

1967

Comparisons of Teacher Effectiveness and Speaker Ability from Expert, Supervisors, Student Teachers and Student Ratings

Peggy Lee Geurin
Eastern Illinois University

Recommended Citation

Geurin, Peggy Lee, "Comparisons of Teacher Effectiveness and Speaker Ability from Expert, Supervisors, Student Teachers and Student Ratings" (1967). *Masters Theses*. 4202.
<https://thekeep.eiu.edu/theses/4202>

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.

Comparisons of Teacher Effectiveness and Speaker Ability

from Expert, Supervisors, Student Teachers and Student Ratings
(TITLE)

BY

Peggy Lee Geurin
=

THESIS

SUBMITTED IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS
FOR THE DEGREE OF

Master of Science in Education

IN THE GRADUATE SCHOOL, EASTERN ILLINOIS UNIVERSITY
CHARLESTON, ILLINOIS

1967

YEAR

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

5/2/67
DATE

May 2 1967
DATE

DEPARTMENT HEAD

/LB1861.C57XG3955>C2/

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
LIST OF TABLES	iv
Chapter	
I. INTRODUCTION	1
II. RELATED RESEARCH	4
III. METHODOLOGY	16
IV. ANALYSIS OF DATA	19
V. SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND IMPLICATIONS FOR FUTURE RESEARCH	37
APPENDIX A: Rating Sheets.	46
APPENDIX B: Raw Data	50
BIBLIOGRAPHY.	53

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1. Comparison of Overall Ratings of Speech Examiner, Student Teachers, and Supervisors . .	22
2. Comparison of Overall Ratings of Speech Examiner, Student Teachers and Supervisors Broken Down into Nine Individual Speaking Characteristics	23
3. Individual Student Teacher Rankings by Examiner and Supervisors.	26
4. Ratings of Two Best Teachers by Examiner and Supervisor.	28
5. Ratings of Two Poorest Teachers by Examiner and Supervisor.	30
6. Class Ratings of Student Teachers in Terms of Five Speaking Characteristics.	32
7. Class Ratings of the Two Best and the Two Poorest Teachers Chosen by the Examiner and Supervisors	33
8. Comparison of Total Correlations of the Classes, Examiner, Supervisors, and Student Teachers.	35

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

It has been established that quality of speaking ability correlates highly with teaching ability,¹ and the question may be asked, "Are professional educators preparing our future teachers to become more effective teachers by concentrating on improving their speaking abilities?" An investigation of speech in a student teaching situation should help in understanding what makes a superior teacher. Such an investigation should add insight to the construction of a curriculum for the improvement of prospective teachers. A study of student teachers' speech may help colleges and universities in their task of helping students through their first problems of classroom teaching.

Other studies have tried to determine exactly which speech components are related to teaching effectiveness.² These studies have resulted in endless lists of components by studying the literature in the field, or polling speech teachers and students or both. They have tried to relate teaching proficiency to intelligence,

¹Albert B. Becker, "The Speech Characteristics of Superior and Inferior High School Teachers as Revealed by Student Reaction." Unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation, Northwestern University, 1949.

²Ernest H. Henrikson, "An Analysis of the Characteristics of Some Good and Poor Speakers." Speech Monographs, XI (January, 1944), pp. 120-24.

grades in majors and grades in Education courses. Some literature can be found correlating good speakers with certain personality traits.¹ But because teaching effectiveness and speaking ability are such obscure and subjective terms, no study has been made which can pinpoint certain speech components as being the characteristics best describing the "good teachers." At best past studies have indicated which speech characteristics do not correlate with teaching proficiency. Many papers have been written expressing concern over the fact that such a high percentage of professional educators are poor speakers.²

This study is an attempt to find speaker characteristics which prevail among good teachers. To do this, it is necessary to observe and evaluate student teachers in the actual teaching situation. The method used by most researchers, that of using audio recordings, probably is not the best answer to the problem as results have proved inconclusive; therefore, this study will make observations of the actual teaching situation. To give this study added dimension, the supervising teachers, the student teachers themselves, and their classes' recorded observations or evaluations are also considered.

¹Wilbur E. Moore, "Factors Related to Achievement and Improvement in Public Speaking." Quarterly Journal of Speech (V. 29, April 1943) pp. 213-17.

²Herold Lillywhite, "Speech Needs of Teachers." Quarterly Journal of Speech (V. 32, December 1946) pp. 496-501.

It is hoped that ratings by speech experts, supervising teachers and classes are sufficiently related to indicate certain speaking characteristics which are capable of reliably indicating teacher effectiveness.

Some research has been done showing how poor teachers tend to overevaluate their abilities and superior teachers tend to under-evaluate their abilities.¹ Therefore, one aspect of the study is designed to find out how well the student teacher's evaluations of himself correlate with those evaluations given by the other three raters. With the results of this study in mind, it is hoped that professional educators will begin preparing future teachers more effectively by concentrating on improving those speaking characteristics which the raters agree are most important for describing the "good" teacher.

¹Wilbur E. Moore, "Factors Related to Achievement and Improvement in Public Speaking," Quarterly Journal of Speech (V. 29, April 1943) pp. 213-27.

CHAPTER II

RELATED RESEARCH

Very little recent research has been done on speaking ability and teaching effectiveness which relates to this study; however, several pertinent studies were conducted prior to 1945. Only those studies related to speaking ability and teaching effectiveness are included.

Becker studied student responses of teacher effectiveness.¹ He attempted to find the components of speech characteristics of the superior high school teacher and the speech traits characteristic of the inferior high school teacher. To determine what should be regarded as the most significant components of speech for high school teaching, Becker collected extensive information from three sources: a) literature which deals with speech for teaching, b) speech departments in teachers' colleges and universities, and c) high school graduates. A speech rating instrument employing the top ten speech components chosen by the three sources was developed. The final printed form dealt principally with the students' rating of two teachers: a) the teacher from whom he had learned the most,

¹Albert B. Becker, "The Speech Characteristics of Superior and Inferior High School Teachers as Revealed by Student Reaction," (Unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation, Northwestern University, 1949).

and b) the teacher from whom he had learned the least. Each of these two teachers was rated by the student according to general teaching ability and the ten questions dealing with the teacher's speech. The order in which ten speech components rated relative to teaching ability were as follows: (1) organization of ideas, (2) communicativeness, (3) emotional control, (3) vocal expressiveness, (5) intelligence, (6) use of body, (7) intelligibility, (8) likeableness, (9) voice qualities, and (10) use of language. Eighteen high schools in fourteen different states took part in the study.

