Basic Communication Course Annual

Volume 14 Article 13

2002

Basic Communication Course Annual Vol. 14

Follow this and additional works at: http://ecommons.udayton.edu/bcca

Part of the Higher Education Commons, Interpersonal and Small Group Communication Commons, Mass Communication Commons, Other Communication Commons, and the Speech and Rhetorical Studies Commons

Recommended Citation

(2002) "Basic Communication Course Annual Vol. 14," *Basic Communication Course Annual*: Vol. 14 , Article 13.
Available at: http://ecommons.udayton.edu/bcca/vol14/iss1/13

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Department of Communication at eCommons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Basic Communication Course Annual by an authorized editor of eCommons. For more information, please contact frice1@udayton.edu, mschlangen1@udayton.edu.

Basic Communication Course Annual

14

2002

Deanna D. Sellnow
Editor

BASIC COMMUNICATION COURSE ANNUAL 14

2002

EDITOR
Deanna D. Sellnow
North Dakota State University

published by
american press
Boston, Massachusetts

Copyright © 2002 by American Press.
ISBN 0-89641-375-6

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording, or otherwise, without the prior written permission of the copyright owner.

Printed in the United States of America.

Editorial Board

Deanna D. Sellnow, Editor
North Dakota State University

Joe Ayres
Washington State Univ.

Melissa Beall
University of Northern Iowa

Jacquelyn Buckrop
Ball State University

Nancy Buerkel-Rothfuss
Central Michigan Univ.

Pamela Cooper
Northwestern University

Lynn Disbrow
Sinclair Community College

Karen Dwyer
Univ. of Nebraska-Omaha

Gustav W. Friedrich
Rutgers University

Lisa J. Goodnight
Purdue University, Calumet

Jonathan M. Gray
Southern Illinois University

Pamela Gray
Central Michigan Univ

Nancy Rost Goulden
Kansas State University

Lawrence W. Hugenberg
Youngstown State Univ.

John J. Mckay
Bowling Green State Univ.

John M. Murphy
University of Georgia

Mary Hasslerud Opp
University of North Dakota

Terry Perkins
Eastern Illinois University

Warren Sandmann
MN State Univ, Mankato

Matthew Seeger
Wayne State University

William J. Seiler
University of Nebraska

Amy R. Slagell
Iowa State University

Robert E. Smith
Purdue University

Scott Titsworth
*Minnesota State Univ,
Moorhead*

Robert R. Ulmer
Univ. Arkansas, Little Rock

Samuel P. Wallace
University of Dayton

Julia Wood
Univ. of North Carolina

Esther Yook
Mary Washington College

Editor's Page

This volume of the *Basic Communication Course Annual* marks the end of my second rewarding year as editor. I'd like to take a moment to thank each member of the Editorial Board for your work in making this year's volume something we can all be proud of. It truly highlights the quality research being done to continually improve the basic course. Any journal is only as good as its reviewers. Your conscientious work has made this issue of the *Annual* another outstanding one. I'd also like to thank the authors for your careful attention to the reviewer suggestions when revising your manuscripts. Doing so makes your essays even more helpful to the field.

Similar to last year, this volume of the *Annual* is arranged thematically. You'll notice that the first two essays focus on broad considerations about how we envision the basic course. Nancy Rost Goulden proposes a paradigm shift both in terms of how we think about the public speaking fundamentals course and how we teach it. She supports her argument with contemporary research in the field. Calvin Troup focuses more specifically on the need to teach public speaking in a very student-centered way with the goal of fostering a sense of democratic citizenship among students.

The next two articles focus on the impact of speech laboratories on students' learning. More and more schools are implementing speech laboratories. Hence, these articles are timely indeed. Stephen Hunt and Cheri Simonds examine the efficacy of speech laboratory experiences on student grades and student perceptions of individual growth. Karen Kangas Dwyer, Robert Carlson, and Sally Kahre investigate the relationship between a lab-supported public speaking course and communication apprehension. Since public speaking continues to be the most common "basic" course offered in communication departments across the country, the degree to which we address communication anxiety remains extremely important.

The final three manuscripts focus on particular aspects of the basic course and how well instructors address them. First, Karen Anderson and Karla Kay Jensen examine the speech evaluation process. More specifically, they focus on the degree to which the evaluation instrument and /or the evaluator's experience influence the integrity of the process. Laura Janusik and Andrew Wolvin investigate the treatment of listening in public speaking textbooks, something research suggests is instrumental to the course. Finally, Julia Johnson, Susan Pliner, and Tom Burkhart offer strategies for creating safe learning environments for diverse student populations using the Universal Instruction Design. They do so by addressing the accommodations they made for a student in their course who is d/Deaf.

Combined, these articles remind us of the complex nature of what we call the "basic" course. What is more exciting, however, is the way in which they challenge us to question why we approach the course as we do. I do hope you enjoy the intellectual process of reading these manuscripts!

Deanna D. Sellnow

Contents

Revising Public Speaking Theory, Content, and Pedagogy: A Review of the Issues in the Discipline in the 1990's 1
Nancy Rost Goulden

Literature from the 1990's calling for revision of basic course public speaking theory and pedagogy is examined, summarized, and organized. Discussion of sources that shape and maintain public speaking theory provides background for the reports of journal articles and conference papers categorized under (1) overall perspectives that influence theory, (2) basic theory of what characteristics constitute effective speaking, (3) appropriate course content, and (4) appropriate pedagogy. The dominant theme for change calls for a new theoretical perspective of effective speaking rejecting emphasis on traditional speech behaviors and supported by changes in attitudes and pedagogy, characterized by flexibility, openness, reliance on contemporary research, responsiveness to the needs of students and audiences, and featuring high levels of democratic student participation.

Common Sense in the Basic Public Speaking Course 39
Calvin L. Troup

The foundation of the basic public speaking course ought be questioned and modified to better meet the needs of students today. More specifically, public speaking courses must offer more than technique. Students must be introduced to the historical context that both models effective public discourse and has also contributed to the framework of the American *public forum. This article offers some common sense ideas about what the public forum ought to be. Implementation of these ideas, among other things, will serve to enrich the substance of the course, introduce the central role of rhetoric in American history, culture, and politics; as well as enhance instructor credibility.*

Extending Learning Opportunities in the Basic Communication Course: Exploring the Pedagogical Benefits of Speech Laboratories 60
Stephen K. Hunt and Cheri J. Simonds

This study asked 527 students enrolled in a basic communication course to evaluate the efficacy of a speech lab in relation to speech requirements stipulated by their instructors. In addition, the researchers examined the scores of 435 student speeches to determine if students who visited the lab earned higher grades compared to students that did not visit the lab. Results showed that (a) most instructors require their students to visit the lab before at least one speech, (b) the vast majority of students perceive the help they receive in the lab to be very useful, and (c) students who visit the lab prior to their speeches earn significantly higher grades on speeches than those who do not visit the lab.

Communication Apprehension and Basic Course Success: The Lab-supported Public Speaking Course Intervention 87
Karen Kangas Dwyer, Robert E. Carlson
and Sally A. Kahre

This study examined a lab-supported public speaking course as an intervention for helping reduce overall and context communication apprehension (CA) for high and moderate CA students. In addition, this study queried whether actual lab usage was related to CA reduction and to course grade for those students. Results showed that the lab-supported *public speaking course helped high and moderate CAs significantly reduce overall CA and CA in public speaking, group discussions, meetings, and interpersonal conversation contexts. There was no difference in reduction of CA level between high and moderate CAs who utilized the speech lab and those who did not. However, high CAs who utilized the speech lab earned higher course grades than those who did not use the lab.*

An Examination of the Speech Evaluation Process: Does the Evaluation Instrument an/or Evaluator's Experience Matter? 113
Karen Anderson and Karla Kay Jensen

Speech evaluation forms are a useful and necessary tool of any communication course with a public speaking component. The continued investigation of how such forms are created and used is beneficial to students and teachers. In this study, raters from various experience levels graded two speeches using a combination of four evaluation forms, half of which included directions. Raters then responded to questions regarding the forms they just used. Results indicate that experience level and form type influence the speech grade given. Additionally, raters' responses regarding the forms reveal how they view the use of forms in the speech evaluation process.

Listening Treatment in the Basic Communication Course Text 164
Laura A. Janusik and Andrew D. Wolvin

Numerous studies have indicated that listening is instrumental for academic and professional success, and most students receive listening instruction only in the basic communication course. This study analyzed the treatment of listening in the 17 most widely used basic communication course textbooks. The majority of the textbooks did devote at least one chapter to listening; however, the treatment was gener-

ally light, atheoretical, and lacked substantive listening scholarship.

d/Deafness and the Basic Course: A Case Study of Universal Instructional Design and Students Who are d/Deaf in the (aural) Communication Classroom 211
Julia R. Johnson, Susan M. Pliner, and Tom Burkhart

The primary purpose of this essay is to suggest ways to create a universally inclusive curriculum, which, by definition, addresses the learning needs of all students, including students with disabilities or, in this case, students who are deaf or hard-of-hearing. Presented with the opportunity of having a d/Deaf student in a public speaking class, we reflect on the accommodations made, the assumptions inherent in an inclusive classroom, and the ideology of ableism. Because d/Deafness is as much a cultural identity as an auditory condition, we also address how to create safe learning environments for diverse student populations through the use of Universal Instructional Design.

Author Identification 242

Index of Titles 246

Index of Authors 258

Submission Guidelines 261

Revising Public Speaking Theory, Content, and Pedagogy: A Review of the Issues in the Discipline in the 1990's

Nancy Rost Goulden

INTRODUCTION

Significance of Public Speaking Reform

In the 1990's the on-going trend to redefine the curriculum and scope of the discipline was reflected in departmental name changes, new course and program offerings, and most tellingly, the deletion of the word "speech" from the name of our national organization. In spite of these evolutionary developments, basic public speaking courses have not been abandoned as an outdated area for instruction, but have remained firmly situated at the heart of what we teach. The latest national survey in 1996 of the basic communication course (Morreale, Hanna, Berko, & Gibson, 1999) shows that public speaking is still the dominant (55%) introductory course offered at the responding institutions. The basic public speaking course continues to generate large numbers of students and teaching hours while also consuming large amounts of personnel time and departmental resources. It often is the course by which outsiders identify and define the discipline.

Public speaking continues to hold a central position as a university course at a time when new theories and pedagogies are stimulating reexamination of what and how we teach. Not only has the communication discipline been strongly influenced in recent years by perspectives related to constructionist view of social interaction, feminist and intercultural issues, and power, but these same topics have promoted introspection and change in higher education in many other disciplines. Because of the importance of this introductory course both within and beyond the communication field and because our discipline and higher education are both undergoing a period of reinvention, this is a particularly apt time to review the thinking of public speaking scholars who are speaking out about what they see as inappropriate or outdated assumptions and practices related to public speaking course content and pedagogy.

Approach to the Study

The purpose of this study is to locate and organize these public calls for change found in journal articles and conference papers from approximately the last ten years in order to answer the question: What are the primary reform issues related to the theory and teaching of public speaking raised by public speaking scholars and educators in this time period? This compilation of essays is also designed to serve as a resource for those who wish to find information about specific issues and for those who are interested in current emphases and status of public speaking reform initiatives in general. Making this body of literature more readily accessible promotes validation for those who are in harmony with the authors in their beliefs about how the basic public speaking course can be adapted for changing times. The collective power of the unique ideas and arguments in the essays reviewed may also provide impetus for promoting reasoned change in our understanding and teaching of the basic public speaking course.

The first search for reform articles was conducted using the ERIC Database for the 1990's. Then all issues of *Basic Communication Course Annual* 1990-1999 and the bibliographies of materials located in the ERIC search were scanned to find additional items. Sources that primarily focused on how to implement teaching techniques (e.g. use of technology, adaptation of the course for special groups) or specific programs were excluded, as were sources dealing with change issues related to basic communication courses as a whole and administration of a basic speech course.

The types of sources of the remaining 27 essays were then noted. Perhaps not surprisingly, many of the "position" papers were originally written and presented orally as convention papers, a format that by combining written and oral presentations lends itself well to the reformer's pleas. Of the print publications, many are from *Basic Communication Course Annual*, with a small representation of articles published in *Communication Education*. Some articles included an empirical study, but the more common format was to make an argument supported by authority, often from outside the discipline.

REPORT OF PUBLIC SPEAKING REFORM LITERATURE FROM THE 1990'S

The central issues from each essay were identified and categorized into appropriate categories. These categories ultimately are based on what the reformers believe about the theoretical nature of public speaking and public speaking instruction. Therefore, before the issues themselves are presented and discussed, the background of public speaking theory and the sources of that theory are explored.

Theoretical Background and Nature of Public Speaking Courses

Individually and collectively public speaking courses operate under accepted theoretical templates made up of a basic theory and two corollaries that follow from the foundational theory. The theoretical base for all public speaking courses begins with beliefs about what composes effective communication (Hess & Pearson, 1992; Lucas, 1999). Most public speaking practitioners have standards of what makes a good speech and claim they recognize the features of a "good speech" when they hear it and see it. Using this basic theory of the speaking characteristics that succeed with audiences, educators in public speaking take the next logical step by determining theoretical corollaries of **what content and skills** should be taught and **how the content and skills** should be taught so students will be able to enact the features of effective speaking.

There are three major sources that influence basic public speaking theory and the two theoretical corollaries. These are: tradition, textbooks/publishers, and practitioners/scholars.

Tradition

Hess and Pearson (1992) trace the foundational theory of the nature of effective speaking back to Aristotle's *The Rhetoric*, move on through Modern Rhetoric of the 19th century and into the present era, noting that for the past 80 years there has been little significant change in the theory. They acknowledge there have been minor trends that reflect adjustment of the basic theory, but for the most part it has remained intact. And since content of courses is dependent on the theory of what makes effective speaking, course content has also been relatively constant and highly dependent on classical beliefs about effective speaking and what should be taught (Hugenberg & Moyer, 1998). Public speaking as a course usually remains centered around Aristotle's three kinds of proof and some version of the classical five cannons. The content may have been streamlined; the labels and organization of the content may have changed; informative speaking, inductive reasoning, perhaps Monroe's motivated sequence and a recognition of diversity in audiences have been added, but at the center, today's public speaking teachers for the most part teach what public teachers have traditionally taught.

In all probability, this stability of public speaking theory of effectiveness and closely related course content is not solely dependent on the habit and weight of tradition alone, but may also come from the general satisfaction and belief in the validity of the theory. Throughout time, the majority of those who determine public speaking course content have believed the traditional features are legitimately the most important attributes for successful speaking and the best topics to include in the course. Hess and Pearson (1992) support this view. "[T]his special theory is certainly well-constructed and very useful" (p. 19).

Textbooks/publishers

The resistance to change is reinforced by the practices of textbook authors and publishers. Yoder and Davilla (1997) point out the influence of textbooks on course content and procedural decisions. "Course objectives, assignments, activities, and tests are developed in tandem with the adopted textbook" (p. 12). Of the large number of public speaking texts available, many, if not most, are remarkably similar. In their study of six public speaking texts, Berens and Nance (1992) reported that although all the texts were "not identical" (p. 13), they were "quite similar in their scope (topics covered) and pedagogy" (p. 14).

Hugenberg (1994) explains that we have almost constant replication of virtually the same public speaking texts because authors consciously or unconsciously recognize that the safe way to have a successful public speaking text is to stay very close to the model of the top selling books in the field. Market-conscious writers and publishers respond to peer reviewers' (Sproule, 1991) and teachers' messages that discourage major changes in texts. Yoder and Davilla (1997) in their survey of students' and teachers' responses related to textbook features reported that "consistency of the text with their current course design" (p. 29) was one of the top three factors that influenced teachers in their selection of public speaking textbooks.

Radical new approaches by authors are often discouraged or ignored by the publishing companies (Sproule, 1991). In their content analysis study of 12 popular public speaking textbooks, Hess and Pearson (1992) discovered these texts all conformed to similar content coverage. They conclude, "[t]his finding suggests that even though writers may not always be in agreement about the facts, pressure to standardize may keep them writing about the same concepts" (p. 27). Hugenberg (1994) substantiates this belief: "[e]ditorial staffs of publishing companies follow a golden rule when preparing a textbook: *The book must be 80% old and 20% new.* And they cheat on the 20% new because they are more comfortable with 10-15% new material" (p. 22). And so, because of tradition, merit, and publishing conservatism, classical theory and content remain in a predominant and fixed position of public speaking theory and content today.

Practitioners/scholars

The primary voice for change is that of teachers and course directors of public speaking. From their observations and hands-on experimentation, educators develop their own theories both about the salient features of effective speaking and what course content and pedagogy should be. They may create a minor theory that is only a slight variation on the standard theories they have been exposed to in their training and in textbooks, or they may have an epiphany that leads to a major shift in focus for public speaking theory. The literature search on this topic confirms that in the past ten years a significant number of scholars were compelled to explore the state of public speaking and publicly call for change.

ISSUES FOR REVISION FROM THE 1990'S

This survey of the beliefs of those who write and speak about the theoretical and practical aspects of the public speaking course demonstrates that there is no unified position among reformers, either about what the nature of public speaking should be or how it should be taught. The tendency of the writers is to focus on isolated issues that are most resonant for the individual. The common thread is that something should be different from the way the writers perceive it to be at this time. Consequently, the proposed changes range from a return to the past to a major casting off of traditional thinking and practices. However when one looks at the collection of all the essays, there are patterns and trends that give some shape to the reform movement and appear to reflect related changes in thinking about public speaking courses.

These diverse issues are discussed by categories and are also presented in a graphic scheme that provides an overview of the issues and their categories. (See Figure 1.) The dialectic nature of reform (status quo as opposed

Traditional	Progressive
I. PERSPECTIVES	
Dogmatism (Textbooks from Berens & Nance, study 1992; Hugenberg & Moyer study, 1998)	**Choice** (Dalton, 1997; Hugenberg & Moyer, 1998)
Absolutism (Textbooks; Berens & Nance, 1992; Hugenberg & Moyer, 1998)	**Relativism**
II. BASIC THEORY OF EFFECTIVE SPEAKING	
Classical Characteristics (Russ &McClish, 1999)	**Research-Determined Characteristics** (Berens & Nance, 1992; Hugenberg & Moyer, 1998)
Speaking Skills	**Thinking Skills** (Russ & McClish, 1999; Hess, 1999, Macke, 1991)
Written practices (Textbooks)	**Oral Practices** (Haynes, 1990a, 1990b)
III. COURSE CONTENT/SKILL	
A. Needs (Bendtschneider & Trank, 1990) (Buerkel-Rothfuss & Kosloski, 1990)	
External Basis (Sproul, 1991; Jensfsky, 1996)	**Student Communication Needs** (Jenesfsky, 1996)
Outcome	**Process** (Matula, 1995, Dalton, 1997)
Speaker (Osborn, 1997)	**Audience** (Osborn, 1997, Rowan, 1995)

B. COURSE CONTENT/SKILLS CHOICES	
Delivery	**Speech Content** (Siddens, 1998, Russ & McClish, 1999, Macke, 1991)
Prospective (Textbooks from Berens and Nance study; Hugenberg & Moyer study)	**Descriptive** (Foss & Foss, 1994, Zeman, 1990)
Form (Osborn, 1997)	**Creativity** (Osborn, 1997)
B. COURSE CONTENT/SKILLS CHOICES	
Traditional Purposes/Assignments (Horne & Mullins, 1997; Sproule, 1991; Verderber, 1991; Lucas, 1999)	**Alternative Purposes/Assignments** (Zeman, 1990; Dalton, 1997; Rowan, 1995; Haynes, 1990a)
C. SPEECH TYPES/ASSIGNMENTS	
Knowledge Transmission	**Learning Facilitation** (Grupas, 1996)
Teacher as Authoritarian	**Teacher as Facilitator**
(Buerkel-Rothfuss & Kasloski, 1990)	
Receptive Student Behavior	**Experiential Student Behavior** (Lucas, 1999)
Single Learning Style	**Multiple Learning Styles** (Schaller & Callison, 1998; Grupaas, 1996)
Exclusive Teaching Methods	**Inclusive Teaching Methods** (Grupas, 1996, Hayward, 1993)

Figure 1. Summary of Continua for Public Speaking Theory and Pedagogy

to change) suggested a graphic representation that uses continua anchored at each end by opposing terms, showing the *traditional* viewpoint identified first (it falls at the far left of the continuum) and the *progressive* viewpoint presented second, representing the far right end of the continuum. The labels for the continua presented in this study were for the most part suggested by the language and concepts presented in the articles. Although the continua poles represent extremes, individual and institutional beliefs and practices may fall anywhere along a given continuum, and in some cases, beliefs and practices may embrace both end positions.

The issues and their representative continua are presented in the following order: (1) issues of perspective; (2) issues of theory of effective communication with an audience; (3) issues of corollary of course content/skills; and (4) issues of corollary of instructional approaches.

Issues of Perspective

The willingness or refusal of educators to change elements of the public speaking course depends heavily on one's epistemological orientation about the "truth" of what they already believe about public speaking. There appear to be at least two major perspectives that influence many of the specific beliefs related to what we "know" about public speaking. The first set represents an overarching pair of divergent epistemological views, **Dogmatism** and **Choice**. The second similar, yet slightly different, pair includes **Absolutism** and **Relativism**. Both "dogmatism" and "absolutism" suggest a very high level of confidence that what one believes is the one and only "truth." The distinction is that "absolutists" insist that their belief covers all circumstances equally well. The terms used for the poles of this second continuum are taken from Brummet's 1986 essay that laid out a model representing public speaking students' attitudinal, cognitive, and behavioral growth from an absolutist-operating stance to a relativist stance. Brummet notes that use of the model is not limited to public speaking students and their classroom behavior.

It is not unusual to hear course directors and instructors of public speaking make **dogmatic** and **absolute** remarks about what they see as essential public speaking behaviors such as, "If the speaker does not have an explicit preview of the main points in the introduction, it's all over. It just cannot be an effective speech" or "A speaker who says 'um' repeatedly distracts an audience so much that nothing else in the speech really matters."

Perhaps the best examples of **dogmatism** and **absolutism** are found in public speaking textbooks. In their 1992 textbook study, Berens and Nance observed that the common approach in the six texts they analyzed was to present students with a "list of things to do" (p. 4). Hugenberg and Moyer's 1998 study of five successful public speaking textbooks continues and expands the evidence for **dogmatism** and **absolutism** using as examples pages of statements taken from the texts that are overwhelmingly **dogmatic** in nature. Repeatedly textbook readers are told this is the behavior you must adopt to walk on the path to public speaking success. Hugenbearg and Moyer (1998) point out that the textbook authors' instructions, like true dogma, are largely unsupported and simply proclaim. "Since many [of] these claims are not supported, it is inconceivable to us that they are advanced as if they were fact. They are not fact; they are mere conjecture seemingly based on tradition and historic practice" (p. 166).

What Hugenberg and Moyer (1998) are recommending is that textbooks should instead present recommendations that represent the other end of the continuum, **Choice**. "It would be better to admit that these ideas are simply pieces of advice based on the rich tradition of teaching public speaking and/or a wealth of practical experience" (p. 166).

Dalton (1997) shifts the focus from **dogmatic** texts to **dogmatic** classroom approaches that insist students must function as unthinking machines who are required, without question, to accept and carry out the beliefs of the teacher. She asks for a perspective that includes student **choice**. "It is imperative from the very beginning, that teachers of the basic public speaking course inform their students that they do not have to think like their teacher, but they do have to think!" (p. 5). In addition to these concerns about dogmatic practices, many of the reports found in the content and pedagogy sections are directed toward moving away from the **absolutist** view to a **relativistic** view that would guide selections of content and pedagogy based on the composition of the student population and their needs.

These issues of perspective generated some of the most passionate responses found in the essays. Making a decision between the authoritarian approach of **dogma** and the more democratic approach of **choice** is foundational to all teaching, and later in the essay, additional sub-issues related to these perspective are presented. Unfortunately, there are practical considerations that discourage the abandonment of **dogmatic** and **absolutist** practices in public speaking texts and classrooms. Many students, and teachers also, seek the security of one set recipe for effective speaking. The concept of teaching public speaking without the security of "one right answer," while not new, is truly revolutionary. It is encouraging to see scholars from our discipline embracing such a fundamental change related to student learning.

Theory of Characteristics of Effective Communication with an Audience

Not surprisingly, the first continuum that represents the basic public speaking theory of effective speaking characteristics has **Classical Characteristics** as the left side traditional focus. The partner on the right side is **Characteristics Determined by Current Research.**

In the classical camp are the great preponderance of advocates who support the traditions of Aristotle, Socrates, Isocrates, Cicero, and Quintilian. The Hugenberg and Moyer (1998) and the Berens and Nance (1992) textbook studies endorse the opposite end of the continuum recommending **Current Research** to determine the elements of effective speaking. It is a little difficult to know where to locate the stance of Russ and McClish (1999) who propose that the basic public speaking course be designed around Plato's *Phaedrus*. Although they advocate a text from the Classical Era, the theory of effective speaking characteristics they promote seems to represent a progressive rather than traditional basis. They write, "we recommend assigning a public speaking text that was written not to describe the minute details of the art, but to inspire students to rethink the generalizations and assumptions they bring to the podium" (p.320).

