having to give a speech, cues are missed while rating. Thus, a positive leniency error was present.

Hypothesis two and three also serve as a generalization that females raters are more positively lenient than males. Past studies have also found females to overvalue males than other females in speech evaluation (Barker, 1966). It has also been found that males may receive a higher evaluation in a certain trait, in spite of the fact that women have been found to be better in that particular trait (Bock & Munro, 1979). Additionally, Bock and Bock (1979) and Pearson et al. (1991) found that females gave more positive evaluations than males.

This leads to some interesting questions of why males and females evaluate differently. Some believe it is due to the sex of the teacher (Bohn & Bohn, 1985; Bock & Bock, 1977). Others believe it has to do with the speaking styles of males and females and how this affects their evaluation styles. Bate's (1988) found that females primarily focus on feelings and

relationships whole males focus on tasks. Male speech was found to be more assertive and aggressive while female speech was found to be more "polite" (Eakins & Eakins, 1978; Lakoff, 1975; Kimble, Yoshikawa & Zehr, 1981; Pearson et al., 1991).

In today's society assertiveness is equated with having credibility (Bate, 1988; Pearson et al., 1991). This supports the idea that females will see speeches that are assertive and task oriented as better than speeches of feelings and relationships. Thus, females will be more positively lenient in evaluating speeches than males.

Future Research

An idea to be researched in the future is the way students are being taught. Perhaps students are being taught that showing assertiveness (male oriented) is the only way to express a subject correctly instead of through expressing feelings (female oriented). This may be the reason why women have been shown to be more positively lenient than males. A study with students who are taught to be neutral and evaluate objectively might shed light on past studies.

In the future, teachers may not have students rate speeches until after the student has already given a speech. Further research on this subject might show a decrease in missed cue utilization if the anxiety of having yet to give a speech is taken out.

Limitations

One limitation to the study was that a small portion of the control group was composed of upper division students as

compared to the rest of the subjects who were predominantly freshman and sophomores. A thought might be that these upper division students are more skilled at evaluating and will be more negatively lenient on evaluating or that their education level is higher than the other subjects. This might also cause them to be more negatively lenient on evaluating. However, it did not seem evident in this study. The scores were comparable to the lower class students in the control group.

These findings are only to be generalized for classroom speaking. In other words, these results do not necessarily apply to the outside world of business presentations.

There were substantially more female subjects than male subjects in the study. Although Eastern Illinois University has more women students than males, researchers in the future might want to add more male subjects.

References

- Barker, L. L. (1966). Irrelevant factors and speech evaluation. Southern Speech Journal, 32, 10-18.
- Barker, L. L. (1969). The relationship between sociometric choice and speech evaluation. Speech Teacher, 27, 204-207.
- Barker, L. J., Kilber, R. J., & Hunter, E. C. (1968). An empirical study of overlap rating effects. Speech Teacher, 17, 160-166.
- Bate, B. (1988). Communication and the Sexes. New York: Harper and Row.
- Baumeister, R. F. (1982). A self-presentational view of social phenomena. Psychological Bulletin, 91 (1), 3-26.
- Bock, D. G. (1970). The effects of persuasibility on leniency, halo, and trait errors in the use of speech rating scales. Speech Teacher, 4, 295-300.
- Bock, D. G. (1972). Reliability and validity of speech rating scales: Some error effects. Central States Speech Journal, 23 (3), 145-151.
- Bock, D. G., & Bock, E. H. (1977). The effects of sex on the experimenter, expectancy inductions, and sex of the rater on leniency, halo, and trait errors in speech rating behavior. Communication Education, 26 (4), 298-306.
- Bock, D. G., & Bock, E. H. (1984). The effects of positional stress and receiver apprehension on leniency errors in speech evaluation: A test of the rating error. Communication Education, 33, 337-341.

Bock, D. G., & Munro, M. E. (1979). The effect of organization, need for order, sex of the source, and sex of the rater on the organization trait error. Southern Speech Communication Journal, 44, 364-372.

Bock, D. G., & Saine, T. J. (1975). The impact of source credibility, attitude valence, and task sensitization on trait errors in speech evaluation. Speech Monographs, 42, 229-236.

Bock, D. G., & Powell, L., Kitchens, J. T., & Flavin, J. W. (1976). The influence of sex differences in speech evaluation: Situational and media effects. Communication Education, 26, 143-153.

Bohn, C. A., & Bohn, E. (1985). Reliability of raters: The effects of rating errors on speech rating process. Communication Education, 34, 343-351.

Brenner, M. (1973). The next-in-line effect. Journal of Verbal Learning and Verbal Behavior, 12, 320-323.

Eakins, B. W. & Eakins, R. G. (1978). Sex Differences in Human Communication. Geneva Il.: Houghton Mifflin.

Guilford, J. P. (1954). Psychometric Methods (2nd ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill.

Henchy, T., & Glass, D. C. (1968). Evaluation apprehension and the social facilitation of dominant and subordinate responses. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 10 (4), 446-454.