Becker found the correlation between general teaching ability and speech proficiency to be .90. The inferior teachers (or those from whom the students learned the least) were characteristically weak in making explanation, in emotional stability, in appreciation of student's feelings and problems, and in ability to put ideas into fresh and vivid language. The superior teachers (or those from whom the students learned the most) were characteristically strong in intelligence, use of language, making explanation, likeableness and intelligibility. The two speech characteristics in which there was the least difference between the superior and inferior teachers chosen by the students were use of language and voice quality. Becker concludes, in general, that the superior teachers were stronger in personality traits and intellectual traits than they were in the evaluation of speech; also inferior teachers were weaker in personality

traits and intellectual traits than they were in the mechanics of speech. Although the correlation between general teaching ability and speech proficiency was high at .90, a few inferior teachers rated higher in speech proficiency than did some superior teachers. This suggests that speech proficiency is not always a perfect indicator of teaching effectiveness but more than adequate in a majority of cases. Personality traits seem to be more important to teaching effectiveness in the eyes of the students.

Alan W. Huckleberry investigated the possible relationship of speech to student teaching, to develop means of identifying these speech qualities in the classroom student teaching situation, and to observe the effect of improvement of speech on improvement in student teaching competency.¹ This was a study of the effect of special training in speech on change in student teaching proficiency. Sixty seniors enrolled in the student teaching program at Ball State Teachers' College took part in the study. The experimental and control groups were matched on the basis of speech and broad subject areas. Two speech tests were given, one at the beginning and one at the end of the student teaching period. Eight audible speech items were checked by means of recordings by three speech judges. They were: articulation, pronunciation, voice qualities, voice pitch, inflection, rate,

¹Alan W. Huckleberry, "The Relationship Between Change in Speech Proficiency and Change in Student Teaching Proficiency," Speech Monographs, XVII, (November 1950), pp. 378-89.

rhythm and conviction. Six other student teaching items were rated by Huskleberry just as soon as possible after the start of the teaching period of the student. They were: choice of material, loudness, bodily activity, posture, poise, and audience contact.

High school, college and university teachers of speech throughout the country were asked to rank the audible speech items, and the critic teachers at Ball State ranked the student teaching items in order to be able to weight improvement. The rating sheets were revised until a high degree of reliability of ratings was reached among all judges. The final form of the evaluation sheet consisted of a graphic rating scale using descriptive words. The speech improvement program for the experimental group was the one item that was permitted to vary. There was no significant difference between the total and matched groups and experimental groups in intelligence, grades in majors, and grades in Education courses. The experimental subjects studied initial ratings of the speech judges and those of the critic teachers, comparing them with their own self ratings. If two persons marked an item low, the subject made recordings and listened to the weak speech items. The experimental group was visited as often as necessary to diagnose visible speech or student teaching items (no regular schedule was used for the classroom visits.) A final speech test was given which was the same as the first. An attempt to establish reliability of the ratings was made by checking

two of the ratings of all critic teachers on the item entitled "Appearance." Huckleberry felt that "Appearance" as a factor in teaching, would be the one item least affected by the student teaching experience. If this item was subject to little change and if the critics rated their students at or very near the same spot on the scale, then the reliability of ratings of critics would be established for this item. Using the first and last rating by the critic teachers of the item labelled "Appearance" as a basis of arriving at a correlation coefficient, it was found that very little variation occurred in the two ratings.

Huckleberry found a direct relation between change in student teaching proficiency and change in speech proficiency. Intelligence, grades in majors, and grades in Education courses seemed to have little or no relationship to improvement made in student teaching competency. When there was a hint of a relationship between non-speech variables, it was negative in nature. Huckleberry found that physical vigor, initiative, use of time, rating of pupils, and pupil achievement (which were some of the student teaching items observed) contributed heavily to the total difference of the means in favor of the experimental group. There was a closer relationship between change in audible speech characteristics and change in student teaching than between change in visible speech characteristics and change in student teaching. Finally, he found that speech and student teaching proficiency can be rated in a

reliable fashion. From this study, the writer believes that Huckleberry has determined that, all other factors held constant, there is a direct relationship between positive change in speech and positive change in teaching proficiency. By making the student teacher aware of his deficiencies and by having him practice for improvement, it is almost a foregone conclusion that he will improve in his teaching proficiency as he improves in speaking ability.

However, the writer would question Huckleberry's method of testing reliability by choosing only one item, "Appearance," as a basis of arriving at a correlation coefficient because it seems this item can be subject to change as well as the other items given.

Moore investigated 1) possible relationships between speech factors and personality traits, attitudes toward speech, or mental objectivity, self-evaluation and proficiency in speaking, 2) whether there is any relationship between educational achievement, intelligence or knowledge of contemporary affairs and attainment in speaking, and 3) whether there is a relationship between all the above named factors and improvement in speaking.¹

One hundred and twenty students in the required fundamentals course were given the Knover Speech Attitude Scale and Bernreuter Personality Inventory and the freshman placement exam which tested reasoning ability, quantitative and general linguistic reasoning,

¹Wilbur E. Moore, "Factors Related to Achievement and Improvement in Public Speaking," Quarterly Journal of Speech XXIX (April 1943), pp. 213-17.

educational achievement (literary acquaintance, vocabulary, and social studies) and acquaintance with contemporary affairs. Two speeches were assigned and given in two rounds of competition. Speakers were rated on a 28 item, 4-point scale by two critics who were upper-class majors in speech. Each speaker also rated his own performance on the same scale. Reliability of the critics' ratings was determined by correlating ratings of one half the critics with those of the other half. The reliability of the pooled ratings for each set was found to be .75 and .76 respectively. Reliability of self evaluations was determined by correlating the ratings of the self in the first round with those in the second round. The correlation coefficient was $.94 \pm .006$.

From the results, Moore concluded that tests of intelligence and educational achievement more consistently and more significantly differentiated the poor from the good speakers than did inventories of speech attitudes and personality traits. This suggests that the investigations of such problems as improvement in reasoning, gain in knowledge of contemporary affairs, etc. which may accompany instruction in speech, are no less important than changes in "personality." He further states that poor speakers are inferior to good speakers in linguistic intelligence, in literary acquaintance, in vocabulary and in knowledge of the social studies and contemporary affairs.