Russ and McClish 's (1999) rejection of the external, prescriptive approach to speech preparation and presentation ("minute details of the art") leads to a second dialectic related to the basic theory of what makes effective speaking. The suggestion here is that the effective speaker does not so much need skills of composition and delivery, but instead requires critical thinking skills that develop from personal reflection. This continuum is labeled **Speaking Skills** and **Thinking Skills**. Hess (1999) reports that he has moved the course he teaches away from the external skills that evaluators or audiences see and toward the internal **thinking skills**. In his scheme, the general areas of personal cognition and student speaking practices are guided by the framework of an ethical perspective. Hess states, "Rather than teaching the students *how*, this approach teaches the students *why*, and the *how* naturally follows" (p. 319). Macke (1991) reaches a similar conclusion that the effective speaker is not a performer but an alert, aware person who is actively thinking. He states, "The question of what should be included in the 'basic course' of speech instruction should, thus, not be 'What can we teach students to 'do' *with* themselves?—how can we fill up their notebooks with information?,' but 'How can we teach students to think *about*, to think *of* themselves?'" (p.140).

Most of the scholars whose work and ideas are shared in this essay are asking for fairly limited modifications to beliefs about, and methods of, teaching public speaking. In contrast, Haynes (1990a, 1990b) in his landmark proposals for moving from a writing based approach for public speaking to a true oral base has proposed a fundamental redefinition of what public speaking is in an electronic media age and what characteristics are needed in contemporary society for effective speaking. The continuum that represents this major departure from traditional theory of the characteristics of effective speaking is labeled **Written Practices** and **Oral Practices.**

Haynes (1990a, 1990b) claims that the traditional approach to public speaking relies on writing-based thinking. Notice that his label of "writing-based thinking" refers to structured patterns that direct speaker thinking about speech composition rather than the personal reflection and exploration Russ and McClish, Hess, and Macke promote. Haynes supports the writing composition connection by pointing to a common characteristic of public speaking texts: "enormous effort goes into describing the process of constructing speeches that is remarkably like the writing-based rhetoric of freshman composition courses" (Haynes, 1990b, p. 92). Haynes (1990a) further illustrates the prevalence of the writing mode model in public speaking instruction by noting the current emphasis on "division of the world into dichotomies" (p.90). Examples of this emphasis on order and structure are: typical public speaking class activities designed to test arguments and evidence, the conventions of using stock organizational patterns, the oral sharing of speech organization, including the substructure of the speech, with the listening audience. Haynes (1990a) contrasts these left-brained writing behaviors to speech-based thinking and discourse, characterized by natural flow or continuity rather than deliberate structuring and a lack of methodical examination and testing of ideas and strategies before presentation.

An additional difference between the pre-set writing approach of creating texts to be presented orally and the spontaneous, flexible oral approach is further highlighted in the partnership of writing practices with a reliance on "absolute truths and falsehoods," (Haynes, 1990a, p. 90). Haynes (1990b) points to the trap of inconsistency dogmatic and absolutist public speaking texts fall into when they leave no room for deviation from the set speech. [Textbooks] "mention the importance of adapting to feedback from the audience early on but then devote their efforts to teaching the construction of fixed texts that deter if not preclude such adaptation." (p. 92).

In the "oral practices" approach as proposed by Haynes (1990b), the primary efforts of the speaker would be to become so thoroughly immersed in the speech subject that, in effect, at the moment of speaking, the speakers could pull from their files of knowledge and compose the best speech for that specific audience. No longer tied down by the paraphernalia of fixed text such as manuscript and extensive notes, the speaker would be free to carry on authentic interaction with the audience. The characteristics of the effective speech in the electronic media age would focus on conversational, intimate, almost communal, sharing of knowledge by the "expert" speaker.

Haynes's sketch of this new model of an effective speech is a logical extension of the shift in emphasis from conventional classroom public speaking behaviors to the emphasis on thinking proposed by other scholars in this section. The idea of changing the paradigm of speech preparation to focus on the interior rather than the exterior, to give speakers the freedom to create unique messages for specific audiences at the time of presentation rather than relying on external rules and templates is exciting, provocative, and somewhat frightening as are most major changes. This is unexplored territory, and there is the whispered fear that public speaking teachers either will not know how to teach "oral practices" or there will be nothing to teach. Fortunately, for the educators who have the courage to move toward this new theory of speech characteristics in the electronic era, several of the writers who address the issues related to the corollaries of content and pedagogy have been thinking along lines that may be helpful in teaching a new kind of speechmaking.

Corollary of Content/Skills That Contribute to Students Becoming Effective Speakers

Although the group of essays in this section, generally, deals with more specific and concrete issues than the essays that focus on theory, the section begins with consideration of the abstract criteria that inform the process of making decisions about content and skills.

Determination of whose and what needs to address. The first continuum reflects what practioners believe the criteria base for content decisions should be, either an **External Basis** or **Student Communication Needs**. These two poles are suggested in Bendtschneider and Trank's 1990 survey of instructors, students, and alumni that was designed to discover how successfully topics and skills taught in the public speaking course met the often divergent needs of the respondents.

The traditional approach at the left side of the continuum, related to the **dogmatic** bias, is **External Basis.** This represents the situation when the course content is set by textbooks, teacher preference, departmental policy, post-graduation employment preferences, and civic speaking expectations rather than the opposite pole based on specific knowledge of the **communication needs** of the students enrolled in the course. An alternative wording for this dichotomy is found in Buerkel-Rothfuss and Kosloski's 1990 essay in which they look at organizational theories as a means to evaluate and identify possible research questions related to basic communication courses. Three of the theories they put forth essentially partner task or work concerns (the analogue of **External Basis**) against human concerns (**Student Communication Needs**).

Within the grab bag of **External Basis**, Sproule (1991) speaks up for privileging society's need for speakers who can carry on a "reasoned discussion of civic issues" (p.1) in public life over the trend of producing speakers to fulfill the needs of the world of commerce, another **external** need. He suggests that what could be interpreted as a **student needs** focus, the need for career success, is driven by the historical trend of teaching a model that fits the needs of the professional and business world.

Jenefsky (1996) supports an **External Basis** for course content decisions similar to Sproule's. She sees the objective of learning to be the production of effective speakers in the public sphere who meet the needs of addressing social injustices. In her vision of the ideal classroom, however, the strong source for content decisions would be the **Student Communication Needs** for self-expression. She believes that by speaking "with authority about their own lives both within contexts that feel like home and those that feel alienating" (p. 352), students will become empowered and be able to become spokespersons for social change.

A second area of concern related to the needs-basis for content decisions focuses not on interested parties' competing goals but on which set of student needs should determine the content of the course. In his essay, Matula (1995) introduces the terms "outcome paradigm" and "ritual/process approach" that are borrowed for this continuum. Inherent in the two poles of the **Outcome** and **Process** continuum, which may be the operationalization of the **Speaking Skills/Thinking Skills** continuum discussed above, is the question of whether student needs are best fulfilled by focusing on the outcome of speech performance or on the "communication processes such as devising ideas for speeches, writing the speech, and thinking about the speech afterwards" (p. 4). Matula champions the process approach and its benefits by recommending that public speaking classes need a better balance between the product and the process, including evaluation of the process.

Matula's ideas about outcome and process are also supported by Dalton (1997) when she writes, "I argue that the main point of public speaking is not structure or performance, but rather communicating something meaningful, developing ideas, justifying and providing rationale for arguments, and bringing community together" (p. 6). Dalton's understanding of the elements of the process also have implications for the next needs area—the opposing forces of needs and concerns of the speaker as opposed to the needs of the audience.

Michael Osborn, one of the co-authors of a widely-used public speaking text, in his essay (1997) reflects on the metaphors he discovered embedded in the textbook following the production of a new edition. One of the metaphors is that of "student as climber." He observers that both speakers and listeners build barriers through their fears and suspicions that form a mountain between them and that part of the process of learning about public speaking is that both speaker and listeners can learn how to climb to the top of the mountain and meet each other. Recognizing the needs and concerns of both speaker and audience forms the continua simply labeled "**Speaker**" on the left and "**Audience**" on the right.

Rowan (1995) expresses concern about the dominance of speaker-needs over audience-needs perspective advocated in public speaking texts. This unbalanced focus is especially troublesome when students are instructed to develop goals, purposes, and objectives for their speeches that overlook the role of the audience. Perhaps Osborn's "top of the mountain" and Rowan's balanced focus represented the ideal shared social construction of meaning in the middle of the continuum.

Choice of course content and skills. Issues related to what content or skill areas are necessary or desirable in public speaking courses follow from decisions related to needs. The perennial question for speech educators who teach a traditional speaking skills course is whether the primary efforts in the course should focus on **Delivery** or **Content**. Siddens (1998) explored teacher beliefs about the relative importance of the two areas in his survey of teaching assistants and faculty at two universities. His results appear to confirm what is suggested by the relative coverage of "delivery" and "content" in public speaking texts. Most teachers responded that they believe both are important, but if they have to choose one over the other, **content** is the overwhelming victor.

This dialectic has some relationship with the dialectic **Speaking Skills** and **Thinking Skills** discussed in the section "Theory of Characteristics of Effective Communication with an Audience" where the writers (Russ and McClish, 1999 and Macke, 1991) suggest that speaking skills grow out of thinking skills rather than through a mechanistic drill approach to delivery. Such a stance also places the views of these educators in the **Content** area of the continua.

The next course content/skills continuum is closely related to the conflicting perspectives of **dogmatism** and **choice**. The labels **Prescriptive** and **Descriptive** reflect the two approaches of telling students exactly what to do in speech preparation and presentation as opposed to providing students with stimuli or a menu of choices from which to make independent decisions about their speeches.

As pointed out earlier, the textbook studies of Berens and Nance (1992) and Hugenberg and Moyer (1998) confirm the dominance of prescriptive content in influential textbooks. In contrast, a few texts such as the

Foss and Foss textbook, *Inviting Transformation: Presentational Speaking for a Changing World* (1994) offers students a menu, reflecting many possibilities based on strategies contemporary speakers use for each step of speech making.

It is not merely self-determination that the advocates of the **descriptive** end of the continuum advocate, but also self-exploration on the road to making one's own choices. Zeman (1990) centers this self-discovery on the cannon of invention. He looks at and rejects the prescriptive content of several public speaking texts and replaces it with prompts that allow students to center on their own unique discoveries rather than just follow a formula, a process that parallels the emphasis on **thinking skills** as opposed to **speaking skills** in Haynes' **Oral Practices** model.

Osborn (1997) introduces the dichotomy of **Form** and **Creativity**, two content/skills areas closely related to **Prescription** and **Description.** He first asserts that students need to be taught **form.** This is a comforting argument for those who in their imaginations are projecting the great "content vacuum" of Haynes' vid-oral style. Osborn supports this claim by arguing that people have a need "to shape the world around us to our needs and purposes—to impose order and purpose upon the chaos or sensations that surrounds us . . . . [W]e need to give our students the gift of a sense of form" (p. 3). Osborn balances the two end points of the continuum by supporting what he considers a neglected content focus in public speaking courses, **creativity.** "I would emphasize that public speaking nourishes—or ought to nourish—creativity in students . . . . Creative speaking encourages originality of language, thought, and expression as students explore themselves and their world in classroom speeches" (p. 5).

Types of speeches and speaking assignments. One of the most pervasive and enduring prescriptions related to the content and skills of public speaking courses is the division of all speaking into Persuasive and Informative speeches (Zeman, 1987). Although occasionally ceremonial speeches and speeches to entertain are included in courses and texts, the prescriptive codification of the course usually forces course organization and assignments to fit into the two major categories. The obvious continuum to begin this section of types of speeches and speaking assignments is **Traditional Speech Purposes/Assignment** as opposed to **Alternative Speech Purposes/Assignments.**

Under the **Traditional** category are both the speech contexts/purposes from the classical era and the division of speeches by informative and persuasive purposes. Two of the reform articles in this section want change that would locate speech assignments more closely to the classical contexts/purposes of speaking than to the more contemporary purposes that often call for practical speeches designed for the business world. Both Horne and Mullins (1997) and Sproule (1991) support the belief that students need to be prepared to speak in the civic and ceremonial settings as classical orators were trained to do. In addition, they claim greater emphasis on epideictic and public-issue-oriented speech assignments would provide cultural and societal benefits, namely "clarifying and transmitting cultural values" and "instigating civic virtues in modern societies" (Horne and Mullins, p. 5).

Sproule (1991) traces the steps by which "discourse has atrophied in a social climate that provides little space for reasoned discussion of civic issues" (p. 1) as he reviews the movement since the time of the Civil War away from the classical purpose of public or civic speaking to speaking for personal success in the business world. He claims, "speech educators can accomplish all their current goals as well as some other useful objectives by giving students a wider context for visualizing themselves as speakers. By providing a broader model of public life it may be possible to strengthen the public sphere at the same time that we build more confident and competent speakers" (p. 11).

Two prominent public speaking textbook authors remain in the **Traditional Purposes/Assignments** camp with their support of the status quo division of speeches into those that have as their purpose "to inform" and "to persuade." Verderber (1991), when writing about what should be included in a basic public speaking course, states that speech assignment should be based on the informative and persuasive categories. Lucas (1999) does admit that there are alternatives to informative and persuasive speaking assignments, but his acknowledgment is more an afterthought to the central assumption that these are the two categories to be used for speaking assignments.

On the other hand, Zeman (1990) argues that there "is no real functional reason" (p. 1) for this traditional division of speeches into persuasive and informative sets and recommends that we break with this empty ritual and adopt what he terms the "propositional approach." He brings up the familiar argument that all communication is designed to influence and so a discrete informative category may not even exist. Further support for this view comes from Dalton (1997) who concludes, "The distinction between informative and persuasive speaking is anachronistic at best" (p. 20).

Rowan (1995) gives further examples of the confusion that results from trying to force speeches into the informative classification. She claims part of the problem lies with a historical lack of clarity of what informative discourse even means. Sometimes it refers to subject matter, sometimes an arrangement form.

Based on his stance of supporting a theoretical shift away from using only writing-based features to including vid-oral based features, it is appropriate that Haynes (1990a) recommends that narrative speaking, an alternative speech assignment, be given a more important position than the traditional argumentative speaking. Dalton (1997) also recognizes the need to include oral-based thinking to reflect the place of orality in the culture. She sees using narrative speaking in the public speaking classroom as an appropriate and helpful response to these realities.

Corollary of Instructional Approaches That Contribute to Students Becoming Effective Speakers

In addition to considering improving the public speaking course by revising the basic theory and the content choices, scholars are also concerned with how the course is taught. Individual teachers probably have more latitude in this area than those of theory and content. Textbooks can shape or perhaps limit a teacher's instructional approaches through the use of material that lends itself well to a particular methodology, but most textual elements can be ignored or supplemented. Hence, this corollary is determined more by practitioners and scholars than by textbooks. Tradition, however, does play a role, in this case through the models of teaching in higher education that have been practiced in the past and that are widely retained today. Reports on papers that focus on pedagogical issues are arranged by (1) overall instructional perspective and (2) teaching methodologies.

Overall instructional perspectives. Teachers or course directors may not consciously decide and articulate their broad beliefs about teaching, but instead gradually make small decisions that form a perspective. The first of these overall perspectives about teaching is represented by the continuum set **Knowledge Transmission** on the left, opposing **Learning Facilitation** on the right. Grupas (1996) uses these terms to emphasize how instructional orientation affects a teacher's decisions about a course and day-to-day conduct of the course. The historical view that the instructor's primary job is to disseminate information, hopefully leading to knowledge, is still very common today. In many university and college classrooms, the picture is of the professor in the front sending words, often dogmatic and prescriptive, out to the students in their seats. Grupas (1996) is supporting changes in instructional practices that originate in teachers' perceptions that their main task is not to broadcast information, but to find and implement strategies to help their students learn the material and skills of the course.

The next continuum is logically related to educators' views of their teaching mission discussed above since it deals with the role of the teacher, this time in regard to authority. The tradition pole refers to the **Teacher as Authoritarian** and the progressive pole identifies the **Teacher as Facilitator.** The choice here is between the role of absolute ruler of both knowledge and classroom protocol or a role as an overseer who provides needed information and structures to enable the classroom to run smoothly so that learning may flourish. Although Buerkel-Rothfuss and Kasloski in their 1990 essay do not take a stand that supports any specific point on the continuum, they do provide a discussion of the variety of attitudes and behaviors a teacher may adopt relative to authority and rules, such as explicit and implicit rules, negotiable rules, and the syllabus as a source of rules.

The third general teaching perspective is based on the issue of whether students learn best in a classroom based on **Receptive Student Behavior** or **Experiential Student Behavior**. The picture above of the knowledge-transmission teacher requires **Receptive Student Behavior**. The contrasting picture of a busy classroom of students talking, working in groups, speaking, and demonstrating, represents **Experiential Student Behaviors**. Lucas (1999) strongly endorses this latter perspective. "[L]earning [public speaking] skills is an experiential process that requires extensive practice and repetition" (p. 78).

The fourth and final continuum that guides instructional decisions is based on the assumption of either a **Single Learning Style** or **Multiple Learning Styles**. Traditionally teachers have conducted their classes as if all students learn in the same way, usually the preferred learning style of the teacher. Schaller and Callison (1998) call for the recognition that students have different comfort levels and different levels of success depending on whether or not the instruction is based on their preferred approaches to learning. They propose that public speaking educators base their planning on Gardner's seven intelligences and select activities and assignments that reflect a wide variety of intelligences and corresponding learning styles.

Grupas (1996) selects two opposing learning styles, The **analytic learning style,** the approach often used by those who base their instruction on a single style, and the **relational learning style.** The **analytic learning style** is based on the presumption that students learn best when material is highly organized, there is one "true" answer, and authority or research supports the information presented. These features are affiliated with what have been labeled as a "masculine teaching style" and "preferred male learning style." In contrast the **relational learning style** is more in harmony with the terms "feminine teaching and learning styles." In the **relational learning style,** students cooperate with each other and the teacher to learn. There is a lack of emphasis on hierarchy or status. Student experience is a source for learning and knowing. Multiple views and answers are possible. Grupas' (1996) extensive study was undertaken to create a plan for integrating women's preferred learning style into a public speaking class. She obviously supports a pedagogical view that, at the least, includes a **relational learning style.**

Instructional methodologies. The beliefs about roles and learning styles discussed in the previous section lead to instructional methodologies that are consistent with the course director or teacher's belief preferences. The papers that focus on how to best teach public speaking use a variety of labels for methods that are closely related and often used in concert. For the continuum, the umbrella terms for these methodologies are **Exclusive Teaching Methods** and **Inclusive Teaching Methods.** Under the **Exclusive Teaching Methods**, fall the traditional lecture method, the masculine teaching method and teacher-centered methods. The **Inclusive Teaching Methods** include experiential learning methods, active learning methods, feminist pedagogy, connected learning methods, and student-centered methods. Two authors (Grupas, 1996; and Hayward, 1993) champion the **Inclusive Teaching** approach and give arguments supporting their views in their papers.

DISCUSSION

Overview of Results

It is interesting and rather reassuring to see that in the nineties, scholars have produced work that covers all four theoretical categories used to organize the data in this study: perspectives; basic theory of what constitutes effective public speaking, course content and skills, and instructional approaches. The areas that receive the most attention are instructional approaches and selection of content and skills.

Figure 1 provides a way of looking at the planks of this reform platform both individually and collectively. But unlike political platforms that are worked out in face-to-face negotiations, this plan has been assembled out of the individual pieces that were independently and separately chosen and constructed, without deliberate intention of contributing to a larger program. Nevertheless, as a group, the work of these writers and speakers, forms a beginning foundation of contemporary theory and pedagogy for the basic public speaking course.

As one explores the reform literature, it is clear that although the approximately 25 writers have independent agendas, they are working from a shared set of values and influences. Although the paper topics vary, the reader keeps bumping into reform recommendations that challenge rigidity and old prescriptive formulae and recommendations that reject one way as opposed to multiple ways. The writers shift the spotlight from performance to process and from teacher to collaboration. These theoretical and pedagogical changes the writers discuss represent a new understanding of what constitutes public speaking from a social construction perspective in the electronic age, with redefined roles for speaker and audience and for teacher and student. One source of stimulus for these changes may well be the two essays published early in the decade by Jo Sprague (1992, 1993) that not only issued the challenge for rethinking and revitalizing the instructional communication and communication education research agendas, but also provided a summary of the educational and communication theoretical backgrounds that support new ways of thinking about what and how we teach.

DOMINANT ISSUES AND CHANGE RECOMMENDATIONS

The most obvious trend found in the reform literature is the general proposal for policies that abandon or alter the traditional positions at the left of the continua in favor of progressive positions on the right. The really big news that comes from the combined voices of these progressive reformers is that our discipline has the opportunity and means of revising the traditional theory of effective speaking from a focus on external speaking skills to one of thinking skills, the key to a contemporary model of a public speaking. Whether the traditional theory of public speaking is significantly altered depends on the willingness of the communication education community to make changes in the perspectives and pedagogy related to teaching public speaking. For widespread acceptance of this major paradigm shift, communication educators would have to surrender dogmatic, absolutist attitudes that stifle change and discourage responses to the varied backgrounds of students, the current culture, and disciplinary trends and research. To support the implementation of new public speaking theory, classrooms would be required that utilize the alternative pedagogies the reform writers advocate, These would be public speaking classes characterized by more flexibility, openness, responsiveness to the needs and nature of contemporary students and audiences in a diverse society, featuring high levels of democratic student participation.

These are changes that in most cases will occur slowly and incrementally. There will not be a revolution.

We will not get up some morning next year and discover that public speaking as we have known it has disappeared forever. Hopefully, though, the discussion will continue. The essays reviewed in this study demonstrate that change is in the works. These essays are the descendents of earlier discussions about revision and improvement. That's how it works. We explore how things are going, ask questions, search for ideas that fit the current situation, and then make changes in our individual classrooms, courses, and curriculae, and share our beliefs and practices with the larger community.

Looking at this body of literature as a whole stimulates the asking of more questions and reveals areas where future research is needed. Since this report is based on the views of a limited number of leaders for change, it may present an incomplete picture of the beliefs and attitudes of speech educators throughout the nation about how public speaking can and should be updated. A study based on a national survey, specifically soliciting attitudes related to reform, would expand our initial understanding of revision issues. We also need studies that tell us more about the proposed changes and their impacts. Although some of the recommendations by reformers reviewed in this essay have been empirically studied, notably the teaching methodologies, many of the proposals are based on reasoning and anecdotal evidence. Multiple reports of field experiences and testing of how to teach public speaking by the "thinking leading to doing" method and "oral practices" approach would seem to be an essential starting point. Explorations of a workable balance between prescriptive and descriptive instruction and sources would also be helpful.

Any healthy discipline needs those who are willing to reexamine "how we have always done it" and look for ways to improve our academic endeavors. That tendency is alive and flourishing in the study of public speaking courses. May it continue and expand as the discipline confronts the challenge of creating a modern theory of public speaking.

REFERENCES

Bendtschneider, L.B. & Trank, D.M. (1990). Evaluating the basic course: Using research to meet the communication needs of the students. *Basic Communication Course Annual, 2*. 166-191.

Berens, E., & Nance, T.A. (1992). Is what we have, what we want? Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Speech Communication Association, Atlanta, GA.

Brummet, B. (1986). Absolutist and relativist stances toward the problem of difference: A model for student growth in public speaking education. *Communication Education, 35*, 269-274.

Buerkel-Rothfuss, N.L., & Kosloski, D.L. (1990). The basic course: What do we know? What do we need to know? Where do we go from here? *Basic Communication Course Annual, 2*, 192-231.

Dalton, D.G. (1997). Reevaluating the basic public speaking course. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the National Communication Association Convention, Chicago, IL.

Foss, S.K., & Foss, K.A. (1994). *Inviting transformation: Presentational speaking for a changing world.* Prospect Heights, IL: Waveland Press Inc.

Gayle, B.M. (1989). Implementing feminist pedagogy in the public speaking course. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Speech Communication Association, San Francisco, CA.

Grupas, A. (1996). Development of a plan for integrating gender communication research and women's preferred styles of learning into the public speaking course at St. Louis Community College-Meramec. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 409 924.)

Hayward, P.A. (1993). The intersection of critical pedagogy and developmental theory for public speaking. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Speech Communication Association, Miami Beach, FL.

Haynes, W.L. (1990). Beyond writing: A case for a speech-based basic course in a vid-oral world. *Basic Communication Course Annual, 2*, 89-100.

Haynes, W.L. (1990). Public speaking pedagogy in the media age. *Communication Education, 38*, 89-102.

Hess, J. (1999). Integrating the textbook into a philosophical foundation for the course. *Communication Education, 48*, 319-320.

Hess, J.A., & Pearson, J.C. (1992). Basic public speaking principles: Examination of twelve popular texts. *Basic Communication Course Annual, 4,* 16-34.

Horne, J.S., & Mullins, D.G. (1997). A pedagogic examination and evaluation of the status of epideictic speaking in *public speaking* curricula. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Eastern Communication Association, Baltimore, MD.