Henrickson, E. H. (1940). The relation among knowing a person, liking a person, and judging him as a speaker. Speech Monographs, 7, 22-25.

Kimble, C. E., Yoshikawa, J. C. & Zehr, H. D. (1981). Vocal and verbal assertiveness in same-sexed and mixed-sex groups. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 40 (6), 1047-1054.

Hintze, J. L. (1985). Number cruncher statistical system (Version 4.2). Kaysville, Utah: NCSS.

Hudson, J. B. (1992). Gender differences in evaluation styles. Unpublished master's thesis, Eastern Illinois University at Charleston.

Kramarae, C. (1981). Women and Men Speaking. Rowley MA: Newsbury House.

Lakoff, R. (1975). Language and Woman's Place. New York: Harper and Row.

Miller, G. R., & McReynolds, M. (1973). Male chauvinism and source competence: A research note. Speech Monographs, 40, 154-155.

Paulus, P. B., & Murdoch, P. (1971). Anticipated evaluation and audience presence in the enhancement of dominant responses. Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 7, 280-291.

Pearson, J., Turner, L. H., & Todd-Muncillas, W. (1991). Gender and Communication. (2nd ed.). Dabuque, Iowa: Wm. C. Brown Publishers.

Sargent, A. G. (1977). Beyond Sex Roles. New York: West.

Schlenker, B. (1975). Self-presentation: Managing the impression of consistency when reality interferes with self-enhancement. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 32, 1030-1037.

Zajonc, R. B. (1965). Social facilitation. Science, 149, 269-274.

Zajonc, R. B., & Sales, S. M. (1966). Social facilitation of dominant and subordinate responses. Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 2, 160-168.

Appendix A

Appendix B

Informed Consent

This letter is to inform you that your speeches will be video-taped. The following speeches will not be graded from the video-tape. Additionally, the results of your speeches will be held confidential. Upon, signing the consent form you agree to be video-taped.

Signature

Table 1
Analysis of Variance Results
Organization

Source	DF	Sum-Squares	Mean-Squares	F-ratio	P
A1 (Speaker Gender)	1	14.71526	14.71526	8.41	*.004
B2 (Rater Gender)	1	27.96523	27.96523	15.99	0
C3 (Condition)	2	254.4292	127.2146	72.74	0
A x B	1	2.33262	2.33262	1.33	.247
A x C	2	6.768346	3.384173	1.94	.143
B x C	2	17.99363	8.996816	5.14	*.006
A x B x C	2	.5897109	.2948555	.17	.848
Error	1410	2465.896	1.748862		

*Significant Results at .01 for Gender of Speaker

<u>Gender</u>	<u>Count</u>	<u>Mean</u>
Male	420	8.507143
Female	1002	8.798403

Table 1 Continued

*Significant Results at .01 for Gender of Rater x Condition

<u>Gender x Condition</u>	<u>Count</u>	<u>Mean</u>
Male x Before	138	8.847826
Male x After	199	8.251257
Male x Control	63	*7.396825
Female x Before	486	8.942387
Female x After	450	*9.020001
Female x Control	86	7.616279

Table 2

Analysis of Variance ResultsLanguage

Source	DF	Sum-Squares	Mean-Squares	F-ratio	P
A1 (Speaker Gender)	1	30.42893	30.42893	16.45	*0
B2 (Rater Gender)	1	40.0122	40.0122	21.63	*0
C3 (Condition)	2	364.5506	182.2753	98.52	*0
A x B	1	5.272492	5.272492	2.85	.088
A x C	2	6.236646	3.118323	1.69	.184
B x C	2	11.89975	5.949873	3.22	.039
A x B x C	2	2.234263	1.117132	.6	.507
Error	1410	2608.733	1.850166		

*Significant Results at .01 for Gender of Speaker

<u>Gender</u>	<u>Count</u>	<u>Mean</u>
Male	420	8.259524
Female	1002	8.677645

Table 2 Continued

*Significant Results at .01 for Gender of Rater

<u>Gender</u>	<u>Count</u>	<u>Mean</u>
Male	400	8.145
Female	1022	8.714286

*Significant Results at .01 for Condition

<u>Condition</u>	<u>Count</u>	<u>Mean</u>
Before	624	*8.75
After	649	8.694916
Control	149	*7.120806

Table 3
Analysis of Variance Results
Material

Source	DF	Sum-Squares	Mean-Squares	F-ratio	P
A1 (Speaker Gender)	1	51.19095	51.19095	28.27	0
B2 (Rater Gender)	1	21.28846	21.28846	11.75	*.001
C3 (Condition)	2	304.0745	152.0372	83.85	0
A x B	1	4.271615	4.271615	2.36	.121
A x C	2	31.96918	15.98459	8.83	*0
B x C	2	6.369528	3.184764	1.76	.171
A x B x C	2	9.278544	4.639272	2.56	.076
Error	1410	2553.579	1.811049		