In Moore's study, poor speakers consistently overevaluated

their own performance while good speakers tended to underevaluate their performance. In view of the consistency with which the poor speakers and those who make little improvement overevaluate themselves, one arduous task that the speech teacher faces seems to be the development of critical insight.

William B. McCard analysed the relationship of speech to teaching efficiency.¹ In order to establish this relation, he first got a reliable criterion of teaching efficiency by using the Wisconsin Study of Teaching Ability. To ascertain speech effectiveness, sample tests of reading and speaking were used. Competent judges evaluated the 40 teachers by means of a numerical rating scale, (1) poorest to (7) highest. Three general factors were rated, general effectiveness, communication of ideas, and communication of emotion.

McCard found that "good" teachers as a group have better speech than average or poor teachers. He suggests (1) that a good teacher is likely to be good partly because he possesses better speech and (2) that those poor in speech are not likely to be good teachers unless they have outstanding compensatory abilities. From Becker's study, we may infer that these outstanding compensatory abilities may be a combination of certain strong personality traits. McCard also found a statistically significant

¹William B. McCard, "Speech Factors as Related to Teaching Efficiency," Speech Monographs, XI (1944), pp. 53-61.

positive correlation between speech ability and teaching efficiency.

The studies reviewed here generally indicate a strong, positive relation between speaking ability and teaching effectiveness.

Huckleberry established that a positive change in student teaching effectiveness seems directly associated with a positive change in speech proficiency.¹ Moore found that tests of intelligence and educational achievement more consistently and more significantly differentiated the poor from the good speaker than did inventories of speech attitudes and personality traits.² Becker's study found that superior teachers were also characteristically strong in intelligence, but that students tended to rate teachers high because of personality traits.³ The order in which speech components correlated with teaching ability in two different studies⁴ ranked organization of ideas, organization of materials, conviction, communicativeness, or audience contact, vocal expression and emotional control among the highest in importance. Five aspects of speech in which there seems to be the least difference between

¹Huckleberry, Speech Monographs, XVII, pp. 378-89.

²Moore, Quarterly Journal of Speech, XIII, pp. 213-17.

³Becker, Unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation, Northwestern University, 1949.

⁴Ibid.

Alan W. Huckleberry, "When You Seek Advice," Speech Teacher, II, (January 1953), pp. 49-51.

superior and inferior teachers were use of language and voice quality.

From the conclusions of prior research, several assumptions and predictions may be made concerning this study. If we assume that speech ability and teaching proficiency occur together, in more than 90% of cases, then we can assume good teachers are good speakers. We would predict or expect, then, that (1) some speech characteristics are primary in describing the "good" teacher, and that (2) consistent ratings will be obtained from speech expert, supervising teachers, and the students when those ratings deal with speech characteristics which best describe the good teacher.

Two secondary hypotheses which this study can also investigate are: (1) "good" teachers should rate consistently higher on all speech traits than the "poor" teacher, and that (2) ratings of speaking ability (ergo, teaching efficiency) should be positively correlated with teacher intelligence.

DEFINITIONS OF TERMS USED

In order that we may have a better understanding of the ideas presented here, it will first be necessary to define certain terms that have been used in the context of this study. Speech characteristics may be theoretically defined as those qualities or attributes of speech, both audible and visual, used to assess public speakers. In this study, the semantic differential rating scale (which measures

meaning) was used by the speech examiner, the supervising teachers, the student teachers, and the classes to assess these nine qualities or attributes of speech.¹ Therefore, the operational definition of speech characteristics would be the semantic differential ratings of (1) vocal characteristics in terms of the bi-polar adjectives loud-soft, pleasant-unpleasant, modulated-~~unmodulated~~, fast-slow, high-low, good articulation-bad articulation, fluent-nonfluent, forceful-weak, and pleasing-distracting; (2) physical characteristics in terms of awkward-poised, bad posture-good posture, distracting-pleasing, nervous-self-confident, impersonal-personal; (3) personality characteristics in terms of liked-disliked, self-controlled-sectional, sparkling-dull, interesting-uninteresting; (4) appearance characteristics in terms of sloppy-well-groomed, and bad-good; language characteristics in terms of good vocabulary-bad vocabulary, clear-confused, good-bad; (6) organisational characteristics in terms of disorganized-organized, confused-clear, and bad-good; (7) visual aid characteristics in terms of not used-used, and bad-good; (8) class reaction characteristics in terms of attentive-unattentive, engrossed-bored, well behaved-disorderly, interested-disinterested, and good-bad; (9) communicative characteristics in terms of inefficient-efficient, ineffective-effective, and bad-good.

¹The validity of the semantic differential has been adequately established as a rating instrument by other researchers and need not be discussed here.

Teaching ability may arbitrarily be defined as those qualities of the teacher which enable him to give (a person) knowledge of, or skill in. In this particular study, we are assuming that good teachers are also good speakers, an assumption which has been supported by previous studies. Therefore, for our purposes, teaching ability and speaking ability are synonymous. Our operational definition of teaching (or speaking) ability will be the mean ratings of speech characteristics as evaluated by the speech examiner, the supervisors, the student teachers and the classes. The high ratings will indicate high teaching (or speaking) effectiveness and low ratings will indicate low teaching (or speaking) effectiveness.

The writer, a graduate student in speech, will hereafter be called the speech examiner. The seven classroom teachers who were supervising the practice teaching of the student teachers will be called supervisors. The student teachers are those seven students at Eastern Illinois University observed by the speech examiner in their practice teaching, and the classes are those pupils of the student teachers.

CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

PROCEDURE

The sample population used in this study consisted of seven student teachers from Eastern Illinois University. All of the subjects did their student teaching at the Laboratory School on Eastern's campus, Spring Quarter, 1966. All of the subjects had at least the Fundamental Speech 131 course.¹ All the subjects were observed as they taught elementary classes in Language Arts, Social Science, Math-Science, and Art. Each subject was evaluated by the speech examiner ten different times over a period of six weeks. Each subject was evaluated by his supervising teacher three or four times during the same period. In addition, each subject evaluated himself once at the end of the term, and all but one student teacher was rated by his class once at the end of the term. This one exception occurred because one supervising teacher refused to allow the writer to give the class the evaluation sheet. The student teachers and their students did not make evaluations during the term to avoid a bias. The student teachers were told

¹Speech training of the student teachers will be discussed further in Chapter V.

that the writer was observing their classes in different teaching situations. Since the laboratory school classrooms are open to all college students for observation purposes, this satisfied the questions of the student teachers.