Hugenberg, L. W., & Moyer, B. S. (1998). The research foundation for instruction in the basic public speaking course. *Basic Communication Course Annual, 10,* 157-170.

Hugenberg, L.W. (1994). Preserving the integrity of the beginning communication course: An examination of current practices. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Speech Communication Association, New Orleans, LA.

Jenefsky, C. (1996). Public speaking as empowerment at visionary university. *Communication Education, 45,* 343-355.

Lucas, S.E. (1999). Teaching public speaking. In A.L. Vangelisti, J.A. Daly, G.W. Friedrich (Eds.). *Teaching communication: Theory, research, and methods, 2nd ed.* (pp. 75-84). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Publishers.

Macke, F.J. (1991). Communication left speechless: A critical examination of the evolution of speech communication as an academic discipline. *Communication Education, 40,* 126-143.

Matula, T. (1995). Centrality in research and teaching: Some new directions for the basic speech course. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Speech

Communication Association Convention, San Antonio, TX.

Morreale, S.P., Hanna, M.S., Berko, R.M., & Gibson, J.W. (1999). The basic communication course at U.S. colleges and universities: VI. *Basic Communication Course Annual, 11,* 1-36.

Osborn, M. (1997). Three metaphors for the competencies acquired in the public speaking class. *Basic Communication Course Annual, 9,* 1-11.

Rowan, K.E. (1995). A new pedagogy for explanatory public speaking: Why arrangement should not substitute for invention. *Communication Education, 44,* 236-250.

Russ, S., & McClish, G. (1999). Foundational text as textbook. *Communication Education, 48,* 320-321.

Schaller, K.A., & Callison, M.G. (1998). Applying multiple intelligences theory to the basic public speaking course. *Basic Communication Course Annual, 10,* 90-104.

Siddens, P.J. (1988). An investigation of the amount of emphasis placed on content and delivery by instructors of public speaking. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Central States Communication Association, Chicago, IL.

Sprague, J. (1992). Expanding the research agenda for instructional communication: Raising some unasked questions. *Communication Education, 41,* 1-25.

Sprague, J. (1993). Retrieving the research agenda for communication education: Asking the pedagogical questions that are "embarrassments to theory." *Communication Education*, *42*, 106-122.

Sproule, J. M. (1991) Teaching *public speaking* as public life. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Speech Communication Association, Atlanta, GA.

Verderber, R.F. (1991). The introductory communication course: The public speaking approach. *Basic Communication Course Annual, 3*, pp. 3-15.

Yoder, D.D., & Davilla, R.A. (1997). Perceptions of basic communication texts: Factors in student learning and textbook adoption decisions. *Basic Communication Course Annual, 9,* 12-31.

Zeman, J. V. (1990). A farewell to informative and persuasive speeches: A rationale and a proposal. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Speech Communication Association, Chicago, IL.

Zeman, J.V. (1987). What research in public address says to the basic course instructor—A look at textbooks. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Speech Communication Association, Boston, MA.

Common Sense in the Basic Public Speaking Course

Calvin L. Troup

The foundation of the basic public speaking course is not widely questioned today. As a public speaking course director, I have become well acquainted with sales representatives from many publishers. All of them want me to switch to their text for the coming semester, except for one. I routinely tell the representatives that any of the top ten public speaking textbook authors could probably teach an excellent version of the course from any of the top ten public speaking texts on the market. The shared foundation is so secure, and the emphases that distinguish these texts are so slight, that good teachers can comfortably employ any of them. Of course, we each select our texts based on their particular merits for our own versions of the course. But, as William Norwood Brigance said, "For twenty-three centuries, effective speeches have been prepared in accordance with a theory of public address," adding that "even the slow-minded have had time to catch on" (7). In the 50 years since Brigance's statement in *Speech: Its Techniques and Disciplines in a Free Society*, the field seems to have maintained a consensus on the theoretical foundations for teaching public speaking.

In fact, I am concerned that we now take the foundations so much for granted that we may neglect effectively teaching them. We may be omitting the compelling connections between training for ordinary citizens in the art of public speaking and the vitality of a democratic republic. In that sense, I will argue that our current situation demands that we *recover the foundation of public speaking for our students.*

Much ink has been devoted to the perceived demise of the public forum, both in popular and scholarly literature. As James Darsey has noted, a broad spectrum of scholars and popular pundits who make it their business to disagree with one another have long since reached consensus on the decline in the condition public dialogue and debate (ix-x). The public speaking course would appear to be a prime site for equipping our students to do the practical work of rehabilitating the public square in America.

Recent editions of public speaking texts do address certain relevant aspects of contemporary public discourse for students. Authors devote serious attention to the diversification of American audiences via immigration and the implications of globalization through international travel and communication technologies. But these same public speaking texts seem only to gesture toward basic issues concerning rhetoric, citizenship, and democracy enacted through active public dialogue. The texts seem to assume that students today possess the historical and cultural knowledge to understand the significance of their participation in public discourse.

I cannot take the time to document fully what I consider an unintended consequence of the general form to which the most widely used texts in the field adhere. But the texts do point to the lack of connection between students and the foundations of public speaking in the basic course. One popular text seems to be silent on the connection of public speaking to citizenship and democracy (Lucas). Three others devote a few paragraphs each to the citizenship and democracy connection (Andrews 4-5; Beebe 11-12; Osborn 8-9). Another includes a ten-page segment of the first chapter (Sproule 11-21), and the text we are using at Duquesne includes a brief mention, but devotes a more extended appendix on citizenship and rhetoric in the public forum (Zarefsky 5-6, 409-418).

So, we articulate clearly the general need for inclusion of disenfranchised voices into American society, but "as citizens in a democratic republic" remains largely unstated. Whether due to ignorance, inexperience, or apathy, I suggest that many of our students cannot provide our unstated premise. Therefore, students are prone to think of public speaking as a knack or a craft to gain personal advantage, or they infer some psychological, self-help foundation, as in, "I gained so much self-confidence by learning to speak in front of people!" Too many leave the course lacking theoretical depth and historical connections.

THE POWER OF RHETORICAL DIALOGUE IN DEMOCRACY

Therefore, we need to acquaint students with our deeply held assumptions about public speaking in a democratic society. In short, we need to lead them to the tree of democracy. In *Common Sense*, Thomas Paine invokes this metaphor that was well worn even in his own day, more than 225 years ago. Speaking of a fledgling society of immigrants in a sprawling wilderness he says, "Some convenient tree will afford them a state-house, under the branches of which the whole colony may assemble to deliberate on public matters"(3). The metaphorical tree of democracy points to the power and necessity of rhetoric for that dialogue that we call deliberation in the public forum. Where public speaking is concerned, I am convinced that the historical and theoretical foundations of rhetorical culture are radical and subversive in a most hopeful sense, especially for people living in an age and culture where hope sometimes eludes them entirely.

As Rod Hart once suggested, we need to own the fact that education, especially communication education, is a positively subversive act. "Teachers are insurgents, liberators, restoring in others the freedom to reason, releasing them from the tyrannies of conventional wisdom, conventional morality, conventional television" (100). Hart was speaking of communication education in general. But public speaking teachers, who annually reach a huge segment of the American collegiate population, possess great potential to motivate and equip students to become more fully functional citizens in a public forum.

Our tree of democracy has deep historical roots in the field. As Martin J. Medhurst reminds us, basic training in the rhetorical arts grounds our disciplinary heritage:

> To be able to articulate a point of view, defend a proposition, attack an evil, or celebrate a set of common values was seen as one of the central ways in which the people retained their freedoms and shaped their society. Training in public speaking or public address was thus understood to be preparation for citizenship in a democratic Republic. It was this sense of the term

> that motivated the founding, in 1914, of a new scholarly organization called The National Association of Academic Teachers of Public Speaking. (xi)

The connection between public speaking, citizenship, and democracy was once commonplace in our textbooks, rooted in ancient soil. In *Fundamentals of Public Speaking*, Donald C. Bryant and Karl P. Wallace state two assumptions that "men of good will in a democratic society have always known" (9). The assumptions come directly from the Greek *polis*: "First...that democracy will not work unless there is a general communication among men—a constant and effective interchange of both information and opinion," and "Second...that if communication is widespread and *free*, knowledge will prevail over ignorance, and truth over falsehood" (9-10).

Indeed, the intellectual genealogy of these assumptions is clear from Isocrates and Aristotle through the founding discourse of the United States to mid-twentieth century public speaking texts. And professors like Bryant, Wallace, and Brigance framed the rationale for advancing such assumptions in the wake of the two world wars that rocked the first half of their century. They viewed the role of public speaking in the college curriculum as vital to the distinction between democracy and tyranny (Bryant & Wallace 10). Introducing his text first published in 1952, Brigance stated the premise on which a public speaking course should be taught this way:

> The system of speechmaking was born of man's early struggle for democracy. It is still inherent in a free society, and unless an adequate portion of leaders in all areas of human life can speak intelligently, effectively, and responsibly—among themselves and

> to the people at large — we must live in constant danger of internal breakdown. (7)

So, against the backdrop of history and political philosophy, this essay also participates in the sense of public speaking education as a deeply American phenomenon and in the tradition of worrying over its demise. Robert T. Oliver's voice resonates with the Americana theme in public speaking:

> Whatever else has happened in our history, the democratization of society has steadily advanced. And one reason is that when once the principle is admitted that issues affecting the public may be publicly discussed, the compass of the discussion always expands and never contracts.
>
> It is not without significance that in these United States public speaking has flourished as it has nowhere else.... We as a people have developed orators, have valued oratory as an art, and have listened and talked back to multitudes of speakers far more than has any other portion of the globe. (xviii)

Some may be too humble, others too cynical to affirm Oliver's statement. But I think we still believe that, ultimately, a decline in the health of the public forum means the loss of freedom — not freedom to make choices about personal preferences or consumer freedom, but basic human freedom. I hope that we still believe, also ultimately, that rhetoric is not violence (as has been recently suggested by some) but one of the best alternatives to violence known to human society.

The baseline commitment to a real connection between the art of public speaking and free democratic societies makes the quality of the basic public speaking course a recurring worry. Isocrates worries about the implications for Athens when his students neglect their public speaking lessons and instead are "wasting their youth in drinking bouts, in parties, in soft living and childish folly" not to mention drinking to excess, gambling and "hanging about the training schools of the flute girls" (53). Brigance simply worries that "we don't have enough competent speakers to carry on the everyday business of living together in a democracy" (5).

Therefore, taking our students to the tree of democracy means explicating the aforementioned assumptions for our students and substantially integrating the assumptions into our public speaking courses. Of course, the tree of democracy to which we must lead our students has become less tangible and more metaphorical in today's society than ever before. As teachers, we first need to help our students to locate the tree. As Zarefsky notes, "Today, the public forum is not an actual place to which we go; instead it is an imagined 'space' that exists wherever people have the freedom to exchange ideas"(410). But we cannot afford for them to lose the basic, foundational idea of public, rhetorical dialogue in a forum where members of society come together to make reasonable decisions about their societal life together.

THE TEMPTATION TO TEACH TECHNIQUE

To reintroduce a theoretical and historical foundation into the basic public speaking course at any depth is a major project. At two universities, I have been involved in directing moves toward making the public speaking course more intellectually demanding and theoretically rich. Students do not realize that they want this approach to public speaking. Most imagine that a public speaking course at its best allows them to speak many times with much encouragement, volumes of constructive criticism, and grading based on effort instead of performance. But student pressure rarely tempts us to omit the foundations of the course and reduce it to techniques. Rather, institutional issues and student complacency about the public sphere are more likely culprits.

Institutional Issues

A number of conditions under which most public speaking courses are taught today may inhibit the introduction of more substantial theoretical and historical material. A few of the most prominent include:

Class Size. Most public speaking classes enroll 20-25 students, some schools allow even slightly higher caps. The performance components of the course intensify time pressure on instruction. The larger the class, the less time an instructor can devote to relevant historical and theoretical material.

Student Expectations. Many students expect public speaking to be an easy course and benign intellectually. Especially in cases where public speaking is a "service" course, other departments often view the course as a simple, skill-driven course.

Instructor Preparation. Teaching assistants with a limited background in the field often teach the course. In many cases, the teachers have not yet been taught the foundations of the course themselves. Combined with justifiable concerns about teaching and grading the performance aspects of the course, teaching assistants may find it difficult to incorporate meaningful connections to citizenship and democracy on their own.

Immediate Rewards of Skill Instruction. Public speaking can be a rewarding course to teach, if only because the instructor can actually witness the development of students' performance and confidence as the term proceeds. But the rewards that manifest themselves most immediately and most clearly pertain to practice, not foundations.

Student Complacency

What is often considered the political apathy of traditional college-age students has been so well documented over the past 20 years that I will not revisit it here in any depth. However, I should note that in "Attitudes Toward Politics and Public Service: A National Survey of College and University Undergraduates," the *Harvard Political Review* confirms that the turn of the millennium appears to have made little impact on the attitudes of 21st Century college students. Levels of political activity and trust in government institutions are low; students are "disillusioned about and disconnected from the political system" and are looking for alternatives to politics as solutions to community and society's problems.

The Harvard study confirms what have now become conventional concerns about the shape of public life in America. In *The Great Disruption: Human Nature and the Reconstitution of Social Order*, Francis Fukuyama synthesizes many of the related issues for college-aged people that appear in the Harvard study, such as high levels of local community involvement with contrasting lows in traditional political activity.

Fukuyama also identifies the emergence of a kind of absolute tolerance principal in middle-class American culture — a principal that many public speaking teachers may have encountered in class: "Most middle-class Americans don't believe in anything strongly enough to want to impose their values on one another" (89). In fact, Fukuyama says that while middle-class Americans do have convictions, ethics, and moral positions, "they are even more committed to being non-judgmental about the values of other people" (90). Therefore, rather than being simply complacent about public speaking, students may be reflecting larger cultural shifts that translate into a predisposition against the kind of public advocacy traditionally associated with public speaking.

In simple terms, institutional pressures and cultural changes seem to be making the trip to the tree of democracy more demanding than it might have been in previous generations. Teachers need to provide a more substantial intellectual, political, and cultural framework to support the trip. But this pedagogical work also seems more necessary.

Perhaps my expectations exceed what any of us can humanely deliver in a typical semester. Nevertheless, I cannot easily shake my desire for students to understand public speaking as more than a self-help project dressed up in academic garb. Public speaking is one of the crucial remaining sites for rhetoric in its most basic sense to be grounded in the hearts and minds of college students in a way that can benefit the commonwealth of humanity.

THE WISDOM OF COMMON SENSES

I am now prepared to suggest an antidote to the temptation of reducing the basic public speaking course to technique. To apply the antidote, we must lead students to the tree of democracy all semester long. One way to exercise such leadership may be to introduce into the course an historical text that both models appropriate and effective public discourse and has also contributed to the framework of the American public forum. I am suggesting specifically that we consider texts foundational to our common sense ideas about what the public forum ought to be.

Common Sense is one example that I will develop more fully in a moment. Other candidates would include *I Have a Dream*, *Federalist #10*, *The Declaration of Independence*, certain Supreme Court decisions and Presidential inaugural addresses, etc. I am not advocating for any one particular text, only that through such texts we can lead students to the tree of democracy and give them some idea of what to do when they get there. Such formative texts combine passion for democratic government with the rhetorical engine of democracy—speech that is not only free, but also reasonable, informed, and constructively critical.

But taking such an approach also may require a return to foundations that would cause a shift in approach from current conventions—at least the conventions I have met through experience and in our basic public speaking literature (including textbooks). The current conventions invite students into the course as a means of overcoming their fear of public speaking and gaining new skill in self-expression.

I have no interest in overstating this case. I myself have been trained to teach the course in this way and the structure of the basic public speaking course as I teach it has many of the earmarks of our conventional approach. Students still frequently express their positive public speaking experience with me in terms of enhanced self-confidence or self-esteem. Students do learn much of value in such courses—organization, audience adaptation, extemporaneous delivery, reasoning, critical thinking, and more. I want them to continue to learn these things, but also to do so in connection with their role as educated citizens in a democratic republic—one in which the voices of citizens are sorely needed.

COMMON SENSE IN DUQUESNE PUBLIC SPEAKING

How are we trying to reintroduce the foundational issue of public speaking as a cornerstone of public discourse in a democratic republic and a responsibility for all citizens? I will attempt to outline in brief the assumptions and components of the basic public speaking course at Duquesne University. Then I will explain our current use of *Common Sense*, recognizing that hearing an account of how someone else teaches a course can quickly become as tiresome as hearing awe-stricken parents tell interminable stories about their children.

We want students to own their role as engaged citizens in the American republic and to cultivate their public speaking knowledge and skill to pursue civic virtue as citizens in a democracy. We recognize that the course routinely enhances the self-concept, self-confidence, and self-esteem of students. But we see these effects, desirable as they may be, as byproducts that students should reap from virtuous civic conduct. Our aim to rebuild the basic public speaking course on the foundation of citizen participation in public discourse has emerged from our department's alignment within the strong tradition of liberal and professional education at Duquesne.

In other words, the historical and intellectual traditions of our country, our discipline, and our community provide common rationale for making pursuit of civic virtue prominent in our basic public speaking course —more prominent than pursuit of enhanced self-concept, self-expression, or personal gain. Therefore, although still in process, we are working to enrich the course theoretically and historically.

About four years ago we began to revamp our approach. We selected David Zarefsky's, *Public Speaking: Strategies for Success* as our primary textbook because we wanted one of the more rigorous and rhetorical of the available public speaking texts. Text selection is particularly important because graduate students teach most sections of the course. We set the class limit at 25 students to allow for three major graded speeches and ample in-class response time. Finally, we decided to incorporate Paine's *Common Sense* as a required supplementary text.

The sailing with *Common Sense* has not been entirely smooth. We reconsidered it after the first year's student responses because they seemed to have a hard time making connections. However, we elected to continue with *Common Sense* for three reasons. First, in both purpose and reception the pamphlet was deeply and explicitly rhetorical in its own day. Second, the text possesses enduring historical status as a benchmark for the American Revolution. Third, Paine's work connects quite directly to the better-known texts of the *Declaration of Independence* and *Constitution*. Therefore, *Common Sense* adds significant intellectual value and depth and forwards our purpose of making public speaking a course in which students can learn the history, theory, and practice of enacting civic virtue.

CURRENT USE OF *COMMON SENSE*

Instead of substituting a different text, we decided to adjust our approach to teaching *Common Sense*, incorporating it more aggressively. Students seem to be engaging the text more actively and making some of the basic connections we anticipated. We have attempted to make *Common Sense* a more integral component of the course through the following methods:

Students must read the text in segments that correspond with the three exams in the course. *Common Sense* passages are used in multiple choice test items as examples for specific conceptual material appearing on the exam. Students who have not read *Common Sense* place themselves at a serious disadvantage on such questions.

As we approach the second and third units of the course (persuasive speeches and speeches of controversy) the text becomes much more directly relevant to the course material. Instructors use examples from *Common Sense* to teach persuasive structures, invention, reasoning, evidence, proofs, refutation, etc.

To conclude the persuasive unit and the unit on controversy, students prepare a think paper in which they find applications of critical and theoretical concepts from class in *Common Sense.* (Copies of the think paper assignments are attached.)

CONCLUSION

The impact of *Common Sense* on student knowledge, experience, and perspective in our basic public speaking course has been modestly successful in the direction we had hoped. Although no formal study has been conducted, a number of instructors have reported similar responses as they have incorporated *Common Sense.* While we can continue to improve the substance and methods for achieving our pedagogical goals, as we have honed and shaped the content and structure of the course to resurrect the foundations of civic virtue, our adjustments have registered in the consciousness of our students. Across a number of sections, we have seen the impact of *Common Sense* in six key areas.

First, *Common Sense* has enriched the substance of the course and raised the conceptual plane at which we teach public speaking. Student comments indicate that they recognize the added substance—they resonate with the fact that public speaking demands knowledge, not just presentation skills. Second, *Common Sense* has produced a better grasp of argumentation concepts for public speaking purposes. We have seen better understanding of claims, warrants, evidence, etc.

Third, *Common Sense* helps us to introduce the central role of rhetoric in American history, culture, and politics. Students gain insight into the fact that public speaking is intrenched as a significant factor in the collective experience and heritage of all Americans. Fourth, *Common Sense* has illustrated the practical implications of public speaking for society. As students become more familiar with the context of Paine's text, they understand better why they might need to become involved in public discourse. Fifth, gaining contextual bearings has also enabled students to see the previously mentioned connections between *Common Sense,* the *Declaration of Independence*, and the *Constitution*. They can begin to understand that many Americans were thinking and speaking about the same issues. Public discourse becomes a broader, more popular prospect rather than an elite activity.

Finally, *Common Sense* has enhanced instructor credibility. Students consistently resist the initial introduction of the text, but by the end of the semester, many of them report that *Common Sense* has contributed to their learning experience. The integration of the art of public speaking with its implications in society, politics, and history foreground the expertise of the instructor, the intellectual rigor of the field, and the intrinsic personal benefits of the course.

In the future we may choose to conduct a formal study of the pedagogical influence of *Common Sense* in the basic public speaking course. We may also experiment with different texts like those mentioned earlier. However, the pedagogical point is not attached to the specific text selected or a particular method. Our goal is to lead them to understand the enduring relevance of the tree of democracy—the basic assumptions that connect the practical wisdom of public speaking with the virtues of living in a free, democratic republic. Once they come to that tree, we want them to learn the value of their participation and provide the knowledge and skills they need to negotiate a more elusive and technologically sophisticated public space than Thomas Paine ever imagined.

REFERENCES

Andrews, Patricia Hayes, James R. Andrews and Glen Williams. *Public Speaking: Connecting You and Your Audience.* New York: Houghton Mifflin, 1999.

"Attitudes Toward Politics and Public Service: A National Survey of College and University Undergraduates." The Institute of Politics, Harvard University. *Harvard Political Review Online.* Spring 2001. 14 June 2001 <http://www.hpronline.org/survey/key.shtml>.

Beebe, Steven A. and Susan J. Beebe. *Public Speaking: An Audience-Centered Approach, Third Edition.* Needham Heights, MA: Allyn & Bacon, 1997.

Brigance, William Norwood. *Speech: Its Techniques and Disciplines.* New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1961.

Bryant, Donald C. and Karl R. Wallace. *Fundamentals of Public Speaking*. 5th ed. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall, 1976.

Darsey, James. *The Prophetic Tradition and Radical Rhetoric in America*. New York: New York UP, 1997.

Fukuyama, Francis. *The Great Disruption: Human Nature and the Reconstruction of Social Order*. New York: Simon & Schuster, 1999.

Hart, Roderick P. "Why Communication? Why Education? Toward a Politics of Teaching." *Communication Education* 42, April 1993.

Isocrates. From *Antidosis*. Trans. George Norlin. *The Rhetorical Tradition: Readings from Classical Times to the Present*. Ed. Patricia Bizzell and Bruce Herzberg. Boston: St. Martin's, 1990. 50-54.

Lucas, Stephen E. *The Art of Public Speaking, Sixth Edition*. Boston: McGraw Hill, 1998.

Medhurst, Martin J. "The Academic Study of Public Address: A Tradition in Transition." *Landmark Essays on American Public Address*, Ed. Martin J. Medhurst. Davis, CA: Hermagoras, 1993. xi-xlii.

Oliver, Robert T. *History of Public Speaking in America*. Boston: Allyn & Bacon, 1965.

Osborn, Michael and Suzanne Osborn. *Public Speaking, Fourth Edition*. Boston: McGraw Hill, 1997.

Paine, Thomas. *Common Sense*. New York: Prometheus Books, 1995.

Sproule, J. Michael. *Speechmaking: Rhetorical Competence in a Postmodern World, Second Edition.* Madison: Brown & Benchmark, 1997.

Zarefsky, David. *Public Speaking: Strategies for Success, Second Edition.* Needham Heights, MA: Allyn & Bacon, 1999.

COMMON SENSE THINK PAPERS

We cherish the right to freedom of speech in the United States. Thomas Paine's pamphlet, *Common Sense,* is one example of how public dialogue played a significant role in the life of our nation. The concepts and skills you are learning in class can be seen at work in this famous document from American history. During each speaking round, you will return to *Common Sense* to explore how Thomas Paine practiced the concepts, strategies, and techniques more than 200 years ago in ways that affect your life every day today.

In each think paper, you should **incorporate the main concepts that we've read and discussed.**

- Each think paper should be approximately 750 words in length.
- Each think paper will be worth 100 points.
- Deduction for late submission: 15 points.

Think Paper #1: Values and Information in *Common Sense.*

1. Write one paragraph that summarizes who Thomas Paine was and why *Common Sense* was such an important and influential document at the time it was written. Refer to at least 2 sources from outside of the book itself and cite them according to MLA or APA style for research papers in a "works cited" list (bibliography) attached to your paper.
2. In your own words, write a one-paragraph synopsis of the overall story that Thomas Paine is trying to tell. Do not exceed 100 words.
3. Outline the book. Each chapter should be a Roman numeral. Main points within the chapter should be assigned a capital letter. Key sub-points should receive an Arabic numeral.
4. List all the sources that Paine identifies plus any that you recognize as outside references, even if Paine takes it for granted that the reader knows the reference.
5. Write a paragraph explaining the values that Paine wants the reader to adopt and live by. Quote specific passages that indicate the values Paine is advocating in *Common Sense.* If you accepted what Paine proposed in the book and you were living at the time of the American Revolution, what actions would you have been willing to take as a result?