*Significant Results at .01 for Gender of Rater

<u>Gender</u>	<u>Count</u>	<u>Mean</u>
Male	400	8.4075
Female	1022	8.90998

Table 3 Continued

*Significant Results at .01 for Gender of Speaker x Condition

<u>Gender x Condition</u>	<u>Count</u>	<u>Mean</u>
Male x Before	159	8.798742
Male x After	187	8.73262
Male x Control	74	*6.932432
Female x Before	465	*9.075269
Female x After	462	8.887445
Female x Control	75	7.973333

Table 4
Analysis of Variance Results
Delivery

Source	DF	Sum-Squares	Mean-Squares	F-ratio	P
A1 (Speaker Gender)	1	27.1222	27.1222	12.76	*.001
B2 (Rater Gender)	1	18.08747	18.08747	8.51	*.004
C3 (Condition)	2	329.2374	164.6187	77.43	*0
A x B	1	1.876758E-02	1.876758E-02	.01	.953
A x C	2	5.953324	2.976662	1.4	.246
B x C	2	14.53076	7.265381	3.42	.032
A x B x C	2	1.827697	.9138483	.43	.564
Error	1410	2997.529	2.125907		

*Significant Results at .01 for Gender of Speaker

<u>Gender</u>	<u>Count</u>	<u>Mean</u>
Male	420	7.780952
Female	1002	8.239521

Table 4 Continued

*Significant Results at .01 for Gender of Rater

<u>Gender</u>	<u>Count</u>	<u>Mean</u>
Male	400	7.7975
Female	1022	8.224071

*Significant Results at .01 for Condition

<u>Condition</u>	<u>Count</u>	<u>Mean</u>
Before	624	8.253204
After	649	*8.266563
Control	149	*6.771812

Table 5

Analysis of Variance ResultsAnalysis

Source	DF	Sum-Squares	Mean-Squares	F-ratio	P
A1 (Speaker Gender)	1	63.27146	63.27146	33.34	0
B2 (Rater Gender)	1	37.3246	37.3246	19.67	*0
C3 (Condition)	2	224.7941	112.397	59.22	0
A x B	1	4.680558	4.680558	2.47	.112
A x C	2	36.30994	18.15497	9.57	*0
B x C	2	10.00546	5.002728	2.64	.07
A x B x C	2	6.418882	3.209441	1.69	.183
Error	1410	2675.904	1.897804		

*Significant Results at .01 for Gender of Rater

<u>Gender</u>	<u>Count</u>	<u>Mean</u>
Male	400	8.2675
Female	1022	8.810176

Table 5 Continued

*Significant Results at .01 for Gender of Speaker x Condition

<u>Gender x Condition</u>	<u>Count</u>	<u>Mean</u>
Male x Before	159	8.603773
Male x After	187	8.657754
Male x Control	74	*6.932432
Female x Before	465	*8.870968
Female x After	462	8.831168
Female x Control	75	8.08

Table 6
Analysis of Variance Results

Voice

Source	DF	Sum-Squares	Mean-Squares	F-ratio	P
A1 (Speaker Gender)	1	35.62858	35.62858	16.02	0
B2 (Rater Gender)	1	26.23063	26.23063	11.79	*.001
C3 (Condition)	2	405.0371	202.5185	91.070	0
A x B	1	9.161614	9.161614	4.12	.04
A x C	2	6.421588	3.210794	1.44	.235
B x C	2	1.745344	.8726718	.39	.588
A x B x C	2	4.10591	2.052955	.92	.525
Error	1410	3135.668	2.223878		

*Significant Results at .01 for Gender of Rater

<u>Gender</u>	<u>Count</u>	<u>Mean</u>
Male	400	7.935
Female	1022	8.39726

Table 7
Analysis of Variance Results
Overall Total

Source	DF	Sum-Squares	Mean-Squares	F-ratio	P
A1 (Speaker Gender)	1	427.022	427.022	9.770001*	.001
B2 (Rater Gender)	1	1010.651	1010.651	23.12	0
C3 (Condition)	1	178.9049	178.9049	4.09	.041
A x B	1	10.34896	10.34896	.24	.545
A x C	1	3.605401	3.605401	.08	.707
B x C	1	508.9204	508.9204	11.64	*.001
A x B x C	1	17.13698	17.13698	.39	.504
Error	1264	55252.74	43.71261		

*Significant Results at .01 for Gender of Speaker

<u>Gender</u>	<u>Count</u>	<u>Mean</u>
Male	346	51.07515
Female	926	52.35745

Table 7 Continued

*Significant Results at .01 for Gender of Rater x Condition

<u>Gender x Condition</u>	<u>Count</u>	<u>Mean</u>
Male x Before	138	51.92754
Male x After	199	*49.04523
Female x Before	486	52.32099
Female x After	449	*53.00891

Table 8
Analysis of Variance Results
Overall-Condition

Source	DF	Sum-Squares	Mean Squares	F-ratio	P
A (Condition)	2	10838.96	5419.478	114.99	0
Error	1419	66877.7	47.13016		

*Significant Results at .01 for Condition

<u>Condition</u>	<u>Mean</u>
Level 1 (Pre-presentational mode)	*52.23397
Level 2 (Post-presentational mode)	51.79199
Level 3 (Control)	*43.02013