The speech examiner's observations took an average of 20 minutes each to complete while the student teacher was in front of the class in the actual teaching situation. The supervisors evaluated the student teachers on an average of once every two weeks. In all cases, the supervisors were helpful and willing to cooperate in the study.

MATERIALS

The semantic differential evaluation sheet was used by the writer, the supervisors and the student teachers and consisted of three main speaker concepts (see Appendix A). They were Delivery, which included voice, physical manner, personality, and appearance; Content, which included language, organization, and visual aids; and Relation to the Student, which included reaction of the class and communicativeness.

The evaluation sheet given to the classes was a shortened form and included only five areas of evaluation: voice, physical manner, personality, appearance (all delivery variables) and reaction of the class (see Appendix A). The purpose of the class evaluation sheet

was primarily to find out how well the classes liked their student teachers, and so it was decided to cut out those sections which might not be readily understood by the students.

CHAPTER IV

ANALYSIS OF DATA

At the end of the six week observation period, the rating data was accumulated and put on IBM cards to expedite handling. A Multiple Correlation Program was chosen as the best method of analyzing the information. The program was put on the 1620 computer in the Data Processing Center on Eastern Illinois University's Campus.

The nine speech characteristics used in this study are general terms often used in training teachers. Because they are general, these symbols may have different connotations to different people. In the following analysis, statistical correlation was used to compare the three rating sources, (the speech examiner, the supervisors, and the student teachers) to find out how closely the three sources agreed on the meanings of these symbols in their judgments. A fourth source of ratings, the ratings of the students in the classes, were included when practical and meaningful.

In the first five analyses below, the student ratings of the student teachers were not included because a different rating scale was used by the students. The students were given a shortened

form of the speech evaluation instrument used by the other three raters (see Appendix A). It was felt that the classes were not sophisticated enough to evaluate those speech characteristics which are not readily observable, so that analysis involving student ratings is made separately.

The statistical correlation is a mathematical device used to indicate how similar the judgements of one rater are with the judgements of another rater. For instance, a correlation coefficient of +1 would indicate perfect agreement of two rater's judgements, a 0 rating indicates no relationship, and a -1 rating would indicate that there is a perfect negative or opposite relationship between the two rater's judgements. Any correlation coefficient between +1, 0, and -1 indicates the degree of agreement between the rater's judgements. Although the "significance" of a correlation coefficient is often dependent upon the particular sources of variation which are being related, in this study using the standard semantic differential rating method, a rating of .45 correlation coefficient (either positive or negative) can be considered as significant agreement among judges.

RESULTS

To determine if there was any correlation between the judgements of the three major sources of ratings, (speech examiner,

supervisors' and student teachers') the data was analyzed and the total ratings of the three raters are summarized in Table 1. The results indicate a correlation of .65 between the examiner's and supervisors' ratings. The high level of agreement of ratings for the examiner and supervisors' indicate that both sources agree on the connotations of the words used in the speech evaluation instrument. The high correlation between the ratings of the examiner and the supervisors' provides considerable statistical confidence for making inferences about objective speaking characteristics and teaching abilities of the student teachers.

The agreement between the student teachers' "self" ratings and the supervisors' and writer's ratings was not closely correlated being only .31 and .38. In other words, the student teachers' subjective ratings did not agree with those objective ratings of the speech examiner and supervisors'.

In order to determine if the agreement among the speech examiner's, the supervisors', and the student teachers' ratings were the same for each of the nine speech characteristics being rated, the data was analyzed and the results summarized in Table 2. It can be noted that the (1) examiner's and (2) the supervisors' correlations are consistently high: indicating close agreement. The lowest correlations between the supervisors' and the examiner's were obtained in those categories where there were less definite

TABLE 1
COMPARISON OF OVERALL RATINGS OF SPEECH EXAMINER,
STUDENT TEACHERS AND SUPERVISORS

	Supervisor	Student Teacher
Speech Examiner	.69	.51
Student Teacher	.38	

TABLE 2

COMPARISON OF OVERALL RATINGS OF SPEECH EXAMINER, STUDENT TEACHERS AND SUPERVISORS
BROKEN DOWN INTO NINE INDIVIDUAL SPEAKER CHARACTERISTICS

	Examiner with Supervisor (1-2)	Examiner with Student Teacher (1-3)	Supervisor with Student Teacher (2-3)	Mean Rating of Examiner	Standard Deviation	Mean Rating of Supervisor	Standard Deviation	Mean Rating of Student Teacher	Standard Deviation
Voice	.753	.353	.439	4.81	1.032	4.85	.780	4.61	.750
Physical Manner	.882	.348	.267	4.76	1.133	4.76	.940	4.75	.638
Personality	.484	.131	.638	4.56	1.120	4.71	.836	4.34	.352
Appearance	.692	.422	.596	5.00	1.234	5.19	1.466	5.37	.695
Language	.776	.517	.690	4.74	1.179	5.23	1.206	5.26	.754
Organization	.720	.643	.498	5.02	.997	5.00	1.292	4.78	.234
Visual Aids	.753	-.067	.062	4.46	.495	4.39	1.130	4.50	.866
Class Reaction	.461	.119	-.381	4.79	1.011	4.73	.905	4.60	.624
Communicativeness	.465	.457	-.463	4.90	1.030	5.22	.821	5.04	.587

criteria for judgment, i.e., personality, class reaction, and communicativeness. Those categories in which the speech examiner and the supervisors' agreed highly were: voice - .753, physical manner - .882, appearance - .692, language - .776, organization - .720, and visual aids - .753. The correlation is high enough to indicate that a classroom teacher could "spot" these characteristics as readily as the examiner should these speaker characteristics prove important in teaching effectiveness. It can also be noted that there was a general disagreement between the student teachers' ratings of themselves and the examiner and supervisors' ratings.

The correlations between the student teachers' self ratings and the other ratings were uniformly low except for the following exceptions. Between the examiner (1) and the student teachers' (3) there is agreement on organization which correlated .643. This tends to indicate that organization is a concept that is easily "spotted" and reliably rated by all three rating sources. This indicates that the student teacher can reliably estimate his own abilities (or at least his success) in organization.

The supervisors' (2) and the student teachers' (3) ratings agree significantly high on personality, .638, appearance, .596, and on language, .690. This would indicate that these two raters are agreeing on the connotations of these words, even on such an ambiguous term as personality. On two speaking characteristics, class reaction and communicativeness, the supervisors (2) and the

student teachers' (?) ratings resulted in a negative correlation coefficient. The correlation coefficients are not high enough to show a meaningful relation, but there is a slight indication that, in those two speaking characteristics, when the student teacher thought he was strong, the supervisor believed he was weak, and vice versa.