Think Paper #2: Reasoning and Controversy in *Common Sense*:

1. Write down three main arguments that you think Paine makes in *Common Sense.* Using Zarefsky's discussion in Chapter 7 on Proof, Support, and Reasoning, write the claim for each in your own words and identify the supporting material that Paine uses for each argument.
2. Using Zarefsky's list of six strategies for reasoning in Chapter 7, rank the types of reasoning Thomas Paine depends upon in *Common Sense*, from most to least. State your reasons for your top ranking, and then give one example from *Common Sense* for each of your top three.
3. In your opinion, what made *Common Sense* such an influential pamphlet, in a time when literally thousands of pamphlets were being published, distributed, and read throughout the colonies?
4. Find an argument of Paine's that you think is still pertinent to your life and our country today. Explain why you say so. Then, diagram and analyze the argument according to the Toulmin model of argument analysis. Where is the argument strongest? Where is it most susceptible to refutation?

Extending Learning Opportunities in the Basic Communication Course: Exploring the Pedagogical Benefits of Speech Laboratories

Stephen K. Hunt
Cheri J. Simonds

Communication educators have long been concerned with developing pedagogical strategies for extending students' learning experiences in the basic communication course. Basic course directors have increasingly turned to speech laboratories in an attempt to address this ongoing need. This is a particularly popular approach in basic communication courses containing a public speaking component. Participation is such laboratories is expected to affect students' public speaking competency and some laboratories are specifically designed to assuage students' fear of public speaking. However, as basic course directors continue to implement speech laboratories, they often do so relying on implicit theories and personal experience rather than extant research to develop instructional strategies. Indeed, there is very little published evidence to support the pedagogical benefits of speech laboratories. Therefore, the purpose of this investigation was to document students' perceptions of the efficacy of a speech lab. Further, we examined the possibility that those who utilize the lab earn higher grades on classroom speeches compared to their peers who do not utilize the lab.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Much of the extant speech laboratory literature focuses on narrative descriptions of the purposes, development, and implementation of speech laboratories. For instance, scholars have examined considerations for instilling functional communication skills for non-native speakers (Flores, 1997), hypertext and other technological applications (Berube, 1988), as well the incorporation of communication laboratories into comprehensive retention efforts (Brownell & Watson, 1984). In a more recent essay, Hobgood (2000) described the development of a speech center designed to serve the entire university community. While these essays provide valuable design information for those interested in developing their own laboratory, they fall short of providing the kind of empirical data needed to substantiate that students perceive speech laboratories to be pedagogically beneficial or that such facilities actually help students perform better in the classroom.

The National Communication Association (NCA) recently surveyed members about the presence of communication laboratories on their campuses (Morreale, 2001). Faculty members from ten campuses provided the National Office with information about lab-based programs and described the advantages of having a lab. The results of this informal survey revealed that lab directors perceive the lab to be beneficial to undergraduate students, graduate teaching assistants (GTAs), faculty, and departments. Labs benefit undergraduate students by enhancing learning and self-confidence and decreasing communication anxiety. Communication labs also act as a training ground for GTAs and benefit faculty because they gain class time to work on other concepts as students can develop some skills in the lab. Finally, communication departments benefit because lab programs increase awareness on the campus of the discipline and provide assessment data for the department's review process.

The extant empirical research regarding the efficacy of speech laboratories highlights the role these facilities can play in the reduction of communication apprehension (CA) which is defined as "an individual's level of fear or anxiety associated with either real or anticipated communication with another person or persons" (McCroskey, 1977). For example, because many speech laboratories include videotaping facilities, researchers have sought to document the utility of this instructional practice in terms of reducing student apprehension (Ellis, 1995). This line of research seems compelling in light of other findings which indicate videotaping practice speeches reduces speech anxiety (Hinton & Kramer, 1998).

Beyond the practice of videotaping speeches in laboratories, scholars have documented that participation in speech laboratories can represent an efficacious option for reducing CA (McKiernan, 1984). Morreale, Ellis, and Mares-Dean (1992) found that at-risk students who participated in a speech laboratory reported significant gains in public speaking competency and an overall reduction of public speaking apprehension. Similarly, Ellis (1995) noted that students participating in a laboratory-supported public speaking course reported significant gains in competency and significant decreases in anxiety. According to Ellis (1995), one-on-one laboratory support consisting of goal setting, video feedback, and private feedback with GTAs "provided a nonthreatening, nurturant environment that helped all students, including high apprehensives, to perceive significant increases in self-perceived competency" (p. 74). These findings are consistent with Ratliffe's (1984) research which indicates that students respond positively to the opportunity for out-of-class, individualized feedback.

Scholars in the communication discipline have not collected much data concerning the pedagogical benefits of speech labs, and consequently, lab administrators have little guidance in terms of knowing what works and what does not. The research that has been conducted has focused almost exclusively on CA and communication competency. While this research provides a foundation for the claim that speech labs work, it says little about what those who visit the lab actually think about their experience. A better understanding of students' perceptions of the lab is important to identify which aspects of lab services are most and least helpful. In other words, such an understanding should better equip lab administrators to meet the diverse needs of their students. Also, research using standardized assessment measures of CA and communication competence may not completely reflect classroom speech requirements. In addition, existing research in this area says virtually nothing about whether students who visit the lab actually receive higher grades on classroom presentations. Therefore, we asked the following research questions:

RQ1: Do students perceive the assistance they receive in the speech lab to be useful in terms of the requirements of the speeches they deliver in the classroom?

RQ2: Do students who visit the speech lab earn higher grades on their classroom speeches compared to those that do not visit the speech lab?

METHOD

Speech Lab Design

The speech lab that we investigated was developed to provide an opportunity for students enrolled in the basic communication course[1] to practice their speeches and receive constructive feedback from trained instructors. The speech lab is overseen by a tenure-track professor who is also the Co-Director of the basic course. The lab is staffed by GTAs who teach at least one self-contained section of the course. All of the speech lab monitors receive extensive training before they begin their assignment in the lab. Initially, the GTAs are required to attend an intensive training program at the beginning of the first semester of their academic program. In addition, all GTAs are required to complete a one credit hour course that explores the pedagogical concerns of teaching the basic course (in their first semester at the university). Also, lab monitors complete a brief training program that exposes them to the expectations, pedagogical goals, and operating procedures of the speech lab.

---

[1] The basic course is a required component of the general education program and services approximately 1,500 students a semester. The focus of the course is public speaking but it also includes units on group and interpersonal communication.

All students in the basic course receive a tour of the lab within the first two weeks of the semester. During this tour, students are informed of the appropriate and inappropriate uses of the lab. The appropriate uses of the lab include assisting those students who are high in CA through systematic visualization of successful speaking and by providing a quiet and private place for them to practice their speeches. In addition, students may utilize the lab to practice a speech (with or without taping) prior to its formal delivery in front of the class. Students also receive assistance with issues like organization and word choice as questions arise during the practice session. However, the speech lab is not available to help students prepare for exams or written assignments. In addition, students are instructed that they should not use the lab for functions that would be better served by instructors during office hours (e.g., selecting topics, proofreading an outline, constructing visual or audio aids, etc.).

The speech lab consists of one large room divided by sliding doors. Students initially enter the main office of the lab where they register and wait for assistance. The practice room is equipped with a camera, microphone, monitor, overhead projector, tape recorder, slide projector, easel, and projection screen (the sliding doors can be closed to provide privacy). The practice room is large enough to accommodate small groups of students who wish to practice their group presentation. All students who visit the lab are provided the opportunity to receive immediate oral and written feedback from lab monitors and may tape each speech for self-analysis.

Participants

Data for this study were collected from two sources: (a) students' evaluations of their lab experiences, and (b) information from students' instructors concerning lab visits and speech grades. The first group of participants consisted of 527 students who visited the speech lab at a large Midwestern university during the Spring and Summer 2000 semesters. There were more females (*n* = 351) than males (*n* = 173) in the study (3 students did not identify their sex). Despite this difference in the sex of the participants, roughly the same percentage of women (14.53%, *n* = 50) as men (12.14%, *n* = 21) reported that they visited the lab even though they were not required to do so. The average age of participants was 18.84 (*SD* = 2.66) and the majority of participants were in their first year of school (first year *n* = 461, sophomore *n* = 15, junior *n* = 37, senior *n* = 14). The racial and ethnic distribution of the sample was as follows: 86.1% (*n* = 454) Caucasian, 7.4% (*n* = 34) African American, 3.2% (*n* = 17) Asian/Pacific Islander, and 3.3% (*n* = 18) other.

In order to acquire data to address the second research question, the researchers collected a separate convenience sample of student speech scores from GTAs teaching the basic course in the Fall 2000 semester. The GTAs were instructed to provide the researchers with their students' scores (no information that would identify the students was included) and indicate whether they visited the speech lab prior to each of the three required course presentations. This procedure yielded scores for 435 informative, group, and persuasive speeches. Because of the anonymous nature of data collection, the researchers were unable to acquire demographic information for the second group of participants.

Instrument

A questionnaire was developed for data collection. Beyond demographic questions, 21 items were based on the standardized form used by all basic course instructors at this university to evaluate student speeches (see Table 1). The participants were asked to rate how helpful the speech lab was in terms of the individual components (e.g., thesis statement, language use, eye contact) of the instructor evaluation form on a 1 to 5 Likert-type scale (1 = "not helpful", 5 = "very helpful"). The assessment instrument also included demographic-type questions (e.g., participant age, sex, class level) and required the participants to identify whether their visit to the lab was required by their instructor. The participants completed this assessment instrument immediately following their speech lab appointment. The alpha reliability estimate for the 21-item assessment instrument was .97.

Statistical Analyses

Simple frequency distributions were conducted for each item. This provided the researchers with information about students' motivations to visit the speech lab as well as an indication of their perceptions of the usefulness of the help they received in the speech lab. In addition, independent samples *t*-tests and MANOVA procedures were employed to explore differences between groups (those that did and did not visit the lab). The .05 level of significance was established for all statistical tests.

RESULTS

The purpose of this study was to determine whether students perceive the help they receive in the speech lab to be useful in terms of the assessment criteria used by their instructors and whether students who visit the lab earn higher grades on their classroom presentations compared to their peers who do not visit the lab.

The data indicate that most instructors require their students to visit the speech lab prior to at least one of their speeches. Specifically, 86.3% (*n* = 449) of the students indicated they were required to visit the lab while 13.7% (*n* = 71) reported their instructor did not require a visit to the lab. In addition, of the students who were required to visit the lab, 56.2% (*n* = 240) noted their instructor allowed them to visit the lab before any of the three major speeches. However, 27.2% (*n* = 116) were required to visit the lab prior to the informative speech; 7.3% (*n* = 31) were required to visit the lab prior to the persuasive speech; 5.9% (*n* = 25) were required to visit the lab prior to all of the major speeches; and 3.5% (*n* = 15) were required to visit the lab prior to the group presentation. When asked to identify their primary reason for visiting the lab, 43.5% (*n* = 229) of the students responded they were required to do so by their instructor. Other reasons for visiting the lab included an opportunity to practice the speech (26.8%, *n* = 141), to improve public speaking skills (12%, *n* = 63), and to acquire help in polishing the speech (10.1%, *n* = 53).

Research Question 1

The first research question asked if students perceive the assistance they receive in the speech lab to be useful in terms the requirements of the speeches they deliver in the classroom. We asked students to evaluate how helpful the lab was in terms of the outline and references, introduction, body, conclusion, delivery, and overall impression. Overall, the students found the lab work useful for most trait areas. The lowest rankings were for the help students received regarding the mechanical planning decisions of the speechmaking process (e.g., purpose statement, outline format, references). The means and standard deviations for the entire assessment instrument are presented in Table 1.

We also asked whether students' perceptions of the lab varied based upon whether they visited the lab voluntarily or were required to do so by their instructor (see Table 2 for means and standard deviations). The independent samples *t*-tests revealed statistically significant differences between groups for the CA variable [$t(409) = -2.07, p < .05$]. Students who went to the lab of their own volition ($M = 4.41, SD = .93, n = 59$) rated the help they received from the lab regarding CA more favorably compared to students who were required to visit the lab ($M = 4.12, SD = .99, n = 352$). However, the groups did not differ on any of the other 20 traits and both groups rated the help they received regarding CA very favorably.

Table 1
Means and Standard Deviations for Assessment Instrument

	M	*SD*	*n*
Outline & References	11.86	2.97	292
Purpose Statement	3.97	1.10	329
Outline Format	3.91	1.14	311
References	3.26	1.88	435
Introduction	21.31	4.10	372
Attention Getter	4.24	1.00	405
Relevance Statement	4.34	.92	409
Credibility Statement	4.43	2.23	412
Thesis Statement	4.13	1.02	401
Preview of Body	4.27	.96	405
Body	20.59	4.26	325
Organization	4.16	1.04	413
Language Use	4.03	1.03	403
Transitions	4.15	1.04	406
Argument Development	4.03	1.04	351
Supporting Material	4.22	1.79	398
Conclusion			
Summary/Memorable Close	4.37	.92	404
Delivery	16.80	3.33	399
Eye Contact	4.22	1.05	422
Use of Voice	4.08	1.29	448
Use of Gestures	3.95	1.44	443
Communication Apprehension	4.16	.98	416
Overall Impression	12.83	2.49	316
Audience Analysis	4.12	1.05	382
Practice with Time Limits	4.31	.94	413
Visual Aids	4.32	1.01	350
Total	90.30	14.44	210

Table 2

Means and Standard Deviations for Assessment Instrument by Type of Visit

	Required Visit			Voluntary Visit				
	M	*SD*	*n*	*M*	*SD*	*n*	*t*	*Df*
Outline & References								
Purpose Statement	3.97	1.11	279	3.93	1.06	46	.19	323
Outline Format	3.90	1.16	264	3.93	1.07	44	-.16	306
References	3.24	1.88	372	3.34	1.89	59	-.36	429
Introduction								
Attention Getter	4.24	1.01	344	4.25	.96	56	-.10	398
Relevance Statement	4.33	.92	346	4.43	.88	58	-.78	402
Credibility Statement	4.41	2.39	352	4.48	.79	56	-.21	406
Thesis Statement	4.11	1.05	337	4.24	.86	59	-.90	394
Preview of Body	4.26	.98	343	4.32	.83	57	-.43	398
Body								
Organization	4.14	1.07	353	4.27	.83	55	-.91	406
Language Use	4.00	1.05	345	4.20	.83	54	-1.34	397
Transitions	4.12	1.06	347	4.33	.87	54	-1.44	399
Argument Development	4.06	1.05	300	3.85	.96	47	1.30	345
Supporting Material	4.27	1.89	340	3.94	.93	53	1.23	391

Table 2 (continued)

	Required Visit			Voluntary Visit				
	M	*SD*	*n*	*M*	*SD*	*n*	*t*	*Df*
Conclusion								
Summary/Memorable Close	4.37	.92	344	4.29	.98	55	.60	397
Delivery								
Eye Contact	4.19	1.06	361	4.39	.86	57	-1.30	416
Use of Voice	4.06	1.30	380	4.21	1.22	63	-.84	441
Use of Gestures	3.91	1.46	376	4.10	1.35	62	-.92	436
Communication Apprehension	4.12	.99	352	4.41	.93	59	-2.07*	409
Overall Impression								
Audience Analysis	4.10	1.07	325	4.23	.90	52	-.85	375
Practice with Time Limits	4.29	.97	353	4.42	.74	55	-.93	406
Visual Aids	4.30	1.05	297	4.42	.74	48	-.72	343

*$p<.05$.

Research Question 2

The second research question ascertained whether students who visit the speech lab earn higher grades on their classroom speeches compared to those that do not visit the lab. The descriptive data indicated that the students (data provided by the instructors) who visited the lab prior to their classroom presentations outperformed their colleagues who did not visit the lab. For example, 81.5% (n = 44) of those students who went to the lab prior to the informative speech earned a "B" (using a standard 90, 80, 70, 60 scale) or higher on the speech. In contrast, 75.4% (n = 282) of the students who did not visit the lab prior to the informative speech earned a "B" or higher. In a similar vein, 44.1% (n = 49) of students who visited the lab prior to the group presentation earned an "A" compared to only 29.8% (n = 95) of students who did not visit the lab. Finally, 61.8% (n = 42) of those that took advantage of the services offered in the lab prior to the persuasive presentation earned an "A" on that speech compared to only 34.4% (n = 121) of those who choose not to utilize the lab. A complete breakdown of the grade distributions for the speeches is presented in Table 3.

The independent samples t-tests revealed statistically significant differences for all three major presentations (see Table 4 for means and standard deviations). Specifically, students who visited the speech lab prior to the informative [$t(426) = 2.25$, $p < .05$], group [$t(428) = 4.66$, $p < .05$], and persuasive [$t(418) = 4.20$, $p < .05$] speeches obtained significantly higher scores compared

Table 3
Comparison of Speech Grades for Students Who Did and Did Not Visit the Lab

	Informative		Group		Persuasive	
	Visit	No Visit	Visit	No Visit	Visit	No Visit
A	25.9% ($n = 14$)	17.4% ($n = 65$)	44.1% ($n = 49$)	29.8% ($n = 95$)	61.8% ($n = 42$)	34.4% ($n = 121$)
B	55.6% ($n = 30$)	58% ($n = 217$)	55% ($n = 61$)	55.8% ($n = 178$)	32.3% ($n = 22$)	50.5% ($n = 178$)
C	18.5% ($n = 10$)	21.4% ($n = 80$)	.9% ($n = 1$)	13.5% ($n = 44$)	4.4% ($n = 3$)	13.3% ($n = 47$)
D		2.4% ($n = 9$)		.9% ($n = 2$)	1.5% ($n = 1$)	.9% ($n = 3$)
F		.8% ($n = 3$)				.9% ($n = 3$)

Table 4

T-Test Results for Differences in Speech Scores

	Visited the Lab			Did Not Visit the Lab				
	M	*SD*	*n*	*M*	*SD*	*n*	*t*	*Df*
Informative	85.48	5.67	54	83.21	7.10	374	2.25*	426
Group	88.64	4.68	111	85.73	5.96	319	4.66*	428
Persuasive	89.63	5.44	68	85.98	6.77	352	4.20*	418

*$p < .05$.

to those that did not visit the lab prior to the same speeches.

In order to explore whether participation in the speech lab produced immediate and/or lasting effects, a MANOVA was calculated to compare the scores of the three required speeches (informative, group and persuasive) based on students' level of participation in the lab (e.g., the number of times they went to the lab over the course of the semester). In other words, we were interested in determining if the benefits students received from visiting the speech lab extended beyond the immediate speech for which they were visiting the lab. A significant multivariate main effect was observed for the participation factor, Wilks $\lambda = .86$, $F(18, 1154.48) = 3.60$, $p < .05$, $\eta^2 = .05$. Univariate follow-up tests for the participation main effect indicated significant main effects for the group, $F(6, 410) = 7.44$, $p < .05$, $\eta^2 = .09$, and persuasive presentations, $F(6, 410) = 3.84$, $p < .05$, $\eta^2 = .05$.

In terms of the group presentation, Tukey comparisons revealed that students who visited the lab *only* prior to the group presentation ($M = 87.20$, $SD = 4.30$, $n = 82$) and students who visited the lab prior to *both* the informative and group presentations ($M = 92.90$, $SD = 2.18$, $n = 10$) earned significantly higher grades on the group presentation compared to those who never visited the lab ($M = 85.18$, $SD = 7.68$, $n = 219$). Also, students who visited the lab prior to *both* the informative and group presentations did significantly better on the group presentation compared to students who went to the lab *only* prior to the group presentation. Similarly, students who visited the lab prior to *both* the informative and group presentations earned significantly higher grades on the group presentation than those who visited the lab *only* prior to the informative speech.

However, we were unable to find evidence of a lasting effect of participation in the speech lab. Students who visited the lab prior to the informative speech (*M* = 85.74, *SD* = 6.90, *n* = 39) did not earn significantly higher grades on the group presentation compared to those who never visited the lab at all.

In terms of the persuasive presentation, Tukey comparisons revealed that students who went to the lab prior to *only* the persuasive speech (*M* = 89.81, *SD* = 5.61, *n* = 47), students who visited the lab before *both* the informative and group presentations (*M* = 90.60, *SD* = 4.50, *n* = 10), and students who visited the lab before *both* the group and persuasive presentations (*M* = 89.75, *SD* = 4.48, *n* = 16) earned significantly higher grades on the persuasive presentation than those who never visited the lab at all (*M* = 85.95, *SD* = 6.98, *n* = 219). In analyses of persuasive scores, multiple visits to the lab benefit students' classroom performance. Specifically, students who visited the lab before *both* the informative and group presentations as well as those that went to the lab prior to *both* the group and persuasive presentations earned significantly higher grades on the persuasive speech than those who visited the lab *only* prior to the group presentation (*M* = 85.60, *SD* = 6.64, *n* = 82).

Finally, students that visited the lab prior to only the persuasive speech earned significantly higher scores than students who only went to the lab before the informative (M = 86.59, SD = 5.32, n = 39) and group speeches. In summary, students who visit the lab prior to the immediate speech being presented in the classroom reap the most benefits from participation in the

Table 5
Means and Standard Deviations for the Informative, Group, and Persuasive Presentations by Level of Participation in the Lab[2]

Participation in the Lab:	Informative		Group		Persuasive		
	M	*SD*	*M*	*SD*	*M*	*SD*	*n*
No Visits	83.55	6.73	85.18	7.68	85.95	6.98	219
Only for Informative	85.15	5.98	85.74	6.90	86.59	5.32	39
Only for Group	82.34	7.12	87.20	4.30	85.60	6.64	82
Only for Persuasive	84.19	7.23	88.09	5.70	89.81	5.61	47
Informative and Group	86.50	5.17	92.90	2.18	90.60	4.50	10
Group and Persuasive	84.06	3.68	93.81	2.20	89.75	4.80	16
Informative and Persuasive	85.75	5.32	81.00	5.48	87.00	8.33	4
Total	83.65	6.69	86.43	6.90	86.64	6.65	417

---

[2] Only one participant visited the lab prior to all three speeches.

lab. The means and standard deviations for all groups are reported in Table 5.

DISCUSSION

Given that speech laboratories afford students the opportunity to extend learning experiences in the basic communication course, it is important to investigate the extent to which students find this experience useful. In addition, because many communication departments are in the initial phases of developing and/or maintaining speech laboratories, they soon will be in the position to assess the pedagogical benefits of such laboratories. This study is an effort to provide statistical data to lend support to the efficacy of providing this service to speech communication students.

Research question one sought to determine the extent to which students found speech laboratory visits to be useful with regard to meeting the requirements of their speech assignments. The present study provides practical information for those seeking to develop or refine a speech lab. The results presented here highlight areas that the students in this sample perceived to be the least and most helpful services offered in the lab. The students rated all of the areas favorably but those services relating to the development, writing, and planning of speeches received the lowest rankings. The lab was perceived to be least helpful in the outline and references category. For instance, 16.9% (n = 89) of the students indicated the lab was "somewhat" or "minimally" helpful in developing a purpose statement while 30.5% (n = 95) of the students reported the lab was "somewhat" or "minimally" helpful in providing assistance with the outline format.

By all accounts, students found the services of the speech lab to be generally useful and/or helpful in all of the required elements of the assignments. From the students' perspective, the lab was most helpful in the following areas: introduction, body, conclusion, delivery, and overall impression. For example, 58.5% (*n* = 241) of respondents noted the speech lab was "very helpful" in terms of creating credibility statements. Similarly, 56% (*n* = 409) of students responded that the lab was "very helpful" regarding the assistance with the relevance statement. Impressively, 93% (*n* = 370) of students noted the lab was at least "somewhat helpful" in terms of feedback regarding the summary/memorable close of their speech. Consistent with previous speech lab research (Ellis, 1995), 47.1% (*n* = 196) of students found the lab to be "very helpful" in the reduction of CA.

These results suggest that speech lab administrators should carefully consider the goals of the lab in relationship to the services offered. Considering the goals of the lab investigated in this study, the findings are not surprising. The lab is set up to provide opportunities for students enrolled in the basic course to practice and refine delivery of their speeches. Therefore, it makes sense that students would rate development and writing services least favorably. For those seeking to start a lab, the results of this study indicate that simply providing the opportunity to practice, videotape, and receive feedback regarding the speech has pedagogical utility. This may be the best option for programs lacking the monetary resources to develop a technology speech lab that offers additional services (e.g., computers to create visual aids or outlines) to those in the rest of the university community. Simply put, the lab does not need to assist students in every aspect of speechmaking in order to benefit students.

While this information is encouraging to speech lab attendants and basic course directors, the question still remains: Do speech lab visits make a difference in student performances? Research question two (data collected from instructors) was an attempt to address this issue. It was important to ask this follow-up question because data for research question one were collected at the conclusion of each visit but prior to actual speech performance. The results of this study suggest speech labs do make a difference in overall student performance. That is, students who attended the speech lab received higher scores on all three of the major assignments compared to students who did not attend the lab prior to their performance.