If we assume the supervisor is better qualified to judge these speaking characteristics than the student teacher, then the indications are that either they are not agreeing on the connotations of these words, or that the student teacher is unable to evaluate his own teaching ability, and the classes' reaction to him as a teacher. Perhaps in the early stages of beginning teaching, developing this critical insight about the self as a speaker and teacher is most important for improvement. If the student teacher fails to analyze his audience or misreads the feedback he gets from the class, he cannot correct himself and would tend to make the same mistakes without realizing it. Although these are generalizations, the writer believes that further study would prove helpful in answering some of these questions.

The speech examiner's and supervisors' ratings of the student teachers were ranked to separate the "best" from the "poorest" teachers in this study. The results are summarized in Table 3 and indicate that the best two and the poorest two teachers were ranked as such by both raters. In general, the ranking of the student

TABLE 3

INDIVIDUAL STUDENT TEACHER RANKINGS BY EXAMINER AND SUPERVISORS

Student Teacher	Examiner's mean rating	rank	Supervisors' mean rating	rank	Composite rank
#1	5.76	2	4.71	5	4
#2	5.76	3	5.21	3	2
#3	3.22	8	2.94	8	8
#4	5.98	1	6.13	1	1
#5	4.30	5	4.58	6	6
#6	4.45	4	5.44	2	3
#7	3.96	6	4.48	7	7
#8	3.93	7	4.88	4	5

teachers by the examiner and supervisors were consistent; however, so that relative differences might be more pronounced, the two "best" rated teachers and the two "poorest" teachers were extracted for comparison on the basis of rating by examiner and supervisors.

With a 7.00 rating being the highest possible, the two best teachers are teacher #4 (5.98 and 6.13) and teacher #2 (5.76 and 5.21). The two poorest teachers are teacher #3 (3.22 and 2.94) and teacher #7 (3.96 and 4.48). Because the total rankings of the examiner and supervisors' correlated so highly, it can be assumed that the two best teachers were considered best because of certain outstanding speaker characteristics readily observable by the speech examiner and the supervisors, and that the two poorest teachers were poor because of deficiencies in speaking characteristics readily observable by the speech examiner and the supervisors.

To determine which speech characteristics were most important in describing the best teachers, the data was analyzed by comparing the examiner's ratings with the supervisors' ratings. The results summarized in Table 4 indicate that the examiner's and supervisors' rankings agreed that the best teachers' outstanding speech characteristics were appearance, language, and organization. The examiner's and supervisors' rankings agreed that the second best teacher, #2, had outstanding speech characteristics of appearance, language, organization, and communicativeness. The consistently high ratings suggest that appearance, language, and organization are the most important characteristics of the "good" teacher.

TABLE 4
RATINGS OF TWO BEST TEACHERS BY EXAMINER AND SUPERVISOR

	Student teacher #1				Student teacher #2			
	Examiner	Rank	Supervisor	Rank	Examiner	Rank	Supervisor	Rank
Voice	6.17	5	6.11		5.95		5.05	
Physical Manner	6.64	1	6.15		5.84		5.55	4
Personality	5.95		6.12		5.92		4.56	
Appearance	6.30	3	7.00	1	6.10	2	6.00	2
Language	6.26	4	6.75	5	5.96	5	6.08	1
Organization	6.63	2	7.00	2	6.06	3	5.66	3
Visual Aids	5.50		7.00	3	4.30		4.25	
Class Reaction	5.74		6.25		5.98	4	5.05	
Communicativeness	6.10		6.83	4	6.23	1	5.08	5

To determine which speech characteristics were important in describing the poorest teachers, comparison of the examiner's ratings with the supervisors' was made. The results summarized in Table 5 indicate that the examiner's and supervisors' ratings agree that the poorest teacher, #3, had outstanding deficiencies in the speech characteristics of physical manner, appearance, and language. The examiner's and supervisors' ratings agreed that the second poorest teacher, #7, had outstanding deficiencies in the speech characteristics of personality, appearance, class reaction, and communicativeness. We may infer from this information that (1) appearance seems most important in "identifying" the "poor" teacher, (2) appearance is a determining factor in identifying both or separating the best and poorest, and (3) the raters agree more on the "good" teacher's characteristics than on the "poor" teacher's characteristics.

The next three tables are evaluations of the student teachers made by their classes. As previously explained, the classes rated only five speaking characteristics: (1) voice, (2) physical manner, (3) personality, (4) appearance, and (5) reaction of class. Since one student teacher was used in two different class situations and the writer was unable to get a class evaluation of another student teacher, only six student teacher ratings are included in this analysis. To determine which teachers were rated best and poorest by their classes, the data was analyzed by comparing the

TABLE 5

RATINGS OF TWO POOREST TEACHERS BY EXAMINER AND SUPERVISOR

	Student teacher #3				Student teacher #7			
	Examiner	Rank	Supervisor	Rank	Examiner	Rank	Supervisor	Rank
Voice	3.20	3	3.13		4.82		5.16	
Physical Manner	3.32	4	2.95	4	3.78	3	4.35	
Personality	2.90	2	3.31		3.85	4	4.06	2
Appearance	3.50	5	2.75	2	2.90	1	4.25	4
Language	2.53	1	2.41	1	4.63		5.25	
Organization	3.73		2.77	3	4.63		4.41	
Visual Aids	3.90		3.00	5	4.37		4.00	1
Class Reaction	3.76		3.10		3.10	2	4.15	3
Communicativeness	3.50	5	4.08		4.16	5	4.25	5

mean ratings of the classes. The results summarized in Table 6 indicate that the classes' ratings of teachers agree with ratings of the speech examiner and supervisors' except for student teacher #1 who the class rated low. The order of rankings by the students shows student teacher #8 as best or (1) with a 30.58 rating, teacher #4 (2) second with a 27.39 rating, teacher #5 as third with a 25.01 rating, teacher #7 was fourth with a 22.86 rating, teacher #1 as fifth with a 21.09 rating, and teacher #3 as sixth as poorest with a 19.69 rating. The ranking based on class ratings was used to divide the best teachers from the poorest teachers. Teacher #1 was temporarily discarded because there was disagreement between the ratings of the speech examiner and supervisors, and the ratings of the class.

On the basis of the classes' ratings, personality and appearance were the most reliable indicators of the better teachers and physical manner and reaction to the teacher were the most reliable indicators of the poorer teachers. These particular characteristics, personality and appearance, and physical manner and reaction of the class, seem to be the indicators children use to rate a teacher high or low.

If one assumes that the speech examiner and the supervisors are better judges of good and bad teaching characteristics than the students, then the classes' ratings can be re-examined in terms of the better and poorer teachers chosen by the examiner and supervisors (see Table 7), and analyzed in terms of class response. This table

TABLE 6

CLASS RATINGS OF STUDENT TEACHERS IN TERMS OF FIVE
SPEAKING CHARACTERISTICS

Student Teacher	#1	#3	#4	#5	#7	#8
Voice	4.65	4.24	5.19	4.97	5.02	6.45
Physical Manner	5.38	3.09	5.96	4.78	4.62	5.93
Personality	3.51	4.61	5.35	4.87	4.93	6.43
Appearance	4.51	4.37	6.42	5.81	4.25	6.91
Reaction of Class	3.04	3.48	4.47	4.58	4.04	4.84
	21.09	19.69	27.39	25.01	22.86	30.58
Rank	5	6	2	3	4	1

TABLE 7

CLASS RATING OF THE TWO BEST AND THE TWO POOREST TEACHERS CHOSEN BY THE EXAMINER AND SUPERVISORS

	Best Teachers		Poorest Teachers	
	#1	#2	#7	#8
Voice	5.19	4.65	5.02	4.14
Physical Manner	5.96	5.38	4.62	3.09
Personality	5.35	3.51	4.93	4.61
Appearance	6.42	4.51	4.25	4.37
Reaction of Class	4.47	3.04	4.04	3.48

indicates the two factors which best describe the "good" teachers are appearance and physical manner. Conversely, the two factors which tend to describe the poorest teachers are poor physical manner and reaction of the class.

To determine how closely related the judgements of the class were with the other three raters, the total correlations were compared and examined. To make this comparison, it was necessary for the rating sheets used by the examiner, supervisors, and student teachers, to have some items deleted so that they matched the rating sheets used by the classes (see Appendix A). Again, the multiple correlation technique was applied using data from student ratings and the reduced data from the examiner's, supervisors', and student teachers' ratings. The results summarized in Table 8 show that the supervisors' ratings were correlated most highly with the classes' ratings. This implies that the supervisors are better able to predict the judgements of their students. The correlation coefficient resulting from a comparison of the examiner's ratings and class ratings shows that no significant relation exists. The examiner, in other words, was not able to predict the classes' judgements of their student teachers. The correlation coefficient resulting from a comparison of the class ratings with the student teachers' ratings shows a significantly negative correlation indicating that the student teacher considers himself to have certain speaking characteristics which the class does not think he has. In other words, the student teachers were not able to judge their classes.

TABLE 8
COMPARISON OF TOTAL CORRELATIONS OF THE CLASSES,
EXAMINER, SUPERVISORS, AND STUDENT TEACHERS

	Class
Examiner	-.043
Supervisors	.518
Student Teachers	-.319

DISCUSSION OF RESULTS

The results of this study generally support prior studies (summarized in Chapter II) in those areas where "overlapping" occurred. However, the results of this study provide adequate data for further clarifying and quantifying certain speaker characteristics other studies have ignored in their quest for meaningful relations between speaker efficiency and teaching ability.

Inferences which may be reasonably based on the results of this study, will be discussed and summarized in the Conclusions Chapter.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND IMPLICATIONS FOR FUTURE RESEARCH

A comparison of teaching effectiveness and speaker ability was determined by correlating the ratings of the speech examiner, supervisors, student teachers, and students as these raters observed the student teachers in the actual classroom teaching situation. Realizing fully that the results of this study are based upon empiricism and that any generalizations or implications beyond the limits of this study are extremely risky, the writer believes the following conclusions to be pertinent.

RESULTS

Perhaps one of the most significant findings of this study is the fact that the speech examiner, who is trained to evaluate speech characteristics, and the regular classroom supervisors show high agreement on their evaluations of student teachers' speech characteristics using this form of the semantic differential rating sheet. The regular supervisors' evaluations of speech characteristics, therefore, may be considered nearly as reliable as a speech expert. This means that the supervising teacher could be much more active in criticizing and improving student teachers' communication abilities. For example the main criticism brought out in the practice teaching seminars by the writer as well as the

other student teachers seemed to be that the supervising teachers did not give enough evaluations and criticisms. It was the consensus that any criticisms offered by the supervisors were limited to correcting bad grammar and poor pronunciation. Apparently, the supervisors felt (1) unqualified and/or (2) not responsible for giving further criticism. The findings of this study indicate the supervisors are at least qualified to "point out" (as opposed to remedial procedures) speech deficiencies. As far as being responsible for giving criticisms, the supervisors seem to have delegated this area to the coordinator who must visit many students during the quarter and does not have time to go into any depth on any one student's problems. The coordinator seems to rely on the supervisors to give necessary evaluations and criticisms. Because of this apparent lack of delegated responsibility, no one takes the initiative, and the student teacher suffers. And so, what should be the most important area of the student teaching situation is neglected almost entirely. With the help of this study, therefore, it is hoped that the classroom supervisors will become aware of their ability to evaluate speech characteristics and be able to give the student teachers in their care the help they both need and want to improve as teachers.

Although the speech examiner and supervisors correlated highly on most of the nine speech characteristics, there were three categories in which the correlations were relatively low,

i.e., personality, class reaction, and communicativeness. Perhaps the reason for this low correlation may be that the terms used are so broad that the speech examiner and supervisors are unable to agree on the connotations of these words. It is interesting to note, however, that the supervisors' ratings and student teachers' ratings on the item called personality were closely correlated. This difference of opinion on personality may be explained in terms of the close daily contact between the supervisors and student teachers, whereas the speech examiner observed the student teacher only a few minutes each time in the actual teaching situation. In any case, future studies of this type may be improved by setting down a more specific criteria to judge these items, or the terms may be changed so that agreement may be reached as to the connotations of these words.