Students may reap the benefits of speech labs for various reasons. Given that students must prepare their speeches in advance of the speech lab appointment (usually scheduled at least a day or two prior to their assigned speaking date), students who attend the lab not only receive extra practice, but also feedback from lab instructors who know the criteria for evaluating speeches. It would be reasonable to assume that many students who do not attend the lab are still in the writing phases of speech preparation just prior to their speaking dates and do not allow themselves time to practice, let alone time to seek feedback from outside sources. In addition, the laboratory experience provides students the opportunity to reduce uncertainty with regard to speech requirements. This, in turn, gives students more confidence when presenting their speech to their own classmates and instructor and increases their self-perceived competence (Ellis, 1995).

These results seem to substantiate the claim that the more students visit the lab, the better they perform on classroom presentations. The unique requirements of each of the major presentations in the basic course make it important for students to visit the lab throughout the semester to gain feedback relevant to particular tasks. Therefore, the results of this study provide speech lab directors with invaluable evidence to demonstrate the need for ongoing support for speech labs.

Although the findings of this study are of considerable importance, several limitations are notable. The first of these stems from the timing of data collection for research question one. Students completed the assessment immediately after they finished their lab session. It is possible that perceptions of the utility of the lab may differ after students actually give the speech in the classroom and receive instructor feedback. In addition, the use of two different sources of data in this study may confound the results (there may be some overlap between groups, but we do not know based on the data we collected). Specifically, the students who reported on their reactions to address the first research question may not have the same grade and visit results as the second group of students (the group we had speech scores for). Additional research using more controlled conditions will be necessary to extend the results of this study.

Additional limitations concern research question two. Initially, the design of this study prevents us from claiming that the speech lab was solely responsible for the significant differences in speech scores we observed. We were unable to ascertain whether the students in the second group (the group we had speech scores for) who visited the lab did so because they were required to or simply because they chose to do so. This is potentially confounding because the results may reflect highly motivated students rather than the experience of visiting the lab. Again, future research efforts should seek to control for motivation.

It may be fruitful for researchers to explore sex differences in speech lab participation. In this study, several more women than men reported visiting the lab (even though the percentages of those who went voluntarily were roughly equal). Previous research suggests that women possess higher achievement motivation compared to men and are especially likely to outperform men on out-of-class assignments (Launius, 1997). Therefore, it may be that women are more likely than men to visit the lab because they are more self-motivated to do out-of-class assignments.

In addition, communication researchers should further explore students' experiences when they are required to visit the lab compared to free-choice visits. Our data indicate that both groups report very similar perceptions of the lab for all areas except CA. It may be that students who go to the lab of their own volition feel more comfortable in the lab and therefore perceive the lab to be more helpful in reducing CA. At a minimum, a better understanding of the differences between these groups (required vs. free-choice visits) would provide valuable planning information for speech lab directors.

Despite these limitations, results from both research questions are encouraging especially for those who find themselves in the position to defend the efficacy of speech laboratories to their own institutions. Information from this study can help basic course directors justify the funds to develop their own speech labs and/or rationalize the continued financial support for maintaining a speech laboratory. While Hobgood (2000) provided basic course directors with valuable design information on how to develop speech laboratories, this study provides some empirical data needed to help substantiate the efficacy of speech laboratories. These studies used in concert should provide educational institutions the needed evidence to make arguments in support of providing this beneficial service to students.

REFERENCES

Berube, D. M. (1988, November). *A prospectus for the future development of a speech lab: Hypertext applications.* Paper presented at the meeting of the Speech Communication Association, New Orleans, LA.

Brownell, W. W., & Watson, A. K. (1984, November). *Creating a speech communication laboratory in a university retention program.* Paper presented at the meeting of the Speech Communication Association, Chicago, IL.

Ellis, K. (1995). Apprehension, self-perceived competency, and teacher immediacy in the laboratory-supported public speaking course: Trends and relationships. *Communication Education, 44*(1), 64-78.

Flores, N. L. (1997, November). *How Golden West College is addressing pedagogical assessment and accountability concerns through integrated spoken communication labs.* Paper presented at the meeting of the National Communication Association, Chicago, IL.

Hinton, J. S., & Kramer, M. W. (1998). The impact of self-directed videotape feedback on students' self-reported levels of communication competence and apprehension. *Communication Education, 47*(2), 151-161.

Hobgood, L. B. (2000). The pursuit of speaking proficiency: A voluntary approach. *Communication Education, 49*(4), 339-351.

Launius, M. H. (1997). College student attendance: Attitudes and academic performance. *College Student Journal, 31*(1), 86-92.

McCroskey, J. C. (1977). Oral communication apprehension: A summary of recent theory and research. *Human Communication Research, 4*(1), 78-96.

McKiernan, J. (1984, April). *Getting our act together: A justification for a speaking lab.* Paper presented at the meeting of the Central States Speech Association, Chicago, IL.

Morreale, S. P. (2001, January 22). *Communication labs enhance student learning and promote awareness of the discipline.* [On-Line]. Available: http://www.natcom.org/Instruction/ Resources/commlabs1098.htm.

Morreale, S., Ellis, K., & Mares-Dean, J. (1992, November). *A communication laboratory as a resource for the student at-risk: Research and program development at the Center for Excellence in Oral Communication.* Paper presented at the meeting of the Speech Communication Association, Chicago, IL.

Ratliffe, S. A. (1984, November). *Interpersonal communication competencies and peer tutor-evaluators in the speech laboratory.* Paper presented at the meeting of the Speech Communication Association, Chicago, IL.

Communication Apprehension and Basic Course Success: The Lab-supported Public Speaking Course Intervention

Karen Kangas Dwyer
Robert E. Carlson
Sally A. Kahre

It has been estimated that 15 to 20 percent of the student population of universities suffers from high communication apprehension (CA), "the fear or anxiety associated with either real or anticipated communication with another person or persons" (McCroskey, 1977, p. 78; Richmond & McCroskey, 1998). It is imperative that educators attempt to help these high communication apprehensives (HCAs) overcome their anxiety because HCAs are more likely to drop out of college and to receive lower grades than their lower apprehensive counterparts (Ericson & Gardner, 1992; Richmond & McCroskey, 1998). Consequently, one goal of basic communication course instruction is to assist HCAs reduce their anxiety and, thus, avoid the negative academic consequences.

Although there are a multitude of in-class treatment techniques for high CA, such as systematic desensitization (McCroskey, 1972), cognitive restructuring (Fremouw & Scott, 1979), visualization (Ayres, Hopf, & Ayres, 1997), and rhetoritherapy/skills training (Phillips, 1997; Kelly, 1989), these interventions can consume a lot of precious class time. One fairly new intervention that relies little on class time is the lab-supported public speaking course. This use of a speech lab "to support communication instruction in higher education is increasing in popularity," especially with the increased availability of high technology in the form of computers, computer software, and video equipment (Morreale, 1998, p. 8).

An assumption made by those who incorporate speech labs in public speaking classes appears to be that use of technology can somehow help students become more comfortable with the mechanics of preparing a speech. If students are better prepared, the reasoning goes, they will be less anxious about actual speaking performance and able to perform better in the course (Daly & Vangelisti, 1995). However, few studies have examined the effects of speech lab usage on student communication apprehension level or on grades in the basic public speaking course, especially for HCA's.

The purpose of this study is to query the effect of a lab-supported beginning public speaking course on the CA level of those who use the lab versus those who do not choose to use the lab. In addition, this study explores the potential impact of speech lab usage on the academic success of those who are enrolled in the lab-supported course.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Those who experience high CA have reported that it permeates every facet of their lives — school, work, friendships (Richmond & McCroskey, 1998). In fact, high CA has been related to avoidance of postsecondary education (Monroe & Borzi, 1988), apprehension in the classroom setting (Ayres, 1996; Neer, 1987 and Jaasma, 1997), significantly lower grade point averages (McCroskey & Anderson, 1976; McCroskey, Daly, & Sorensen, 1976) more negative views in the workplace (Richmond & Roach, 1992), more apprehension in employment interviews (Ayres & Ayres, 1993), lower ratings as effective communicators in interviews (Ayres, Keereetaweep, Tanichya, Chen, & Edwards, 1998), lower perceptions of self-worth (Colby, Hopf & Ayres, 1993), and lower degrees of self control, adventurousness and emotional maturity (Richmond & McCroskey, 1998).

Recent studies have reported that CA is a potential barrier to student academic success including both retention and academic achievement as measured by grade point averages. A meta-analysis by Bourhis and Allen (1992) found a significant negative relationship between CA and cognitive performance. HCAs tend to suffer lower overall grade-point averages and evaluations (McCroskey, 1977; Powers & Smythe, 1980; Richmond & McCroskey, 1998). Data from two, four-year longitudinal studies at a four year undergraduate college showed that "high CA students were significantly more likely to drop out compared to low CA students" and that the HCAs "tended to drop out significantly more after only one year" (Ericson & Gardner, 1992, p. 127). HCAs often will drop a class with high communication requirements, even if it is a required course and HCAs "who remain in courses with high communication requirements are likely to be absent on days when they are scheduled for presentations" (Richmond & McCroskey, 1998, p. 62).

The concern for HCA students' success in the classroom is what has led researchers for decades to look at different ways and techniques to help HCAs. CA reduction techniques, such as systematic desensitization (McCroskey, 1972) (the pairing of deep muscle relaxation with graduated anxiety-eliciting stimuli in the speech making process), cognitive restructuring (Fremouw & Scott, 1979) (identifying negative self-talk about public speaking and replacing it with positive coping statements), visualization (Ayres, Hopf, & Ayres, 1997) (picturing oneself giving a successful speech) and skills training or rhetoritherapy (Phillips, 1997; Kelly 1989) (learning proper preparation and delivery skills) have all been found to be effective and helpful for the HCAs. "However each of these techniques requires a considerable amount of time to develop and operate with the exception of skills training, which may be included as part of normal lectures" in a public speaking course (Robinson, 1997, p. 190).

Often, it is a basic public speaking course that serves as a general education requirement that all students must fulfill prior to graduation (Gibson, Hanna, & Leichty, 1990). Since the basic course enrolls many students, it would seem to be an ideal way for instructors to help many HCAs. This is not always the case. Although a majority of students report a decrease in self-perceived public speaking anxiety and an increase in self-perceived competency by the end of the semester, the "literature seems to suggest that completing a public speaking course is likely to be a punishing experience for high CA students" (Ellis, 1995, p. 67). Many will drop the course and even drop out of college (Richmond & McCroskey, 1998).

Treating students' CA is a real problem that many speech departments and instructors face every semester (Robinson, 1997). Some colleges and universities have developed special sections of a public speaking course specifically designed for apprehensive students (e.g., Dwyer, 1995; Dwyer, 1998, Dwyer, 2000; Hoffman & Sprague, 1982; Raker, 1992). Other colleges and universities have opened university-wide communication labs to assist students from any discipline with communication skills (Flores, 1997; McKiernan, 1984; Morreale, 1998).

One fairly new intervention to help HCAs is the lab-supported public speaking course. In this course, all students have the opportunity to use a speech lab that offers a wide range of instruction beyond the traditional classroom. The goals for most speech labs include helping students prepare for oral communication activities, providing coaching and feedback during rehearsal stages, and providing evaluative and constructive feedback after the communication events" (Grice & Cronin, 1992, p. 9). A variety of pedagogical methods are offered, such as playback equipment to help students improve oral performance, training in using outlining skills, Internet research skills and presentational software, as well as self-paced interactive instructional modules, communication resource books or audiotapes, and computerized software programs (Morreale, 1998).

One recent study related to the use of speech labs examined "relationships between public speaking anxiety and self-perceived public speaking competency for students with high, moderate, and low CA in the laboratory-supported course" (Ellis, 1995, p. 65). The study reported that "high CA students perceived more improvement than moderate and low CA students" (p. 71), but no significant difference among CA groups was found. It was noted that this "laboratory-supported instructional model provided a nonthreatening, nurturant environment that helped all students, including high apprehensives, to perceive significant increases in self-perceived competency" (Ellis, 1995, p. 74). The laboratory setting offered one-on-one support consisting of "goal setting and accountability interviews, optional coaching in preparation for upcoming speeches, video feedback, and required, private feedback sessions with TA's following each speech" (p. 74).

In order for a speech lab to benefit HCAs, they have to utilize the lab. Although the lab may be available on campus, the student experiencing HCA has to feel comfortable utilizing the lab. This aspect leads to a very important point: the "approach avoidance" chase that can occur between good-intentioned instructors and apprehensive speech students. In one incidence, speech anxious students "upon being encouraged by their public speaking instructors to visit the school's speech lab, responded by dropping the class" (Proctor, Douglas, Garera-Izquierdo & Wartman, 1994, p. 312). It is apparent that being 'sent for treatment' is so embarrassing and/or threatening for HCAs that they will leave a course. This is a critical factor as Monroe & Borzi (1998) pointed out that HCAs face a major obstacle overcoming CA in order to continue their education. That is why the lab-supported course where all are encouraged to use the speech lab can be most useful as no one is singled out to go to the lab.

Based on the negative academic consequences reported for high CA in the communication literature as well as the limited research involving lab-supported public speaking courses, the following hypotheses were proposed.

H1: High and moderate communication apprehensives will show a significant drop in overall and context CA levels at the conclusion of the lab-supported public speaking fundamentals course.

H2: High and moderate communication apprehensives who utilize the speech lab will show a greater decline in overall CA level than the high and moderate communication apprehensives (respectively) who do not use the lab.

H3: High and moderate communication apprehensives who utilize the speech lab will receive higher course grades than high and moderate communication apprehensives (respectively) who do not use the lab.

METHODOLOGY

Participants

Public Speaking Fundamentals Course. Participants for this study were 537 undergraduate students enrolled in 23 sections of a basic public speaking course at a large midwestern university. Participants enrolled in this course represented a cross-section of class rankings (384 [71.5%] freshmen, 106 [19.7%] sophomores, 29 [5.4%] juniors, 17 [3.2%] seniors, and 1 [.2%] missing) and disciplines because the course fulfills a university-wide general education requirement for public speaking. Fifty-three percent were female and 43.8 percent were male (2.4% missing data). The 23 sections represented one-fourth of all students enrolled in the 15-week course over three semesters; 470 completed at least the pretest while 390 students completed both the pretest and posttest instruments.

Speech Lab. With funds from a university grant, a speech lab was staffed by graduate students and made available to all students enrolled in the public speaking fundamentals course. All students in the sample made at least one initial in-class visit to the speech lab at the beginning of the semester. A lab instructor explained the benefits of the lab that focused largely on assistance in all aspects of preparing speeches, but also provided video recording and playback capabilities. All students who visited the lab were required to sign a check-in sheet every time they used the lab. They were asked to sign their name, date of attendance, time, and instructor of their public speaking class.

Measurement Instruments

CA was measured using the Personal Report of Communication Apprehension* (PRCA-24) (McCroskey, 1982). This 24-item scale assesses overall communication anxiety across four contexts, as well as anxiety in each of four contexts (groups, meetings, interpersonal conversations, and public speaking). It uses a five-point Likert-type format and has demonstrated excellent reliability and predictive validity in its wide use in CA research (McCroskey, Beatty, Kearney & Plax, 1985; Richmond & McCroskey, 1998). The obtained reliability coefficients (Cronbach alphas) for the overall scale used in this study were (for the pretest and posttest respectively) .93, and .94. The reliabilities for the context scales were (for the pretest and posttest respectively): groups, .87, .86; meetings, .91, .91; interpersonal, .84, .86; and public speaking, .87, .87.

National norms established in the communication literature show a mean of 65.6 and standard deviation of 15.3 (Richmond & McCroskey, 1998). Low CAs are defined as scoring less than one standard deviation below the norm mean (50 or below). Moderate CAs are defined as scoring between one standard deviation below and one standard deviation above the mean (51 to 80), and high CAs are defined as scoring more than one standard deviation above the norm mean (81 and above).

Speech Lab Usage

Lab usage was measured using the lab check-in sheets. Of the 537 students enrolled in the 23 sections of the public speaking course, 192 (35.8%) used the lab beyond the initial visit and 345 (64.2 percent) chose not to use the speech lab. Eighty-five students (15.8%) used the lab once, 38 students (7.1%) used the lab twice, 25 students (4.7%) used the lab three times, 11 students (2.0%) used the lab four times, 11 students (2.0%) used the lab five times, seven students (1.3%) used the lab six times and 15 students (2.8%) used the lab seven times or more.

Grades

Students' final grades in the course were obtained from departmental records and the instructors who taught the classes. The records showed that 21 (3.9%) received an “A+,” 142 (26.4%) received an "A," 53 (9.9%) received a "B+," 138 (25.7%) received a "B," 30 (5.6%) received a "C+," 55 (10.2%) received a "C," 12 (2.2%) received a "D+," 11 (2.0%) received a "D," 27 (5.0%) received an "F," and 48 (8.9%) “withdrew."

Procedure

Data was collected through PRCA-24 questionnaires that were administered to beginning public speaking students by their instructors during regular class time. The pretest PRCA-24 questionnaire was given during the first week of the semester and the posttest PRCA-24 questionnaire was given during the last week of the semester.

Calculations on speech lab usage were made using the speech lab check-in sheets. Since every student who utilized the lab was introduced to the lab as part of a class assignment, calculations were made on any *additional* visits to the lab. In addition, the students' public speaking course grades were obtained through departmental records.

RESULTS

The results for Hypotheses One and Two were based on the scores of the 390 students who completed *both* pre and posttests on the PRCA-24 questionnaires. From the 390 students, 47 (12.1%) were categorized as high CAs with PRCA-24 overall scores at or above 81 (one standard deviation above the norm mean) and 268 (68.7%) students were categorized as moderate CAs with PRCA-24 overall scores between 51 and 80. This was a total of 315 students scoring in the moderate to high range for CA. The results for Hypothesis Three was based on the scores of 470 students who completed at least the pretest on the PRCA-24 questionnaires, and from that cumulative number, 373 scored within the moderate to high range.

The first hypothesis, which predicted that high and moderate CAs would show a significant drop in overall and context CA levels at the conclusion of the lab-supported public speaking fundamentals course, was supported. Paired t-tests showed a significant difference at the .000 level of probability for the pretest vs posttest scores on overall scores and context scores for both high and moderate CAs. Thus, at the completion of the public speaking fundamentals course, high and moderate CAs did report lower overall and context CA scores (Table 1).

The second hypothesis, which predicted high and moderate CAs who utilized the speech lab would show a greater decline in overall CA level than those high and moderate CAs (respectively) who did not choose to use the lab beyond the initial visit, was not supported. The results of the paired t-tests for Hypothesis Two indicated no significant difference (Table 2).

Hypothesis Three predicted that high and moderate CAs who utilized the speech lab would receive higher course grades than high and moderate CAs (respectively) who did not use the lab beyond the initial visit. The results of the paired t-tests supported the

Table 1
Hypothesis One: Paired T-Test PRCA-24 Results for High and Moderate CAs

High CA	N	Pre-test Mean	SD	Post-test Mean	SD	Change	t	p
Overall	47	88.81	6.61	74.51	11.53	14.30	8.40	.000
PS	47	26.36	2.63	20.83	4.63	5.53	9.74	000
GRP	47	21.36	3.70	17.30	3.68	4.06	5.77	.000
MTG	47	22.53	2.85	19.70	3.61	2.83	5.17	.000
INTP	47	18.55	4.01	16.68	3.68	1.87	3.04	.004
Moderate CA								
Overall	268	65.38	7.97	57.38	12.77	8.00	11.57	.000
PS	268	21.02	3.66	17.89	4.69	3.13	9.97	.000
GRP	268	14.17	3.41	12.43	3.82	1.75	8.46	.000
MTG	268	15.89	3.66	14.29	3.21	1.88	7.16	.000
INTP	268	14.29	3.21	13.06	4.05	1.24	5.23	.000

Table 2
Hypothesis 2 Paired T-Test Speech Lab Utilization Results for High and Moderate CAs

Lab Usage	n	PRCA-Pre Mean	PRCA-Pre SD	Change Mean	SD	Change t	p
High CAs							
N=47							
Yes	24	89.03	6.67	-14.92	11.79	.367	.715
No	23	88.58	6.57	-13.65	11.83		
Moderate CAs							
N=268							
Yes	103	64.03	7.52	- 7.88	10.65	.129	.898
No	165	66.23	8.15	- 8.07	11.71		

higher course grades for high CAs (p = .004), but did *not* support it for moderate CAs (Table 3). (The scale for statistical analysis of grades was: 4.5 = A+, 4 = A, 3.5 = B+, 3 = B, 2.5 = C+, 2 = C, 1.5 = D+, 1 = D, 0 = F.)

Table 3
Hypothesis 3 Paired T-Test Grade Results for High and Moderate CAs

Lab Usage	n	Grade Mean	SD	Change t	p
High CAs N=59					
Yes	28	3.32	.67	2.23	.03
No	31	2.69	1.35		
Moderate CAs N=314					
Yes	114	3.03	.96	.11	.28
No	200	2.88	1.29		

DISCUSSION

The primary purpose for conducting this study was to determine if students who report moderate to high CA, as measured by the PRCA-24, benefit from the lab-supported public speaking fundamentals course. The paired t-test results yielded support for Hypotheses One and Three.

Hypothesis One, which posited that high and moderate CAs would show a significant drop in their overall and context CA levels at the conclusion of a public speaking fundamentals course, was supported. The change scores indicate that the lab-supported basic public speaking course has a positive impact on students experiencing moderate and high CA in public speaking contexts. These findings confirm previous research that found skills training in a public speaking class helps with the reduction of public speaking anxiety (Greene, Rucker, Zauss, & Harris, 1998; Glaser, 1981; Kelly, 1997).

The findings of this study also indicated that the lab-supported basic public speaking course positively impacted all communication contexts for high and moderate CAs. The significant change scores for high CAs (public speaking [5.53], group [4.06], meeting [2.83] and interpersonal communication [1.87]) and for moderate CAs (public speaking [3.13], group [1.75], meeting [1.88] and interpersonal communication [1.24]) were noteworthy. Since CA has been shown to permeate "every facet of an individual's life - school, work, friendships" (Richmond & McCroskey, 1998, p. 41), the students' experience in the lab-supported public speaking fundamentals course *positively* permeated their lives (i.e., school/group context; work/meeting context and friendships/interpersonal context). "The key point to remember is that in the U.S. culture, talk is highly valued" (Richmond & McCroskey, 1998, p. 28). Regardless of the advancement of technology in our lives, it still does not replace the importance of being able to communicate well. The significant change scores of the overall and four communication contexts of high and moderate CAs indicate a direct benefit received through the lab-supported public speaking fundamentals course.

Researchers have substantiated the benefit of instruction. They have examined CA and communication competence in the educational settings and "have documented the impact of instruction on reducing apprehension and improving competence and success" (Rubin, Rubin & Jordan, 1997, p. 105). "If communication educators can improve, even slightly, the degree of student participation throughout their institution, they will be providing a valuable service and most likely will gain the appreciation and support of colleagues in other disciplines" (Phillips, 1980, p. 217).

Communication studies have found that "quiet students often will drop a class with high communication requirements, even if it is a required course" and high CAs who remain in courses with high communication requirements will likely be absent on days when they are scheduled to give speeches (Richmond & McCroskey, 1998, p. 62). Because the lab-supported public speaking fundamentals course benefited moderate and high CA's by lowering their overall, as well as their four communication context scores, the lab-supported course certainly could contribute to retention. This gives further merit to the need to continue studying benefits of the speech lab.

Hypothesis Two, which asserted that high and moderate CAs who utilized the speech lab would show a greater decline in their CA level than high and moderate CAs who did not choose to use the lab beyond the initial visit, was not supported. After reviewing the speech lab usage data, it was found that the majority of students, who did use the lab, used it between one and three times. The lack of significant CA reduction for high and moderate CAs may be attributed to the fact that the lab was not used a lot throughout the semesters. (Only 55.7% of the public speaking students who initially visited the lab utilized the lab more than the initial visit and only 8.2% used it more than three times.) As this was the first time (first three semesters) the speech lab was open, the lack of awareness and importance of using the lab may not have been emphasized by the instructors. In addition, it is possible that once students learned how to prepare a public speech, they may not have felt the need to return to the lab for continued assistance and practice.

Hypothesis Three, which posited high and moderate CAs who utilized the speech lab would receive higher course grades than high and moderate CAs who chose not to use the lab was supported for high CAs but not for moderate CAs. The positive finding for high CAs could have stemmed from many factors including the additional help they received in the lab. This extra effort by the students may have led to higher grades than for those who did not put forth the extra effort to obtain the needed assistance. Another possibility is that HCAs who utilized the lab may have increased their confidence level in public speaking. If so, this would further support Ellis' (1995) conclusion that in addition to the high teacher immediacy it is likely that the "laboratory-supported instructional model provided a nonthreatening, nurturant environment that helped all students, including high apprehensives, to perceive significant increases in self-perceived competency" (p. 74). Higher self-competency for HCAs may have translated into higher course grades. Higher course grades do not necessarily equate with cognitive learning but they are one indicator of personal success in the course and are definitely important in terms of student retention in higher education.