Neither the speech examiner, the supervisors, nor the student teachers correlated highly on the two items called class reaction and communicativeness. In fact, the supervisors' and student teachers' ratings on these two items were negatively correlated, indicating opposite judgements. This may mean that the raters could not agree on the connotations of these words. Although it may not be as important for the speech examiner and supervisors (as observers) to be able to judge these two items, it seems extremely important for the student teacher to be able to analyze his audience to see how they are reacting to him as a teacher. It

is also important for the teacher to know if he is getting his message across to his students. In one instance a student teacher asked the speech examiner how he could tell if he was communicating and how the class was reacting to him unless by means of a pop quiz or test. The speech examiner noted that this particular student teacher had a failing common to many teachers who begin a teaching period as if starting a race. So much material has to be covered in so many minutes (or so he thought) that he hardly raised his head from the book to find out how they were reacting. If the old axiom is true, "If your students haven't learned, you haven't taught," then teachers must stop running races with the clock and get back to the more human job of teaching which requires a sensitiveness to the moods and needs of the class.

In general, the student teachers' ratings of themselves did not agree with the ratings of the speech examiner and supervisors except on one item, organization, in which the speech examiner and student teacher did correlate highly. We may conclude, therefore, that all three raters could agree on the meaning of this item and that the student teacher was able to estimate his own ability in this area. Deficiencies in organization then, do not seem to be a problem in regard to teaching ability. The reason may be that most courses, especially the basic English courses, give much emphasis to this item. In those few cases where a low rating was given in organization, the student teacher was also

aware that it was a problem. From the writer's own experience in the basic speech course, it seems that this item might have been overstressed and that speech teachers might do well to re-examine their emphasis on organization in light of this study and concentrate more on those areas in which student teachers do poorly.

According to the ratings of the speech examiner and the supervisor, the best teachers (those who rated high on the nine speech characteristics) had outstanding scores in appearance, language, organization, and communicativeness. Although the speech examiner and supervisors did not correlate highly on the connotation of the term communicativeness, both raters recognized its value to the teaching situation. The poorest teachers (those with low ratings on the nine speech characteristics) had their lowest scores on personality, physical manner, appearance, language, class reaction and communicativeness. In general, the classes' ratings of the student teachers agreed with the speech examiner's and supervisors' ratings in determining the best and poorest teachers except for one student teacher who was rated low by her class and second highest by the speech examiner and supervisors. This particular student teacher seemed to demand very much of her students both from class and homework assignments. She required much original thought in the students' themes and poetry. She was also a very strict disciplinarian. These factors

may be responsible for the low ratings given by her class on the items of personality and reaction of the class. The speech examiner and supervisor (perhaps objectively) recognized that these factors can combine to make an outstanding teacher, but the class (perhaps subjectively) thought they were being pushed too hard, and the low ratings may be a result of their unconscious reluctance.

The classes picked the items personality and appearance as indicators of the best teachers, and physical manner and their reaction to the teacher as indicators of the poorest teachers. In comparing the items chosen as indicators of best and poorest teachers by the three raters, it may be noted that the classes probably tend to be more subjective and personal in their evaluations. The speech examiner and supervisors probably tended to be more objective than personal in their evaluations. It would be interesting for the speech examiner and supervisors to exchange places with the classes, to see if they could still be objective after being in the position of the students. It seems very probable that their evaluations would also tend to become more subjective. Perhaps this is the reason we need both objective raters (supervisors) and subjective raters (classes) to help evaluate the student teacher's ability and make recommendations for improvement. The supervisors could evaluate objective individual speech characteristics, i.e., voice, language,

organization, visual aids, and the classes could evaluate more subjective speech characteristics, i.e., physical manner, personality, appearance, reaction of the class, and communicativeness in order to get a complete picture or evaluation of teaching ability.

By correlating the ratings of all four raters, (speech examiner, supervisors, student teachers, and classes) it was found that the classes and supervisors' ratings correlated most highly, with no correlation between the speech examiner's ratings and the classes' ratings and a negative correlation between the student teachers' ratings and the classes' ratings. Although the ratings of the speech examiner and supervisors did correlate highly, the speech examiner was not able to judge or predict the classes' judgements, nor were the student teachers able to. The close correlation between the supervisors' ratings and classes' ratings may indicate that the supervisors were also better able to judge or predict the evaluations of the classes. It may be inferred that the supervisors are in such close daily contact with the students all through the school year, that they can predict or judge them better than the speech examiner or student teacher who came in contact with the classes for only a few weeks. This seems especially important for the supervisors to remember when called upon to evaluate the student teachers under their supervision. Not only do the supervisors agree or

correlate highly with the ratings of the speech examiner, but they also know what their classes respond to. This combination leads us to assume that no one is as well qualified as the supervisor to evaluate and offer criticisms to the student teacher.

It was found that trying to relate teaching ability to any advanced training in speech was impossible. The seven student teachers all had approximately the same background in speech, averaging one course per person. This one course was the basic fundamentals course which all are required to take.

It was also noted that no meaningful correlation between teaching ability and intelligence could be found as the sampling of student teachers was insufficient. According to the accumulative ACT test scores, which are the closest indicators of intelligence available, the two poorest teachers had scores of 89 and 96, whereas the two best teachers had scores of 80 and 85. Such a negative relation may have implications for future research.

CONCLUSIONS

From the hypothesis made in Chapter II, the data supports the hypothesis that certain speech abilities correlate highly with teaching proficiency in assessing good and poor teachers. The data also indicates that there are speaking characteristics which are readily observable. On the other hand, the data did

not support the hypothesized relation of teaching ability and intelligence scores, nor did the data indicate that better teachers are superior in all speaking characteristics than the poor teachers.

ORGANIZATION

disorganized ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ organized
confused ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ clear
bad ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ good

VISUAL AIDS

not used ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ used
bad ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ good

III. RELATION TO THE STUDENT

In this section we are trying to evaluate the A) Reaction of the Class to the student teacher, and B) The Effectiveness of the Communication between teacher and student.

REACTION OF CLASS

attentive ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ unattentive
engrossed ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ bored
well behaved ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ disorderly
interested ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ disinterested
good ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ bad

COMMUNICATIVENESS

inefficient ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ efficient
ineffective ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ effective
bad ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ good

The following rating sheet was used by the classes to evaluate the student teachers.