Conclusions. The present study was limited to one sample from one university with data collected over a period of only three semesters. Results provide additional support for the often-reported positive impact associated with completing a basic public speaking course and lowering of overall and context CA levels for high and moderate CAs. In addition, results give some indication that use of technology in a speech lab setting may be beneficial to high CAs in terms of obtaining higher course grades. However, the benefit of speech lab use in lowering CA levels for high and moderate CAs was not supported. This result should not be interpreted to mean the speech lab has no positive benefit in terms of lowering high and moderate CA levels. Perhaps to show such benefit, the lab simply has to be utilized more often than was done by the high and moderate CAs of the present study.

Recommendations for Future Research. The present study can serve as one benchmark for evaluating speech lab usage as an aid in the reduction of CA for high and moderate apprehensives. Future research should continue to explore the potential benefits of the lab-supported basic public speaking course. In addition to utilizing the pre and posttests, it would be beneficial to distribute a questionnaire to those moderate and high CAs who choose to utilize the speech lab to assess their perceptions of skill advancement related to lab usage. As CA stems from a person's *fear* of communication, it would be important to query if students perceive their fear decreases with the increase of skills and additional assistance obtained through the lab. Due to the limited research on lab-supported public speaking classes, this would be valuable information to benefit the continued funding of the speech lab.

Another issue that deserves empirical attention involves the instrument used in this study—the PRCA-24. The PRCA-24 has been widely used to measure overall and context CA for over two decades (Richmond & McCroskey, 1998). The PRCA-24 overall scores reported in this study (and several others) suggest that a public speaking course does impact perceived change in CA levels across four communication contexts. In the past, researchers have linked an overall score on the PRCA-24 to trait CA. However, the communibiological perspective for trait CA suggests that trait CA involves manifestations of neurotic introversion and is not amenable to change (Beatty, McCroskey, & Heisel, 1998; McCroskey & Beatty, 2000). It may be that the PRCA-24 predominately measures self-perceived CA in three public contexts—meetings, group, and public speaking—plus the dyadic context, but not necessarily trait CA. Since a public speaking course appears to help reduce self-perceived CA in public contexts, as well as in dyadic contexts, it could mean that a more refined instrument needs to be developed to measure trait CA instead of the PRCA-24.

Finally, this study suggests the need for continued research on retention of students through the benefit of the lab-supported basic public speaking course. Of the 537 enrolled students, 8.9% withdrew from the course and 5.0% failed the course. This is nearly one-sixth of the enrolled students who did not either complete or pass the course. It would be relevant to explore the retention variable to discern if students who withdrew from the class also withdrew from the educational setting. It would be imperative to find out *why* one-sixth of the enrolled students did not receive a passing grade. Since Ericson & Gardner's (1992) study found "high CA students were significantly more likely to drop out compared to low CA students" and that the HCAs "tended to drop out significantly more after only one year" (p. 127), finding a way to reach these students is of the utmost importance. As has been shown by these findings, the speech lab could serve as a principal way for reaching the HCA students.

For now, it appears that the present study shows benefits of the lab-supported basic public speaking class and the need for continued research to test the lab-supported course as an intervention for HCAs. Any intervention or program that can help HCAs succeed in their post-secondary endeavors is worth the effort for universities, instructors, and most of all for students.

Note:

*The PRCA-24 was used in this study to measure self-perceived overall CA (across four contexts) and self-perceived CA in each of four contexts—groups, meetings, public speaking, and interpersonal conversations. For this study, overall CA is not equivalent to trait CA that may involve "manifestations of neurotic introversion" (Beatty, McCroskey, & Heisel, 1998, p. 201).

REFERENCES

Ayres, J. (1996). Speech preparation processes and speech apprehension. *Communication Education, 45,* 228-235.

Ayres, J., & Ayres, D.M. (1993). A progress report on the development of an instrument to measure communication apprehension in employment interviews. *Communication Research Reports, 10*(1), 87-94.

Ayres, J., Hopf, T., & Ayres, D.M. (1997). Visualization and performance visualization: Applications, evidence, and speculation. In J.A. Daly, J.C. McCroskey, J. Ayres, T. Hopf, & D.M. Ayres. (Eds.), *Avoiding communication,* (pp. 401-422). Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Ayres, J., Keereetaweep, T., Chen, P., & Edwards, P. A. (1998). Communication apprehension and employment interviews. *Communication Education, 47*(1), 1-17.

Beatty, M. J., McCroskey, J.C., & Heisel, A. D. (1998). Communication apprehension as temperamental expression: A communibiological paradigm. *Communication Monographs, 65,* 197-219.

Bourhis, J., & Allen, M. (1992). Meta-analysis of the relationship between communication apprehension and cognitive performance. *Communication Education, 41,* 68-76.

Colby, N., Hopf, T. & Ayres, J. (1993). Nice to meet you? Inter/intrapersonal perceptions of communication apprehension in initial interactions. *Communication Quarterly, 41*(2), 221-230.

Daly, J. A., & Vangelisti, A.L. (1995). Speech anxiety affects how people prepare speeches: A protocol analysis of the preparation processes of speakers. *Communication Monographs, 62*(4), 383-398.

Dwyer, K. (2000). The multidimensional model: Teaching students to self-manage high communication apprehension by self-selecting treatments. *Communication Education, 49*, 157-166.

Dwyer, K. (1998). *Conquer your speechfright*. Orlando, Florida: Harcourt Brace College Publishers.

Dwyer, K. (1995). Creating and teaching special sections of a public speaking course for apprehensive students: A multi-case study. *Basic Communication Course Annual, 7*, 100-124.

Ellis, K. (1995). Apprehension, self-perceived competency, and teacher immediacy in the laboratory-supported public speaking course: Trends and relationships. *Communication Education, 44*, 64-77.

Ericson, P.M., & Gardner, J.W. (1992). Two longitudinal studies of communication apprehension and its effects on college students' success. *Communication Quarterly, 40*(2), 127-137.

Flores, N.L. (1997, November). *How Golden West College Is Addressing Pedagogical, Assessment, and Accountability Concerns through Integrated Spoken Communication Labs*. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the National Communication Association, Chicago, IL.

Fremouw, W.J. & Scott, MD. (1979). Cognitive restructuring: An alternative method of the treatment of communication apprehension. *Communication Education, 28* (2), 129-133.

Gibson, J. W., Hanna, M.S., & Leichty, G. (1990). The basic course at U. S. colleges and universities. *Basic Communication Course Annual, 2,* 233-256.

Glaser, S.R. (1981). Oral communication apprehension and avoidance: The current status of treatment research. *Communication Education, 30,* 321-341.

Greene, J.O., Rucker, M.P., Zauss, E.S. & Harris, A.A. (1998). Communication Anxiety and the Acquisition of Message-Production Skill. *Communication Education, 47,* 338-347.

Grice, G.L. & Cronin, M.W. (1992, April). *The Comprehensive Speech Communication Laboratory: We Have Ways of Making You Talk.* Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Southern States Communication Association, San Antonio, TX.

Hoffman, J. & Sprague, J. (1982). Survey of Reticence and Communication Apprehension Treatment Programs at U.S. Colleges and Universities. *Communication Education, 31,* 185-193.

Jaasma, M.A. (1997). Classroom communication apprehension: Does being male or female make a difference? *Communication Reports, 10*(2), 219-227.

Kelly, L. (1989). Implementing a skills training program for reticent communicators. *Communication Education, 38*(2), 85-101.

Kelly, L. (1997). Skills training as a treatment for communication problems. In J.A. Daly, J.C. McCroskey, J. Ayres, T. Hopf, & D. M. Ayres. (Eds.), *Avoiding communication* (pp. 331-366). Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

McCroskey, J.C. (1972). The implementation of a large-scale program of systematic desensitization for communication apprehension. *Speech Teacher, 21,* 255-264.

McCroskey, J.C. (1977). Oral communication apprehension: A review of recent theory and research. Human Communication Research, 4, 78-96.

McCroskey, J.C. (1982). Oral communication apprehension: A reconceptualization. In M. Burgoon (Ed.), *Communication Yearbook 6,* (pp. 136-170). Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

McCroskey, J.C., & Andersen, J.F. (1976). The relationship between communication apprehension and academic achievement among college students. *Human Communication Research, 51,* 73-81.

McCroskey, J.C., Daly, J.A. & Sorensen, G. (1976). Personality correlates of communication apprehension. *Human Communication Research, 2,* 376-380).

McCroskey, J.C., Beatty, M.J., Kearney, P. & Plax, T.G. (1985). The content validity of the prca-24 as a measure of communication apprehension across communication contexts. *Communication Quarterly, 33*(3), 165-173.

McCroskey, J.C., & Beatty, M.J. (2000). The communibiological perspective: Implications for communication in instruction. *Communication Education, 49*(1), 1-6.

McKiernan, J. (1984). *Getting Our Act Together: A Justification for a Speaking Lab.* Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Central States Speech Association, Chicago, IL.

Monroe, C. & Borzi, M.G. (1988). Communication apprehension and avoidance of postsecondary education. *The School Counselor, 36*, 118-124.

Morreale, S.P. (1998). Communication labs enhance student learning and promote awareness of the discipline. *Spectra, 34* (10), 7-8.

Neer, M.R. (1987). The Development of an Instrument to Measure Classroom Apprehension. *Communication Education, 36,* 154-166.

Phillips, G.M. (1980). The practical teacher's symposium on shyness, communication apprehension, reticence, and a variety of other common problems. *Communication Education, 29*(3), 213-263.

Phillips, G.M. (1997). Reticence: A perspective on social withdrawal. In J.A. Daly, J.C. McCroskey, J. Ayres, T. Hopf, & D.M. Ayres. (Eds.), *Avoiding communication* (pp. 129-150). Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Powers, W. & Smythe, J. (1980). Communication apprehension and achievement in a performance-oriented basic communication course. *Human Communication Research, 6,* 146-152

Proctor II, R. F., Douglas, A.T., Garera-Izquierdo, T. & Wartman, S.L. (1994). Approach, avoidance, and apprehension: Talking with high-ca students about getting help. *Communication Education, 43,* 312-321.

Raker, P.C. (1992). *Communication Apprehension Treatment Programs at U.S. Colleges and Universities: An Update of Hoffman and Sprague.* Unpublished thesis, University of Central Florida, Orlando.

Richmond, V.P., & McCroskey, J.C. (1998). *Communication: apprehension, avoidance, and effectiveness* (5th Ed.). Scottsdale, AZ: Gorsuch Scarisbrick, Publishers.

Richmond, V.P., & Roach, K.D. (1992). Willingness to communicate and employee success in U.S. organizations. *Journal of Applied Communication Research,* 95-114.

Robinson, T.E. (1997). Communication apprehension and the basic public speaking course: A national survey of in-class treatment techniques. *Communication Education, 46,* 188-197.

Rubin, R.B., Rubin, A.M. & Jordan, F.F. (1997). Effects of instruction on communication apprehension and communication competence. *Communication Education, 46*, 104-114.

An Examination of the Speech Evaluation Process: Does the Evaluation Instrument and/or Evaluator's Experience Matter?

Karen Anderson
Karla Kay Jensen

Characterizing the public speaking course as "bedrock of the undergraduate curriculum" (p. 75), Lucas (1999) recognizes that objectively assessing the quality of a student's work can be one of the most challenging tasks for those teaching this course. Consequently, the speech evaluation process, instrument design and its use are critical to those with a vested interest in improving the basic course. By using evaluation instruments commonly found in the public speaking classroom, we attempt to determine whether the instrument or the raters' level of experience influences the grading process. Second, through surveys and open-ended questionnaires, we examine evaluators' perceptions and use of these evaluation forms.

THE SPEECH EVALUATION PROCESS

Many public speaking texts, instructor manuals, and other guides contain speech evaluation instruments in an effort to establish criteria by which speeches will be evaluated. Rubin's (1999) suggestion that the basic principle of setting criteria before evaluating has guided our discipline for the last 70 years. Yet even with predetermined criteria, raters can give biased evaluations. For instance, leniency errors can (Bock, 1970) occur when the evaluator is either too easy or too harsh on all speakers. Halo effect errors (Bock, 1974) can occur when the evaluator is either too easy or too harsh on a particular speaker. Both of these errors can occur when evaluators are aware that the student will see the results (Bohn & Bohn, 1985). Additionally, Stiggins, Backlund and Bridgeford (1985) recognize that lack of training, the evaluator's culture, and even the perceived anxiety of one's students can lead to increased rater bias.

Other studies illustrated that rater training (Bohn & Bohn, 1985, Bowers, 1964; Gunderson, 1978; Miller, 1964), experience (Clevenger, 1963), or the combination of the two (Miller, 1964) improved the evaluation process. For instance, Bowers found that when a group of instructors were trained, the variations among their grades was much lower than a group that received no training. Bohn and Bohn's study "graphically demonstrated . . . not only will training reduce rating error, it will also help to improve student speaking performance" (p. 350). Although there has not been any research on the differences in grading good speeches versus poor speeches, Roubicek's (1990) work examined feedback given by novice and experienced instructors. His study found that there were no considerable differences in how each group offered feedback to their students.

In general, studies conclude that the evaluation instruments can and do affect the judgment of the rater (Becker, 1962; Brooks, 1957; Clevenger, 1964; DiSalvo

& Bochner, 1972). Thus, in tandem with researching instructor experience, it is imperative that evaluation design be evaluated. Research suggests that evaluation instruments can be more reliable and valid if they are simple and balanced in terms of content and delivery, and a speaker's overall effectiveness (Holtzman, 1960; Young, 1974). In addition, the qualities outlined in the evaluation instrument should "be those that are emphasized and taught in the class" (Rubin, 1999, p. 428). Several evaluation instruments have been and are still being developed by instructors and authors, however, these may have not been tested for reliability and validity. In contrast, the *Competent Speaker Evaluation Form* (CSEF), developed and tested in 1990 by Morreale and an SCA/CAT subcommittee is "anchored in the communication literature regarding competent public speaking" (Morreale, Whitney, Zautke, Ellis, McCormick & Whitter, 1992, p.10). This instrument, which has been tested to be reliable and valid, is comprised of eight public speaking competencies including: 1) choosing and narrowing a topic for the audience and occasion; 2) communicating the thesis/specific purpose in a manner appropriate for the audience and occasion; 3) providing appropriate supporting material based on the audience and occasion; 4) using an organizational pattern appropriate to topic, audience, occasion and purpose; 5) using language that is appropriate to the audience and occasion; 6) using vocal variety in rate, pitch and intensity to heighten and maintain interest; 7) using pronunciation, grammar and articulation appropriate to the designated audience; 8) using physical behaviors that support the verbal message. The form scores each competency as unsatisfactory, satisfactory or excellent and allows room for general comments. Although there has been criticism of the CSEF (Hugenberg & Yoder, 1996), most evaluation instruments located contain the eight CSEF competencies.

Although evaluation forms seem to contain common themes, the directions that accompany evaluation instruments can be varied or non-existent. Brooks (1957) contends that directions should be "precise and complete" (p. 29). In addition, Brooks cites various authors who concur that directions encouraging accuracy rather than speed result in more reliable evaluations. Clevenger's (1964) research discovered that a general evaluation form was less reliable than one that directed the raters to evaluate specific qualities of the speech. DiSalvo and Bochner (1972) found that raters do not always use evaluation forms as they were intended to be used. Specifically, participants overwhelmingly used the items that clustered around the concepts of "language" and "delivery" to evaluate the speech. Items of organization, analysis, and speaker personality were seldom used to determine the speech grade. Further, one quarter of the participants used only one item to grade the speech.

Recently, Carlson and Smith-Howell (1995) continued speech evaluation research by examining the reliability and validity of various instruments used in their own department and/or by the participants in their study. First, the expected rating of two video-taped speeches was determined. Next, the instrument reliability was measured by examining the scores given to the two speeches by three levels of raters (experienced from the speech staff, moderately experienced from the mass media staff, and inexperienced from undergraduate public speaking students) using four evaluation forms. Three of these forms were consistent throughout the project, while one form varied from rater to rater. The researchers concluded that a variety of instruments can be used effectively as long as they account for content and delivery. Carlson and Smith-Howell also maintained that the lack of extensive training did not have a major negative impact on the speech evaluation process.

Carlson and Smith-Howell's (1995) study design has a few potential concerns that should be addressed. First, the 58 participants evaluated each speech twice, using two different evaluation forms. Multiple exposures to a speech could influence the perspective the evaluator has regarding that speech. A larger pool of raters might avoid this problem. Second, not all four evaluation forms were used by participants in all three experience levels. For example, Form D was used only by the experienced participants and Form C was never used by this group. Thus, the claim that experience does not matter is perhaps an overstatement. In order to fully support the claim that experience level did not influence the ratings, participants at all experience levels must use all forms in the design. Additionally, the cells of the sub-groups were drastically out of balance. Specifically, of the 19 moderately experienced participants, only two used Form C on Speech 1 and 2, the experienced participants never used Form C on either speech, and the moderately experienced and inexperienced participants never used Form D on either speech. Although the difficulty of finding participants is recognized, and although statistical procedures can adjust for this factor, more balance among the sub-groups might have yielded different results. Finally, although not a methodological concern, the Carlson and Smith-Howell study contradicts many of the previously held opinions about the importance of training in order to avoid rater bias (DiSalvo & Bochner, 1972; Rubin, 1999; Stiggins et al., 1985).

In addition to these concerns, none of the previously cited research address *how* evaluators use speech evaluation forms or the directions that accompany them. LaLumia (1993) points out that most evaluation forms cover areas identical or similar to delivery, language, organization and purpose and that, despite forms' similarities, teachers may use the instruments in different ways to "fill the particular needs of their programs" (p. 241). For example, evaluators may accurately follow directions on the form, or they may make the form fit the grade they believe should be assigned to the students. We can investigate the use of evaluation forms further by asking about an evaluator's like or dislike of the form. Answers to these questions are important to both students and teachers since over 50 percent of the final grade in many basic course programs is comprised of oral performance grades (Gibson, Hanna & Huddleson, 1985). If a particular form is being used in a variety of ways it could yield different grades. This obviously has implications on issues of grade inflation or deflation and consistency across a large number of sections of the basic course within a given department.

By reviewing the previously cited literature, most of which is dated, it is clear that additional speech evaluation form research is warranted. Such an investigation may aid pedagogues in the creation of evaluation forms, as well as assist in the training of how to best use them.

In order to examine these concerns, four research questions were explored:

RQ1: Does previous speech grading experience affect speech ratings?

RQ2: Do raters who have written directions on how to use evaluation forms rate speeches differently than raters who do not have evaluation form directions?

RQ3: Do evaluation forms affect speech ratings?

RQ4: What are evaluators' opinions of the evaluation forms they use?

METHOD

Subjects

In order to avoid the problems of multiple exposures that Carlson and Smith-Howell (1995) faced, the researchers had a total subject pool of 112 participants. Forty-seven were men; 65 were women. Participants were categorized in three age groups. Sixty-one evaluators fell into the 18-23 age group; 22 participants were in the 24-29 group; 29 participants were in the 30 and over group. The participants were gathered from a variety of locations. Twenty-seven percent were from the Communication Studies department, seven percent were from the Mass Communication department, seven percent were high school speech teachers, nine percent were forensics students, 38 percent were undergraduate students and 12 percent were from Toastmasters.

The participants were grouped into three categories: experienced, moderately experienced, and inexperienced raters. The 33 experienced raters had over six months of rating speeches in the classroom or in another venue (i.e., Toastmasters or high school teaching) and specific training in rating speeches. These raters included full-time faculty members at two universities, graduate teaching assistants at one university, high school speech teachers at one high school, and members of the local community. The 31 moderately experienced raters had less than six months experience rating speeches in the classroom or no rating experience in the classroom, but related experience in forensics or broadcasting. These raters included full-time faculty members from mass-media, undergraduate forensics competitors who had judging experience, incoming teaching assistants, and members of the local community. The 48 inexperienced raters had no formal rating experience in a competitive or educational setting and had not taken public speaking or another related course that may have influenced their perception of the rating process. This group, comprised of undergraduate students with no public speaking experience, was chosen in an attempt to answer the Carlson and Smith-Howell (1995) suggestion of using such a group to better understand how novice evaluators grade speeches. In addition, many basic course programs employ Master's candidates who have recently completed BA degrees in a variety of disciplines. Studying inexperienced raters may give us insight into how novice TAs would perform without training.

Evaluation Instruments

Four speech evaluation forms were selected to evaluate a variety of assessment techniques with minimum duplication. All forms selected were representative versions of common instructor-generated instruments published in instructor manuals and/or used at various universities.[1] First, Form A (see Appendix A), used by a large mid-western university and a large southwestern university, is a 100-point scale, which accounts for content and delivery features. The maximum points for each section includes: introduction, 20; body, 35; conclusion, 15; and delivery 30. Within each section a checklist is provided with numerous criteria. This form includes detailed descriptions of what constitutes an A, B, C, D or F speech, using the standard grading scale of 90-100=A; 80-89=B; 70-79=C; 60-69=D; and 59 and below=F. These instructions were given to half of the raters during the study, while the other half of the raters received no instructions other than the point values that were printed on the form.

Form B (see Appendix B) is a "commonly recommended evaluation form" (Carlson & Smith-Howell, 1995), chosen because it was used in the Carlson and Smith-Howell's study. This form focuses on five areas of concentration: introduction, organization, development, conclusion, and delivery. Each area is rated on a five-point scale (poor, fair, average, good, and excellent). The final grade is determined using the same standard scale as Form A. The instructions for this form are not as detailed as Form A or C and include only basic guidelines for evaluating a speech. Half of the raters received instructions and half were not provided with any instructions during the study. The instructions that were provided to the evaluators were developed by the researchers of this project. No instructions were given for this form in the Carlson and Smith-Howell study.

---

[1] Similar to the Carlson and Smith-Howell (1995) design, the evaluation instruments used in this study all contained recommended and previously studied components of content and delivery. See Sprague (1971), Jensen and Lamoureux (1995) and Rubin (1999) for summaries of evaluation instruments.

Form C, also used in the Carlson and Smith-Howell (1995) study (see Appendix C) is a 17-item instrument which accounts for seven delivery categories (appearance, self-confidence, enthusiasm, body vitality, contact vitality, voice vitality, and speech vitality), seven content categories (evidence of thorough planning, explanations, visual aids, interest, content material, support, and logical development), and three structure categories (introduction, body, and conclusion). Each of the 17-items are rated as 0 (average), + (outstanding), or - (not satisfactory). Detailed instructions obtained from Carlson, explain what to look for when evaluating each item. The pluses and minuses are summed and the total establishes a grade as follows: +8 and above = A; +4 to +7 = B; 0 to +3 = C; -4 to -1 = D; and -5 and below = F. Half of the raters were given the written instructions that explain how to figure the grade and convert them to a percentage, while half of the raters were not given instructions.

Finally, Form D (see Appendix D), another commonly found evaluation, is currently used in an upper division undergraduate business and professional communication course at a large southwestern university. This form establishes two main categories of organization and structure, and delivery. Organization and structure is comprised of seven items including: introduction, clarity of main points, support of main points, organization, transitions, conclusions, and use of persuasive elements (evidence, reasoning, emotional appeal and call to action). Delivery is established through eight items including: posture, facial expression, eye contact, gestures, composure, conversational quality, vocal delivery, and language use. Each item is measured on a five-point scale (unacceptable, poor, acceptable, good, and excellent). The general guidelines for evaluating a speech are similar to the instructions for Form B. Once again half of the raters received the instructions and half did not receive any instructions. Since no directions were available, instructions were developed by the researchers of this project.

Procedure

The researchers solicited two video-taped persuasive speeches from 16 public speaking instructors. Tatum's (1992) study concluded that evaluating speeches on tape does not add to or subtract from any rater biases. The two types of speeches requested were to be "C" speech (Speech 1) and an "A" speech (Speech 2). Because the researchers attempted to minimize the influence of sex and age on the ratings, both speakers selected were female, in their early twenties and similar in appearance. Both speeches were persuasive, both were approximately the same length, and neither speaker used a visual aid. A pilot study with eight experienced raters

Table 1
Hypothesis One: Paired T-Test PRCA-24 Results for High and Moderate CAs

High CA	N	Pre-test Mean	SD	Post-test Mean	SD	Change	t	p
Overall	47	88.81	6.61	74.51	11.53	14.30	8.40	.000
PS	47	26.36	2.63	20.83	4.63	5.53	9.74	000
GRP	47	21.36	3.70	17.30	3.68	4.06	5.77	.000
MTG	47	22.53	2.85	19.70	3.61	2.83	5.17	.000
INTP	47	18.55	4.01	16.68	3.68	1.87	3.04	.004
Moderate CA								
Overall	268	65.38	7.97	57.38	12.77	8.00	11.57	.000
PS	268	21.02	3.66	17.89	4.69	3.13	9.97	.000
GRP	268	14.17	3.41	12.43	3.82	1.75	8.46	.000
MTG	268	15.89	3.66	14.29	3.21	1.88	7.16	.000
INTP	268	14.29	3.21	13.06	4.05	1.24	5.23	.000

was conducted in order to determine if the speeches represented the intended grade. Seven of the eight experienced raters, agreed that Speech 1 was a C-/70-72, while remaining evaluator gave the speech a D+/68. Similarly, seven of the eight experienced raters gave Speech 2 an A-/90-92, while the remaining evaluator gave the speech a B+/88.

In order to adequately assess the influence of the experience of the rater on the speech grade given, each of the 112 participants graded both speeches. The original intent was to have each group of evaluators use the same number of each form for each speech. However, some forms had to be thrown out because some evaluators erroneously received the same form twice, did not complete demographics, or failed to assign a final grade to the speech. (See Table 1.) Half of all the forms included directions on how to use the form, the other half included no directions.

Groups containing evaluators of all experience levels, met throughout a period spanning several weeks. A protocol script was followed for each group. First, the participants completed demographic forms to determine sex and age, as well as amount of speech grading experience. Next, evaluators were told they were going to see two persuasive speakers, each of whom met requirements for time limit and number of sources. Raters were told to imagine they were the speaker's instructor and the sole evaluator of the speech. Consequently, they were to evaluate the speech using the evaluation form provided for them as if they were the speaker's teacher. After the directions were given, the first evaluation form was distributed either with or without directions. Participants were given as much time as they needed to familiarize themselves with the form. A speech was then shown (speeches were randomly ordered among groups to avoid any order effect) and raters were given as much time as they needed to complete their comments on the evaluation form. The same procedure was followed for the second speech.

Following the evaluation of both speeches, a survey was distributed to the raters. This survey consisted of open-ended questions regarding the raters' overall opinions of evaluation forms.

Data Treatment

A series of one-way ANOVAs were conducted to determine the influence of teacher experience on assigned speech grade, the influence of evaluation directions on assigned speech grade, and the affect of the evaluation form on assigned speech grade.

To get a better idea of participants' general and specific opinions about evaluation forms open-ended questions were provided on the survey. All answers were content analyzed by two trained coders who overlapped on twenty percent of the coding. The unit of analysis was a topical phrase, which was defined as a thought that can stand alone. For instance, the sentence, "I liked the form's simplicity, but I didn't like the 1-5 grading scale" was coded into two categories of "simplicity" and "grading scale problem." Scott's Pi was used to determine inter-coder reliability. The pilot coding resulted in a 95% inter-coder agreement. Final reliability was also at 95%.

RESULTS

Data Analysis

Research Question 1 investigated the influence of experience on the speech grade assigned. For Speech 1, ANOVAs revealed the mean grade of inexperienced raters was significantly higher than the grade assigned by either moderate or experienced raters (*F*[2, 112], 4.65, $p = .0115$). Specifically, the mean for inexperienced raters was 73.86, while the means for moderate and experienced raters were nearly identical at 68.07 and 68.18 respectively. For Speech 2, the mean grade of inexperienced raters was again significantly higher than the grade assigned by either moderate or experienced raters (*F*[2, 112], 4.45, $p = .0138$). The mean grade was 93.88 for inexperienced raters, while the means for moderate and experienced raters were 90.76 and 91.06 respectively.

Research Question 2 asked whether raters who were provided directions would grade speeches differently than raters who did not have directions. The ANOVAs indicated no significant difference between these groups and the grade assigned to either speech.

Research Question 3 explored whether evaluation forms affect speech ratings. The overall mean grades for Speeches 1 and 2 were 70.69 and 92.24 respectively. These scores fit within the projected grades for each speech. An ANOVA conducted regarding the form used and the grade given for Speech 1 showed no significant difference between the form used and the grade given. However, the ANOVA performed regarding Speech 2 revealed that Forms A, B, and C yielded similar grades, compared to Form D, which yielded a significantly lower grade (F[3, 112], 5.06, $p = .0026$). The means and standard deviations were also calculated for each form and each experience level (See Table 1).

Research Question 4 asked "What are evaluator's opinions of the forms they use?" The first open-ended question asked, "Did this evaluation form include all the necessary components for you to evaluate the speech? Why or Why not? If not, what other components should be included in this evaluation form? Please explain." The answer to this question was analyzed by looking at each form individually (Forms A-D), focusing on how experienced, moderate and inexperienced evaluators answered the question. Regardless of the speech evaluated or whether or not directions were used, similar themes emerged from all three rater levels for each of the evaluation forms.

Assessment of Form A. In general the responses of both the experienced and moderate evaluators were positive, while the lack of directions for inexperienced evaluators yielded negative comments. Specifically, the 15 experienced evaluators who used Form A provided 22 comments in the open-ended evaluation. Only four comments were negative. Specifically, the experienced participants felt the form would be too complicated for novice evaluators, the point system was too difficult, the form was too structured, and there needed to be more specific criteria in the delivery area. The positive comments contained themes of the form being detailed (three responses), comprehensive (three responses), flexible (four responses), easy to use (four responses), and allowing enough room to write comments (four responses).

The 16 moderate evaluators who used Form A offered 28 topical phrases. Negative comments fell into the categories of "problems with the point system" (two responses) and "form too specific" (two responses). The remaining comments were positive and included all the ideas identified by the experienced evaluators, as well as indicating that the form was easy to use (six responses) and the strengths/ weaknesses area was useful (three responses). In addition, of the participants who used directions, four indicated that the directions were useful.

The 23 inexperienced evaluators gave 26 comments regarding their use of Form A. All 10 of the negative comments were from evaluators who did not have directions to this form. These evaluators felt there was too much detail on the form (three responses), they needed more guidance with how to assign the points (five responses), and the form would be better if it had directions (two responses). The remaining 16 positive comments included the same themes as cited above and a new theme of "useful checklist" (six responses).

Assessment of Form B. Overall, evaluators on all experience levels had negative comments regarding Form B. Thirteen experienced evaluators, 14 moderate evaluators, and 25 inexperienced evaluators used Form B. The experienced evaluators generated 20 topical phrases about their use of Form B. The majority of these comments were negative. Experienced evaluators felt the form needed to be more specific (four responses) and to give more room to write comments (one response). Two responses were given on the need for grading on effort or improvement. For those evaluators who had directions, concerns included: the comments not adding up to 100 percent (three responses); the poor-excellent scale seemed too arbitrary (two responses); and difficulty in matching the scale to what the evaluator thought the grade should be (one response). For those evaluators who did not have directions, three commented that directions would make the form easier to use. The remaining four comments were positive, stating that the form was flexible (two responses) and open-ended enough to "fit" any speech or speaker (two responses).

The 14 moderate evaluators also gave negative responses. Unlike their experienced colleagues, the moderate evaluators did not have a problem with the poor-excellent scale, but did cite a problem with the generality of the form. Fourteen responses claimed the scale was not specific enough. In addition, those who did not have directions stated directions would have made the form easier to use (three responses). Moderate evaluators also wanted more room to write comments (three responses). The remaining six comments were positive, citing the form's ease (three responses) and flexibility (three responses).

Finally, the 25 inexperienced evaluators echoed the others, claiming the form did not contain enough detail (12 responses) and the point system was confusing (nine responses). Again, several of those without directions stated they wanted directions for ease in grading (four responses). The six positive comments contained themes of ease of use (four responses) and flexibility (two responses).

Assessment of Form C. The majority of the comments for Form C were also negative for all three evaluator levels. Twenty-one experienced, 17 moderate and 23 inexperienced evaluators used Form C. Most negative comments concerned the evaluation's +,-, and 0 scoring system. Specifically, the experienced evaluators claimed the scale was confusing (five responses), complicated (six responses), and too limiting by only allowing the three options of +,-, and 0 (six responses). Other experienced evaluator comments questioned the specific grading criteria in the areas of body vitality and contact (five responses), as well as the organization of the form (four comments). Experienced evaluators also wanted more room to write comments (five responses). Evaluators not provided directions indicated that directions would have been helpful. The one positive theme was that the form was complete (four responses).

Moderate evaluators also expressed themes that the grading scale was confusing (five responses), complicated (eight responses) and limiting (four responses). They added that the grading system was too long (three responses), too subjective (three responses), and that they felt "trapped" into giving a grade they didn't want to give (four responses). On the positive side, three responses were given that the form was complete.

Inexperienced evaluators agreed with their experienced and moderate counterparts. Themes for this group included the grading scale was difficult to use (nine comments), complicated (six comments), and mathematically challenging (four comments). Inexperienced evaluators also provided the response that it would be difficult for the student to get a good grade using this form (five responses), and that the directions were confusing (four responses). As with the other two groups, some inexperienced evaluators deemed the evaluation complete (three responses).

Assessment of Form D. The responses given for Form D varied among experience level. First, the 17 experienced evaluators expressed confusion with the point system (four responses), and concern that the form was not detailed enough (seven responses). They also requested more space to write comments (five responses). One participant wrote that the form "forced" him to assign a grade lower than he thought the speaker deserved. Some experienced evaluators liked Form D, saying it was flexible (three responses), complete (two responses), and gave the speaker credit for strengths rather than penalizing weaknesses (one response).

The 15 moderate evaluators agreed that the point system was confusing (nine responses), the 1-5 scale was too "constricting" (four responses), and the form was not detailed enough (five responses). There were also moderate evaluators who liked using the form, saying it was easy to use (four responses), it assisted in efficient grading (four responses), it was balanced (three responses) and it was complete (two responses).

Last, the 25 inexperienced evaluators offered a balance between negative and positive comments. They too felt the form needed to be more detailed (five responses) and have a better point system (four comments); however, they also wrote that the form was easy to use (six responses), complete (five responses), and easy for students to understand (four responses). Unlike the responses from Forms A, B, or C, none of the evaluators who used form D without directions made remarks about the absence of directions.

Preference of Evaluation Forms. After the participants graded the speeches and assessed the evaluation form they used, two additional open-ended questions were posed. The first asked raters to identify, if they had a preference, which of the two evaluation forms used would be their choice to use again and why they made that choice. When given the choice between Form A and any other form, evaluators at all levels usually chose Form A. Reasons for this choice included the detailed criteria (nine responses), open-ended questions (eight responses), order of the criteria (seven responses), the checklist (five responses), space for writing (four responses), the point system (four responses) and ease of use for teachers (10 responses) and for students (four responses).

Next, when Form D was a choice with Forms B or C, evaluators regularly chose Form D. Reasons given for the choice included preference for the grading scale (eight responses), the flexibility (eight responses), and simplicity (seven responses) of the form, and the opportunity for students to get a good grade with this form (six responses — all from inexperienced evaluators). Forms B and C were seldom chosen over Forms A or D. However, when the choice was between Form B or Form C, the choice was relatively balanced for all experience levels. Form B was chosen because of its simplicity (11 responses), descriptions of each category (eight responses), and ease of use (five responses). Form C was chosen because of its thoroughness (nine responses), ease of use (six responses), and space for comments (three responses). Four experienced, two moderate, and one inexperienced evaluator did not have a preference of evaluation forms.

Do we need evaluation forms? The final open-ended question asked, "Do evaluators need evaluation forms in a communication course with a public speaking component? Why or why not? Please explain in as much detail as possible." The experienced evaluators offered 52 total comments, 40 of which were affirmative. Specifically, they proposed we do need evaluation forms because they help students improve (10 responses), they help students know the criteria by which they will be judged (nine responses), they help teachers remain consistent and objective among speakers (12 responses), they help justify grades (four responses), they help make grading easier (three responses), and they provide spaces for written comments (two responses). Twelve responses indicated that evaluation forms are not necessary. Eight of these responses stated simply "Teachers don't need them, but students do." The remaining four responses fell in the category of evaluation forms being not flexible enough.

Moderate evaluators gave 38 total comments, 35 of which were affirmative. They included themes that evaluation forms help with consistency and objectivity (17 responses), they give students feedback (10 responses), they assist evaluators with being organized (five responses), and offering more positive feedback (three responses). The three reasons given for not needing evaluation forms were that, "A speech is either good or bad — you don't need an evaluation form to determine that," "forms can be too stifling," and "evaluators should use their own criteria, not what is on a form."

Finally, inexperienced evaluators gave 61 comments, 56 of which were affirmative. These responses included the ideas that evaluation forms show which criteria to grade (19 responses), and how to calculate grades (16 responses), let students know what to work on in the future (14 responses), help with consistency and objectivity (four responses), and completeness of the evaluation (three responses). Inexperienced evaluators who felt evaluation forms were not necessary stated that evaluation forms forced teachers to inflate (two responses) or deflate (two responses) students' grades.

Types of comments given on evaluation forms. Participants' comments on the evaluation form itself were analyzed using a coding scheme similar to the one used by Jensen and Lamoureux (1997). Specifically, the number of total comments were counted, as well as the number of positive (expresses approval) and negative (expresses disapproval or offers suggestions) comments, and the number of content and delivery comments. Attention was also paid to the evaluator's experience, which evaluation form was employed, and whether or not the evaluator was given evaluation form directions.

On average, the experienced evaluator offered 14 separate comments (topical phrases) per evaluation form; moderate evaluators offered eight comments; and inexperienced evaluators offered six comments. Form A yielded the most comments across all experience levels (11 comments), followed by Form B (eight comments), Form D (seven comments) and Form C (four comments). When moderate and inexperienced raters were provided directions, the number of comments rose on average, by four comments per evaluation. When experienced raters were provided directions, the number of comments remained consistent with the number of comments written when directions were absent. Finally, when looking at the types of comments given, experienced raters directed their comments more toward content (61%) than delivery (39%), and gave more negative (59%) than positive (41%) remarks. Moderate raters offered more of a balance between content (48%) and delivery (52%), and negative (47%) and positive (53%) feedback. Inexperienced evaluators offered more delivery (68%) than content comments (32%), as well as more positive (72%) versus negative (28%) comments.

DISCUSSION

The results of this project illustrate a variety of issues important to consider when reviewing what types of evaluation forms are used as well as who is using them. To begin, Research Question 1 (Does previous speech grading experience affect speech ratings?) was supported in the quantitative analysis. The findings show that inexperienced raters give significantly higher grades, despite the level of the speech (A or C speech). This echoes previous research that maintains training and experience are important for consistency in speech ratings (e.g., Clevenger, 1963; Bowers, 1964; Gunderson, 1978). The qualitative analysis of the evaluations written by each experience level revealed a marked difference in the amount and types of comments given. Experienced evaluators offered more comments than moderate or inexperienced evaluators, regardless of the evaluation form used. Although, as previously discussed, the number of comments fluctuated with the presence or absence of directions, the types of comments remained consistent among the three evaluator levels, regardless of the evaluation form used. Experienced raters gave more negative, content comments; moderate raters balanced their feedback between content and delivery, and negative and positive feedback; and inexperienced raters offered more positive, delivery comments. Observing this kind of pattern clearly illustrates what issues evaluators in each experience level deems important or appropriate when grading a speech.

Research Question 2 asked if raters who have written directions on how to use evaluation forms rate speeches differently than raters who do not have directions. The data analysis revealed no differences in the speech grade given and whether or not a rater was provided with directions. However, we know from the open-ended questions that, especially when an evaluation form is complicated (like Form C, and to a lesser extent, Form A), raters like to have directions. Interestingly, as the raters' experience level increased, the requests for directions and comments about directions decreased. A qualitative analysis of the comments also revealed that, when provided with directions, moderate and inexperienced evaluators gave more written feedback to the speaker. These findings indicate that we need to continue offering our less experienced evaluators more guidance before they embark on speech grading. It appears experience enhances confidence using any evaluation form — even without directions.

The results of Research Question 3 (Do evaluation forms affect speech ratings?) show that, although a significant difference between the form used and the grade given for Speech 2 was found, no differences were found among the forms and the grade given for Speech 1. Additionally, only one form (Form D) yielded a significantly different (lower) grade on Speech 2. This indicates that the evaluation form has a minimal affect on the speech rating. These findings are generally consistent with those of Carlson and Smith-Howell (1995). Further research should clarify these conflicting results.

The findings from Research Question 4 (What are evaluators' opinions of the evaluation forms they use?) reveal that, when the speech is poor, evaluators both state and demonstrate that they are more likely to follow the directions or the form. However, when the speech is of higher quality, utilizing the form as designed becomes less important to the evaluators. One possible explanation for this result is the ambiguous nature of Forms B and C. Without directions, evaluators may perceive these forms to lack any clear guidelines for grading the speech. This is further supported from the results regarding Speech 2, which indicate that Forms B and C are less likely to be followed by the rater in forming the grade. We should however note, that directions can also be ambiguous or too confining. Specifically, two experienced raters, both of whom used Form C with directions, gave extremely low grades (a 30% and a 12%) to Speaker 1. Their comments on the open-ended questions help explain these scores. One remarked "after reading the evaluation directions I felt forced into giving the speaker such a low grade." The other simply wrote "evaluation system confusing." The challenge of grading a poor quality speech, in comparison to a high quality speech was also illustrated by the much higher standard deviations on Speech 1 compared to Speech 2. This result is not surprising considering that there is only a 10-15 point range for a good speech (B to A+) compared to the possible 10-50 point range of a poor speech (B- to F). We can make two conclusions from these results. First, when the evaluation form is complex, directions seem to be a key in using the form as it was designed. On the other hand, when an evaluation form is relatively straight-forward, evaluators can use it to determine the grade without the aid of directions. Second, it is imperative to cautiously design our evaluation forms as well as their accompanying directions so they will yield valid and reliable grades for any level of speech.

The findings from RQ4 also reveal a strong preference of certain forms over others. The answers to the open-ended questions indicate that the type of speech evaluation form used matters greatly to the rater even if the form has no bearing on the grade given to the speaker. First, examining the participants' responses shows that a balance between specificity and flexibility is wanted. That is, evaluators liked when a form offered them enough guidance to determine what was to be graded, but they didn't want to feel "forced" into giving a student a grade. Other common themes include evaluators wanting space to write comments and a logical grading system (i.e., one that added up to 100). Second, it is interesting to note the reasons cited among the three experience groups for wanting evaluation forms. The experienced raters considered them as primarily useful for students (48% of the responses), or as a way to remain consistent and objective (30% of the responses). In contrast to the student focus, moderate raters viewed evaluation forms as a useful way to stay consistent or be organized (71% of the responses). Similarly, the 70% of the comments given by inexperienced evaluators dealt specifically with the use of the form (what to evaluate and how to calculate the grade).

Training Implications and Conclusion

The finding that experienced evaluators use and think of evaluation forms differently than moderate or inexperienced evaluators is not really that surprising. However, it is noteworthy considering the number of novice TAs the basic course employs, if not to autonomously teach these courses, at least to grade speeches in these courses. Consequently, it is our responsibility as directors of these courses to provide our TAs with the tools they need to accurately grade speeches. Specifically, the current research suggests that, inexperienced raters certainly need evaluation forms which identify specific criteria to be evaluated as well as clear instructions detailing how to evaluate each item. This is particularly important for "C" speeches. These recommendations are in line with the previously cited research which established that rater training (Bowers, 1964; Gunderson, 1978), experience (Clevenger, 1963), or the combination of the two (Miller, 1964) improved the evaluation process. Considering these collective results, not only do we need well-designed evaluation forms, we also need initial and ongoing supervision as TAs learn how to most efficiently and effectively use their school's evaluation tool. For instance, considering the Jensen and Lamoureux (1997) finding that students deem specific, negative, content comments as most helpful, evaluators should be coached on *how* to use the evaluation form to determine a grade and how to write comments that will be useful to the student.

We can conclude from this study's findings that, although different evaluation forms can produce similar grades, raters definitely have opinions and preferences regarding the form they use. Additionally, as seen in the qualitative analysis, the types and numbers of comments written to the speaker vary according to which form the evaluator employs. Because an evaluator's experience influences speech grades, as well as the amount and type of feedback given to the speaker, future research should focus on designing evaluation instruments that are more helpful to the rater as well as the student. Ensuring our own evaluation forms meet the objectives of our courses or specific assignments would be a good place for each of us to start.

REFERENCES

Backlund, P. (1983). Methods of assessing speaking and listening skills. In R.B. Ruben (Ed.), Improving speaking and listening skills (pp. 59-73). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Becker, S.L. (1962). The ratings of speeches: Scale independence. *Speech Monographs, 29*, 38-44.

Bock, D.G. (1970). The effects of persuasibility on leniency, halo, and trait errors in the use of speech ratings scales. *Speech Teacher, 19*, 296-300.

Bock, D.G. (1974). Reliability and validity of speech rating scales: Some error effects. *Central States Speech Journal, 23*, 145-151.

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 paradigm. *Communication Education, 33*, 337-341.

Bock, D.G., Butler, J.L., & Bock E.H. (1984). The impact of sex of the speaker, sex of the rater and profanity type of language trait errors in speech evaluation: A test of the rating error paradigm. *Southern Speech Communication Journal, 49*, 177-186.

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

Bowers, J.W. (1964). Training speech raters with film. *Speech Teacher, 13*, 228-231.

Brooks, K. (1957). Some basic considerations in rating scale development: A descriptive bibliography. *Central States Speech Journal, 9,* 27-31.

Carlson, R.E. & Smith-Howell, D. (1995). Classroom public speaking assessment: Reliability and validity of selected evaluation instruments. *Communication Education, 44*, 87- 97.

Clevenger, T. (1963). Retest reliabilities of ten scales of public speaking performances. *Central States Speech Journal, 14,* 285-291.

Clevenger, T. (1964). Influence of scale complexity on the reliability of ratings of general effectiveness in public speaking. *Speech Monographs, 31,* 153-156.

DiSalvo, V. & Bochner, A.P. (1972). The use of simulated profiles and the Prof Technique in capturing the policies of speech raters. *Speech Teacher, 21,* 273-280.

Gibson, J.W., Hanna, M.S., & Huddleson, B. (1985). The basic speech course at U.S. colleges and universities: IV. *Communication Education, 34,* 281-292.

Gunderson, D.F. (1978). Video-tape modules as a device for training speech raters. *Southern Speech Communication Journal, 43,* 395-406.

Hugenberg, L. & Yoder, D. (1996, November). A reaction to the "competent speaker speech evaluation form": An update. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Speech Communication Association, San Diego. (ED 404 695)

Jensen, K.K. & Lamoureux, E. R. (1997). Written feedback in the basic course: What instructors provide and what students deem helpful. *Basic Communication Course Annual, 9*, 37-58.

LaLumia, J.P. (1993). Evaluating student presentations. In L.W. Hugenberg, P.L. Gray, & D.M. Trank (Eds.) *Teaching and directing the basic communications course* (pp. 241-248). Dubuque, IA: Kendall/Hunt.

Lucas, S. (1999). Teaching public speaking. In A. Vangelisiti, J. Daly & G. Friedrich (Eds.), *Teaching communication: Theory, research and methods* (2nd ed.) (pp. 75-84). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Miller, G.R. (1964). Agreement and the grounds for it: Persistent problems in speech rating. *Speech Teacher, 13,* 257-261.

Morreale, S.P., Whitney, P., Zautke, B., Ellis, K., McCormick, C. & Whitter, S. 1992, October). The center for excellence in oral communication: A comprehensive program for assessing the development of public speaking competency. Paper presented at the 78th annual meeting of the Speech Communication Association, Chicago, IL. (ED 350 642)

Rubin, R.B. (1982). Communication competency assessment instrument. *Communication Education, 31,* 19-32.

Rubin, R.B. (1999). Evaluating the product. In A. Vangelisit, J. Daly & G. Friedrich (Eds.), *Teaching communication: Theory, research and methods* (2nd ed.) (pp. 425-444). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Roubicek, H.L. (1990, November). Feedback: Instructional decisions to be made in performances courses. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Speech Communication Association, Chicago, IL. (ED 324 722)

Sprague, J.A. (1971). An investigation of the written critique behavior of college communication instructors. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Purdue University, West Lafayette, IN.

Stiggins, R.J., Backlund, P.M., & Bridgeford, N.J. (1985). Avoiding bias in the assessment of communication skills. *Communication Education, 34,* 135-141.

Tatum, D.S. (1992, April). Controlling for judge differences in the measurement of public speaking activity. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco, CA. (ED 353 273)

APPENDIX A

Speech Evaluation Form A

Name: ______________ **Topic:** ___________

Points Possible	Points Received	Check-list	Criteria
20	____		*Introduction:*
		____	1. Captured attention
		____	2. Stated thesis
		____	3. Related topic to audience
		____	4. Established credibility
		____	5. Previewed main points
		____	6. Provided transition to body
35	____		*Body:*
		____	1. Organized main points clearly and logically
		____	2. Included transitions between main points
		____	3. Constructed effective argument for position
		____	4. Used accurate, relevant and timely supporting materials in sufficient quantity
		____	5. Cited sources in speech
		____	6. Incorporated appropriate appeals to emotions, values, motivations
		____	7. Used relevant, easy-to-see visual aids
		____	8. Explained visual aids clearly
		____	9. Used an oral language style appropriate to topic and audience
		____	10. Used sound reasoning

15	____		*Conclusion:*
		____	1. Restated thesis
		____	2. Sumarized main points
		____	3. Ended with a memorable final thought
30	____		*Delivery:*
		____	1. Used adequate and inclusive eye contact
		____	2. Used effective vocal delivery (appropriate rate and volume, clear articulation, varied inflection, and no vocal fillers)
		____	3. Used effective physical delivery (posture, gestures, movement)

*Major Strengths:
*Suggested Goals for Next Speech:
*Areas Needing Improvement:
*Overall Evaluation:
Total Points/Grade
*On the original form, the lower third of the page left room for these comments.