VOICE

pleasant _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ unpleasant

fast _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ slow

pleasing _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ distracting

PHYSICAL MANNER

awkward _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ poised

nervous _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ self-confident

PERSONALITY

liked _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ disliked

interesting _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ uninteresting

APPEARANCE

bad _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ good

REACTION OF CLASS

engrossed _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ bored

well behaved _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ disorderly

interested _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ disinterested

APPENDIX B

RAW DATA

Subject #1

	examiner's rating	supervisor's rating	self rating	class rating
Voice	5.95	4.96	4.88	4.65
Physical Manner	5.84	5.00	4.60	5.38
Personality	5.92	4.33	4.25	3.51
Appearance	6.10	5.33	5.00	4.51
Language	5.96	5.00	5.66	
Organization	6.06	5.55	5.00	
Visual Aids	4.30	4.00	5.50	
Reaction of Class	5.98	4.00	5.00	3.04
Communicativeness	6.23	5.00	5.33	
	5.76	4.71	4.94	4.13

Subject #2

	examiner's rating	supervisor's rating	self rating	class rating
Voice	5.95	5.05	4.88	4.65
Physical Manner	5.84	5.55	4.60	5.38
Personality	5.92	4.56	4.25	3.51
Appearance	6.10	6.00	5.00	4.31
Language	5.96	6.08	5.66	
Organization	6.06	5.66	5.00	
Visual Aids	4.30	4.25	5.50	
Reaction of Class	5.98	5.05	5.00	3.04
Communicativeness	6.23	5.08	5.33	4.13
	5.76	5.21	4.94	4.13

Subject #3

	examiner's rating	supervisor's rating	self rating	class rating
Voice	3.20	3.13	4.33	4.14
Physical Manner	3.32	2.95	4.40	3.09
Personality	2.90	3.31	4.00	4.61
Appearance	3.50	2.75	4.00	4.37
Language	2.53	2.41	3.66	
Organization	3.73	2.77	4.66	
Visual Aids	3.90	3.00	4.00	
Reaction of Class	3.76	3.10	4.60	3.48
Communicativeness	3.50	4.08	4.00	
	3.22	2.94	4.25	3.87

Subject #4

	examiner's rating	supervisor's rating	self rating	class rating
Voice	6.17	6.11	5.44	5.19
Physical Manner	6.64	6.15	6.00	5.96
Personality	5.95	6.12	4.50	5.35
Appearance	6.30	7.00	6.00	6.42
Language	6.26	6.75	5.00	
Organization	6.63	7.00	5.00	
Visual Aids	5.50	7.00	4.00	
Reaction of Class	5.74	6.25	4.20	4.47
Communicativeness	6.10	6.83	5.00	
	5.98	6.13	5.08	5.27

Subject #5

	examiner's rating	supervisor's rating	self rating	class rating
Voice	3.91	5.11	5.55	4.97
Physical Manner	3.88	4.05	4.80	4.78
Personality	3.70	4.56	4.50	4.87
Appearance	4.85	3.37	6.00	5.81
Language	4.40	5.25	6.00	
Organization	4.53	3.41	4.66	
Visual Aids	5.00	3.75	4.00	
Reaction of Class	5.08	4.95	5.40	4.58
Communicativeness	4.53	5.16	6.00	
	4.05	4.58	5.25	4.89

Subject #6

	examiner's rating	supervisor's rating	self rating	class rating
Voice	4.57	4.81	4.88	
Physical Manner	4.82	5.46	3.60	
Personality	4.22	5.06	4.50	
Appearance	5.95	6.66	6.00	
Language	4.06	5.00	6.00	
Organization	4.33	5.44	4.33	
Visual Aids	4.37	5.16	5.50	
Reaction of Class	4.56	5.46	3.80	
Communicativeness	4.33	5.77	5.33	
	4.45	5.44	4.69	

Subject #7

	examiner's rating	supervisor's rating	self rating	class rating
Voice	4.82	5.16	3.77	5.02
Physical Manner	3.78	4.35	4.80	4.62
Personality	3.85	4.06	3.75	4.93
Appearance	2.90	4.25	5.00	4.25
Language	4.63	5.25	5.66	
Organization	4.63	4.41	4.66	
Visual Aids	4.37	4.00	4.50	
Reaction of Class	3.10	4.15	5.20	4.04
Communicativeness	4.16	4.25	4.33	
	3.96	4.48	4.50	4.59

Subject #8

	examiner's rating	supervisor's rating	self rating	class rating
Voice	4.11	4.51	3.22	6.47
Physical Manner	3.98	4.50	5.20	5.93
Personality	4.02	5.08	5.00	6.43
Appearance	4.30	6.16	6.00	6.91
Language	4.13	5.11	4.66	
Organization	4.20	5.77	5.00	
Visual Aids	4.00	4.00	3.00	
Reaction of Class	4.16	4.93	3.60	4.84
Communicativeness	4.16	5.66	5.00	
	3.93	4.88	3.75	5.96

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BOOKS

Osgood, C.E., Suci, G.J., and Tannenbaum, P.H. The Measurement of Meaning. Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1949.

PERIODICALS

Haberman, Frederick W. "Toward the Ideal Teacher of Speech," Speech Teacher, X (January, 1961), 1-9.

Henrikson, Ernest H. "An Analysis of the Characteristics of Some 'Good' and 'Poor' Speakers," Speech Monographs, XI (January, 1944), 120-124.

Huckleberry, Alan W. "When You Seek Advice," Speech Teacher, II (January, 1953), 49-51.

_____. "The Relationship Between Change in Speech Proficiency and Change in Student Teaching Proficiency," Speech Monographs, XVII (November, 1950), 378-89.

Lillywhite, Herold. "Speech Needs of Teachers," Quarterly Journal of Speech, XXXII (December, 1946), 496-501.

Mallory, Edith B., and Miller, Virginia. "A Possible Basis for the Association of Voice Characteristics and Personality Traits," Speech Monographs, XXV (November, 1958), 260.

McCoard, William B. "Speech Factors as Related to Teaching Efficiency," Speech Monographs, XI (January, 1944), 53-64.

Moore, Wilbur C. "Factors Related to Achievement and Improvement in Public Speaking," Quarterly Journal of Speech, XXIX (April, 1943), 213-217.

Morrie, D. W., and Huckleberry, Alan W. "The Student Teacher's Speech," Quarterly Journal of Speech, XXIX (December, 1943), 485-89.

Steer, Max D., and Tiffin, Joseph. "A Photographic Study of the Use of Intensity by Superior Speakers," Speech Monographs, I (January, 1934), 72-78.

UNPUBLISHED MATERIAL

Becker, Albert B. "The Speech Characteristics of Superior and Inferior High School Teachers as Revealed by Student Reaction." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Northwestern University, 1949.

Pugh, Neva Kesterson. "The Relationships Between the Reactions of Pupils Toward Teachers and Programs of Teacher Preparation." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, The University of Oklahoma, 1964.