Criteria for Grading Speeches-Form A

In general, a C grade on a speech means that students have met the minimum requirements for that assignment: a grade of A or B means that students have gone beyond the minimum requirements in a significant way: and a grade of D or F means that students have failed to meet two or more of the requirements for the assignment. A grade of C represents *average, satisfactory* work. More specific information on grading criteria is provided below.

I. A grade of C: Average, Satisfactory Work.

A. To be judged as average and satisfactory, the speech must:

1. Meet all specific requirements for that speech as outlined on the assignment sheet: length, purpose, organization, research, source citation, etc.
2. Be delivered on the date assigned.
3. Address a topic appropriate to the speaker, topic, and occasion.
4. Have a full introduction and conclusion.
5. Have a clear and detectable primary purpose.
6. Include a body which has
   a. clear and logical organization of main points.
   b. transitions between main points.
   c. accurate, relevant, timely and appropriate evidence and appeals in sufficient quantity.
   d. sources of evidence cited during the presentation.
   e. a visual aid (when necessary) which is relevant, appropriate, clearly designed and clearly explained.
7. Be delivered with adequate eye contact and animation, using a direct, conversational style.
8. Be accompanied by a sentence outline or manuscript as assigned.

II. A grade of B: Above Average Work.

  A. To be judged as above average, the speech must meet the criteria for a C speech, as well as:

    1. Exhibit skillful use of internal summaries and/or transitions.
    2. Demonstrate above average skill in the ability to interest and challenge the audience through the use of language, organization and supporting materials.
    3. Include content which shows a greater depth of research and thinking than the average student speech.
    4. Make a significant contribution to the knowledge or intellectual motivation of the audience.
    5. Involve the audience in the topic.
    6. Use a variety of supporting materials in an interesting and original way.
    7. Be delivered with poise and ease, exhibiting the personal involvement of the speaker.

III. A grade of A: Superior Work.

  A. To be judged as superior, the speech must meet the criteria for a B speech, as well as:

    1. Constitute a genuinely individual contribution by the speaker to the thinking of the audience.
    2. Demonstrate exceptional skill in winning understanding of difficult concepts or

processes, or in winning agreement from listeners initially inclined to disagree with the speaker's ideas, or in moving an audience to action.

3. Address a topic of significance.
4. Include thorough research which encompasses both primary and secondary sources.
5. Involved the audience throughout the entire presentation.
6. Be delivered with an interesting, forceful delivery style which catches attention, motivates interest, and uses personalized directness.

IV. A grade of D: Below Average Work.

- A. A speech which is below average has one or more of the following serious problems:
    1. Failure to meet the basic requirements of the assignment as outlined on the assignment sheet: length, organization, research, source citation, etc.
    2. Generalizations without sufficient explicit support material so that the speech material so that the speech is based only on opinion.
    3. Incomplete development of ideas or lack of organization.
    4. Failure to identify sources during the presentation of the speech.

5. Reliance on only one source so that the speech is summarization of one article.
6. Superficiality which demonstrates a lack seriousness about the assignment.
7. Delivery with poor eye contact, frequent hesitations, insufficient volume, extreme dependence on notes, etc.
8. Language which evidences a written rather than an oral, style.
9. No outline.

V. A grade of F: Unacceptable Work.

A. A speech which is unacceptable has one or more of the following characteristics:

1. A majority of the problems of a below average speech.
2. Fabricated support material.
3. Deliberately distorted evidence.
4. Plagiarized materials.
5. Not presented on the assigned day.

APPENDIX B

Speech Evaluation Form B

Name: ______________________________

Topic: ______________________________

	Poor	Fair	Average	Good	Excellent
Introduction: (capture attention; relate to audience; introduce topic)	___	___	___	___	___
Organization: (speech easy to follow; clear progression of ideas)	___	___	___	___	___
Development: (clear explanation; use of supporting material)	___	___	___	___	___
Conclusion: (provides closure; summary; vivid)	___	___	___	___	___
Delivery: (eye contact; understandable; use of gestures/ facial expression; conversational)	___	___	___	___	___

Comments:

Rating Scale: (A) Excellent = 90-100; (B) Good = 80=89; (C) Average = 70=79; (D) Fair = 60-69; (F) = 50-59

Overall Rating (50-100):________________________

Criteria for Grading Speeches — Form B

Please rate the speaker on each category. Each category is worth 25 points. The basic criteria for each is described below.

The introduction should capture the attention of the audience, relate to the audience and introduce the topic. It should include a specific preview of main points, a thesis and a transition into the body of the speech.

The organization of the speech should be easy to follow and the progression of ideas should be clear. Although a set organizational order does not have to be followed, the organization presented should be appropriate for the topic, type of speech and audience.

The development of the topic should be clear and include supporting material. At least one source should be used per main point.

The conclusion should provide closure. A specific review of the main points should summarize the speech. The restatement of the thesis should also be included.

The speaker's delivery should include eye contact, understandable vocal presentation, appropriate gestures and facial expression. The delivery should also be conversational.

Please do not forget to write comments for the student.

APPENDIX C

Speech Evaluation Form C

Name: ____________ **Topic:** ____________

Category	*Score (+, 0, –)*	*Comments*
Appearance		
Self-confidence		
Enthusiasm		
Body Vitality		
Contact Vitality		
Vocal Vitality		
Speech Clarity		
Evidence of Planning		
Explanations		
Visual Aids		
Interest		
Content Material		
Support		
Logical Development		
Introduction		
Body		
Conclusion		

Total Score: ________ **(–17 to +17 possible)**

Percentage Equivalent: ____% **Letter Grade:** __________

Criteria for Grading Speeches — Form C

Listed below are eighteen categories related to the effectiveness of a public speech. Each category is described by key words/concepts. The first seven categories relate to the speaker's delivery; the second two relate to the preparation of the speech content; the next six relate to the content as presented in the actual speech, and the final three relate to the overall speech structure.

The categories are used in grading a speech in the following manner: if the concept described by the category is average, a zero (0) is given to the category; if there is something about the elements of a category that is outstanding and significantly adds to the effectiveness of the speech, a plus (+) is given to the category; if there is something about the elements of a category that is distracting and significantly detracts from the presentation of ideas, a minus (-) is given to the category.

A philosophical assumption underlying this system is that content is most important in a speech; delivery is important only in so far as it does not detract from the content. Therefore, pluses for the seven delivery categories are extremely hard to obtain—to obtain a plus in any of the delivery categories requires that something about the delivery element significantly adds to the effectiveness of imparting the information of the speech to the audience. However, negatives for the delivery categories are relatively easy to obtain — if something about a delivery category is distracting, a minus should be given.

At the conclusion of the speech, the pluses and minuses are summed for a total score (possible scores range from -18 to +18). Grade equivalents are given as follows: -5 and less = F; -4 to -1 = D; 0 to +3 = C; +4 to +7 = B; +8 and above = A. Percentage equivalents are as follows:

–4 = 60.0%
–3 = 62.5%
–2 = 65.0%
–1 = 67.5%
0 = 70%
+1 = 72.5%
+2 = 75.0%
+3 = 77.5%

+ 4 = 80.0%
+ 5 = 82.5%
+ 6 = 85.0%
+ 7 = 87.5%
+ 8 = 90.0%
+ 9 = 92.5%
+10 = 95.0%
+11 = 97.5%
+12 = 100%

Therefore, it is possible with this system, but extremely unlikely, to get more than 100%.

Delivery — Speaker Qualities

Appearance:

Neatness — clothing, person
Bearing — carriage, behavior, posture
Mannerisms — unique action or style
Facial expression

Self Confidence:

Composure — not agitated or disturbed
Positiveness — definite, sure of self, forceful

Enthusiasm:

Animation — appearance of spirit, vigor, expressiveness
Sincerity — personally interested
Salesmanship — punch

Body Vitality:
- Gestures — descriptiveness, appropriateness
- Purposeful movement — aimed, reasoned

Contact Vitality:
- Rapport — accord, harmony
- Friendliness
- Eye contact
- Personality projection

Voice Vitality:
- Pace, pitch, volume
- Projection, emphasis

Speech Clarity:
- Vocabulary, grammar
- Articulation, pronunciation, enunciation
- Fillers — unmeaningful expressions
- Fluency — smoothness of delivery

Content — Preparation

Outline
- Format — style, understanding, use, coordinated flow
- Organization — sequence, completeness, topical fit

Evidence of Thorough Planning:
- Time-material relationship
- Continuity — smooth transitions, pointed to thesis
- Subject matter adequacy
- Audience adaptability — degree of technicality, vocabulary, etc.

Content — Presentation

Explanations:

- Clarity of terms
- Completeness
- Meaningful examples

Visual Aids

- Appropriateness, number, type, size
- Timeliness
- Clear explanation, handling

Interest:

- Choice of subject
- Approach — humor, mood
- Interest factors — suspense, novelty, etc.

Content Materials:

- Worthwhile subject — clear, concise premise
- Understanding of subject
- Adequacy of research

Support

- Logical evidence
- Emotional evidence
- Use — credibility, source identification, etc.

Logical Development:

- Orderly sequence — known to unknown, simple to complex
- Transitions

Structure

Introduction

- Gains and directs attention of audience
- Establishes speaker credibility

Body:

- Information relative to audience
- Clear organization
- Logical
- Appropriate transitions between points

Conclusion

- Summarizes major points
- Clearly related to thesis
- Ends with a clear, relevant statement or question

APPENDIX D

Speech Evaluation Form D

Name: ______________________ Score:________________

Rating Key: 1 is Unacceptable; 2 is Poor; 3 is Acceptable; 4 is Good; 5 is Excellent

Organization and Structure:

1. Introduction	1	2	3	4	5
2. Clarity of Main Points	1	2	3	4	5
3. Support of Main Points	1	2	3	4	5
4. Organization	1	2	3	4	5
5. Transitions	1	2	3	4	5
6. Conclusions	1	2	3	4	5
7. Use of Persuasive Elements					
Evidence	1	2	3	4	5
Reasoning	1	2	3	4	5
Emotional Appeal	1	2	3	4	5
Call to Action	1	2	3	4	5

Delivery

1. Posture	1	2	3	4	5
2. Facial Expression	1	2	3	4	5
3. Eye Contact	1	2	3	4	5
4. Gestures	1	2	3	4	5
5. Composure	1	2	3	4	5
6. Conversational Quality	1	2	3	4	5
7. Vocal Delivery (volume, rate, pitch, variance, etc.)	1	2	3	4	5
8. Language Use (vivid, appropriate, specificity, simplicity, etc.)	1	2	3	4	5

General Comments:

Criteria for Grading Speeches — Form D

Please rate the speaker on each sub-section. Each sub-section is worth five points, for a total of 90 points. The basic criteria for each is described below.

Organization and Structure

1. The introduction should capture the attention of the audience, relate to the audience and introduce the topic. It should include a specific preview of main points, a thesis, and a transition into the body of the speech.
2. The *main points* should be distinct. You should be able to easily identify them.
3. The *support* used for the main points should be complete. Evidence should be used, including, but not limited to testimony, examples and statistics.
4. The *organization* of the speech should be easy to follow and the progression of ideas should be clear. Although a set organizational order does not have to be followed, the organization presented should be appropriate for the topic and audience.
5. The *transitions* should include sentences or words to provide a bridge between the introduction and the body, between each main point, and between the body and conclusion.

6. The *conclusion* should provide closure. A specific review of the main points should summarize the speech. A restatement of the thesis should also be included.
7. The *evidence* should be cited completely and clearly during the speech. There should be a minimum of one source per main point and the information should be published within the past five years.
8. The speech should use *reasoning*. It should be logical and not contain fallacies.
9. The use of *emotional appeal* should be appropriate for the audience and the topic.
10. The *call to action* should be clearly stated steps and should illustrate a logical plan.

Delivery

1. *Posture:* the speaker should look poised and confident.
2. *Facial Expression:* needs to be appropriate for topic and appear relaxed
3. *Eye Contact:* the speaker should frequently make eye contact all around the room
4. *Gestures:* the speaker should use gestures, but they should not be repetitive or distracting
5. *Composure:* the speaker should be confident, relaxed, polished and calm
6. *Conversational Quality:* the speaker should be well rehearsed, but not memorized or stiff
7. *Vocal Delivery:* the speaker should have appropriate volume, rate and pitch

8. ***Language Use:*** **the speaker should use vivid, but appropriate imagery.**

Please do not forget to write comments for the student.

Listening Treatment in the Basic Communication Course Text

Laura A. Janusik
Andrew D. Wolvin

INTRODUCTION

This study assesses the current listening scholarship found in the basic communication course textbook. Wichelns introduced the concept of rhetorical effect in 1925 (Dearin, 1980), which not only introduced the listener into the human communication process, but made the listener of equal importance to the speaker. Listening as a daily communication activity surpasses speaking by 15% in adults (Rankin, 1926, 1930) and 37% in college students (Barker, Edwards, Gaines, Gladney, & Holley, 1980). However, it appears that communication scholars have not taught or researched the role of speaker and listener equally, even though basic communication theory defines communication as a process dependent upon a listener. This study will evaluate content, quality, and position of current listening scholarship in the basic communication course textbook.

RATIONALE

Research on public speaking is bountiful, and research on listening has gained abundance in the last 30 years; yet students in higher education are still offered only 7% of instructional time focused on listening (Perkins, 1994). The three most popular models of communication — the linear, interactional, and transactional models — show the speaker and listener to be involved equally in the communication process, but research and instruction on the speaker and the listener has not been equal.

Listening is a critical skill for success in today's academic and professional worlds, and most students only receive listening instruction in the basic course. However, if listening content in the course text is not adequate, then students are not learning to listen effectively, for listening skills are improved primarily through direct instruction.

Listening scholarship and coverage of basic listening theory and skills in the basic course text are necessary to achieve direct instruction for listening skill development. Listening is a critical skill, and it is particularly important for today's college students. Not only has listening been identified as more important than reading skills or academic aptitude in college student achievement and retention (Conaway, 1982; McDevitt, Sheenan & McMenamin, 1991), but listening has been identified as one of the most used and one of the most important communication skills in professional settings (Hynes, & Bhatia, 1996; James, 1992; Maes, Weldy, & Icenogle, 1997; Waner, 1995; Willmington, 1992; Winsor, Curtis, & Stephens, 1997; Wolvin & Coakley, 1996). Consequently, students must learn to listen effectively for better success in both their academic and professional lives.

The basic communication course is the only course that addresses listening skill development and instruction for most college students. Fewer than 6% of colleges and universities offer a stand alone listening course (Smith & Turner, 1993, as cited in Wacker & Hawkins, 1995), and of that 6%, only slightly more than half of the schools require the separate listening course for their communication majors (Wacker & Hawkins, 1995). Listening is a skill, and students need to be taught to be more effective listeners. Since instructional time spent on developing effective listening skills is severely limited, it is critical that the time spent addresses the most important and current listening scholarship to develop students' knowledge and skills.

Listening content covered in the basic course is relatively unknown. Prior studies of the basic communication course reveal that most courses did include a unit on listening (Morreale, Hanna, Berko, & Gibson, 1999; Perkins, 1994; Wolvin, Coakley & Disburg, 1991 and 1992). The unit typically was short, providing little more than an introduction to the process and to strategies for effective listening. Even a short unit has been found to impact on student perceptions of their listening competencies (Ford & Wolvin, 1993).

Additionally, Perkins' (1994) study provided information on how 498 college institutions taught listening in the basic course. Over half (54%) taught listening, either as a separate unit (37.5%) or by integrating it throughout the semester (34%). A majority (54%) reported covering a general overview of five types of listening (Wolvin & Coakley, 1979, 1982, 1988, 1992, 1993, 1996), with most (44%) focused on critical listening. Instruction primarily took the form of lectures, and even though strategies and activities for developing effective listening skills were presented, less than 50% of the time spent on listening was focused on skill development. The average time spent on listening instruction in the basic course was 7% of class time, or about 3 hours (Perkins, 1994). While Perkins' (1994) study provides important information as to how listening was taught, instructors have little information as to what aspects of listening were included in these units.

Direct instruction of listening has been demonstrated to increase listening skills in the corporate world (Papa & Glenn, 1988; Smeltzer & Watson, 1985) and academic worlds (Cooper; 1988; Brown, 1954; Brown, 1955; Brown & Keller, 1962; Erikson, 1954; Giffin & Hannah, 1960; Lorenz, 1966; Trivette, 1959; Whitfield, 1964; all as cited in Duker, 1968; Irvin, as cited in Steil, Summerfield, & de Mare, 1983). Some advocate the notion of automatic transfer, suggesting that if a student learns speaking skills, one automatically learns listening skills (Sprague & Stuart, 1996). Conversely, others believe that learning listening skills will transfer to being a better speaker (Nelson & Pearson, 1996; Osborn & Osborn, 1997). The assumption of automatic transfer has not been supported. In order for a skill to become a part of a communicator's repertoire, the communicator needs knowledge, training, and practice of that skill (Kirkpatrick, 1999; Steil, Barker & Watson, 1983; Wolvin & Coakley, 1994). Since the notion of automatic transfer has been proven false, the only way for students to develop more effective listening skills in the academic setting is through direct instruction. Thus, it is imperative that the content reflected in the listening section of the basic text accurately and currently reflect listening scholarship today.

Scholarly publications have been judged by their ability to further knowledge while basing the content on current research and theory. Some argue that "textbooks must still participate in the production of knowledge in the field" (Alred & Thelen, 1993, p. 471), but others contend that the textbook's role is more focused on reflecting the proven truths of the discipline (Connors, 1986). This study is based on the latter philosophy, and it assumes that basic course instructors are responsible for presenting both research and skill instruction that accurately and currently reflects the field of listening research.

The content included in the text can provide a sense of what listening principles and practices are highlighted with students in the basic course. While some instructors often go beyond textbooks and complement them with additional materials, many do begin with the text as a base for what is covered in the course. This study was designed to assess basic listening scholarship and content included in basic communication course textbooks.

For the purposes of this paper, listening scholarship is defined as listening-focused research conducted in a systematic fashion, using quantitative or qualitative methods, with research findings presented in an academically sanctioned outlet, such as journals, books, or conferences. Listening scholarship has been published in many journals, and much of it has been published in the *International Journal of Listening* since its inception in 1987. The majority of scholarship has been published within the areas of theory, research, instruction, assessment, and practice, identified as the "intellectual discussion" of the journal (Wolvin, Halone, & Coakley, 1999). Specific research for these five areas have focused on topics such as theory development, listening in the classroom, validation of listening tests, the teaching of listening, and listening practices in specific contexts such as healtcare settings.

To determine what constitutes the study of listening, it is helpful to look at the treatment of listening in the reportedly most-used textbooks in these courses. In their survey of the basic communication course, Morreale et al. (1999) identified 17 most-mentioned textbooks used to instruct the basic course (Appendix A).

This study utilizes an inductive content analysis to determine what content is included in the textbook's listening chapter. Content analyses of texts is the longest established empirical method of social investigation (Titscher, Meyer, Wodak, & Vetter, 2000). Though deductive content analyses are more common, a deductive model would be inappropriate (Silverman, 2001) because predetermined categories of listening constructs do not exist (since a study of this type has not been attempted). An inductive content analysis will lay the groundwork for what is currently included in basic course textbooks, and this will allow instructors and scholars to determine what should be included.

PROCEDURE

The 17 texts cited as those most widely reported to be used to teach the basic communication course were analyzed for this study. All editions of these textbooks were either those cited in the survey (Morreale et al., 1999) or a more recent version available from the publisher. The decision to use the most recent edition was based on the belief that former editions of books usually are no longer available from publishers when a new edition is printed. Thus, the most recent edition would most clearly illustrate that text's treatment of listening today.

The texts were reviewed for listening content, which, in most instances, was limited to a single chapter devoted to listening. Each chapter was read thoroughly, and major content categories emerged. An analysis of the major content categories resulted in three major classifications: content related, process related, and placement. The emerged content categories then became the standard by which the texts were analyzed.

What follows is a report on the approach to listening taken in the listening chapters in these textbooks. Each textbook was reviewed for the location of listening chapter(s) in the textbook, listening content, and the portion of text devoted to listening instruction. A discussion of the findings and their implications for the basic course instructor follows.

FINDINGS

Location of Listening Chapter in Books

The placement of the listening chapter in the book might imply the importance of listening in the basic communication course. Most listening chapters were featured in approximately the first quarter of the text. One exception (Gamble & Gamble, 1996) placed the chapter about half way through the book. Most texts (12 of the 16 with entire chapters) placed the listening chapter as the third or fourth chapter of the book following chapters on the introduction to communication and perception.

Content

References, Additional Readings, and Listening Scholarship

The quantity and quality of references cited in each listening chapter could identify current and accurate reflection of listening scholarship. First, current scholarship was assessed by the number of citations referenced and the date of the referenced publication (Appendix B). The majority of references for all texts were from 1980's publications (81) followed by publications of the 1990's (61). However, citations from the 1970's also were prevalent with 35 references, followed by the 1950's with 21 references.

In general, texts displayed inconsistent numbers of references. Total number of references ranged from 33 (Adler & Rodman, 1997) and 27 (Gamble & Gamble; 1996; Osborn & Osborn, 1997) to 2 (Gronbeck et al., 1998) and zero (Sprague & Stuart, 1996). The reference mode was 7 references (Grice & Skinner, 1995; Zarefsky, 1996).

Authors of two textbooks did address current listening scholarship. Adler and Rodman (1997) cited a number of listening and interpersonal publications. Included were references to listening and empathy (Burleson, 1994; Spaeapan and Oskamp, 1992; as cited in Adler & Rodman, 1997), relational listening (Vangelisti, 1994; as cited in Adler & Rodman, 1997), and organizational listening (Wolvin & Coakley, 1991; as cited in Adler & Rodman, 1997). Likewise, Lucas (1998) referred to two listening textbooks (Coakley & Wolvin, 1991; Wolff & Marsnik, 1992; as cited in Adler & Rodman, 1997), listening training in the organizational environment (Wolvin & Coakley, 1991, 1996; as cited in Adler & Rodman, 1997), as well as the International Listening Association. This international association, established in 1979 in an effort to "promote the study, development, and teaching of effective listening in all settings" (Wolvin & Coakley, 1996, p. 100) was also referenced by Gamble and Gamble, 1996. No other texts gave mention to listening as a separate study of communication and to its international organization.

Some texts suggested additional readings outside of the referenced works (Adler & Rodman, 1997; DeVito, 1994; Gamble & Gamble, 1996; Lucas, 1998; Pearson & Nelson, 1997). Additional readings were almost always published prior to 1990 and rarely included work from listening scholarship. Rather, additional readings included print and film materials, Internet sources, and speeches.

The Listening Model

Models provide a representation of how a process works, and consistency in models indicates agreement on the process. Texts that offered a model described listening as a linear process, one by which all steps needed to be met in order to listen effetively.

Seven of the texts (Adler & Rodman, 1997; Beebe & Beebe, 1997; DeVito, 1994; DeVito, 1999; Grice & Skinner, 1995; Nelson & Pearson, 1996; Verderber, 1999) described listening as a process consisting of detailed steps (appendix C). With the exception of both of DeVito's texts, no two descriptions of the processes were exactly the same. The step most consistent and found in 6 of the 7 texts was the step of understanding. None of the other texts attempted to break down listening into steps, suggesting that listening is not a process and cannot be taught as such. In fact, one text (Gamble & Gamble, 1996) determined that humans have the ability to "unlisten," negating the idea of listening as a linear or dynamic process.

Listening as a Dynamic Process

Communication is a dynamic process, and the act of effective communication requires both listening and speaking. Both Beebe and Beebe (1997) and Gronbeck et al. (1998) approached listening as a dynamic process interdependent with the speaker. Specifically, strategies on how to improve listening by adapting to the speaker and the message were given (Beebe & Beebe, 1997), and listening as a joint responsibility between the speaker and the listener was stressed (Gronbeck et al., 1998). Tips for the listener to listen more effectively in addition to tips for speakers to develop the message so that the audience could listen more effectively were presented (Gronbeck et al. 1998). Verderber (1999) also viewed listening as a dynamic process. His treatment of listening focused more on how to respond as a listener, thereby moving the skill of listening to the first step of being a speaker.

Describing listening as the first step of the speaking process was not unusual. This approach also was found in many of the hybrid texts, the texts that include chapters on interpersonal and group communication, (Adler

& Rodman, 1997; DeVito, 1994; DeVito, 1999; Gamble & Gamble, 1996; Jaffee, 1998; Pearson & Nelson, 1997; Verderber, 1999) by suggesting that the effective listener asks questions and paraphrases what was heard.

Types of Listening

A basic listening taxonomy identifies the importance of listening skills varying by different contexts. This categorization enables students to understand that listening is contextual, that there is no single "right way" to listen in all contexts. Wolvin and Coakley's (1979, 1982, 1988, 1992, 1993, 1996) listening taxonomy, which identified five types of listening, has been widely cited in listening research (Brownell, 1995; Purdy, 1997; Rhodes, Watson & Barker, 1990; Ridge, 1993; Ross & Glenn, 1996). Discriminative listening is used to identify sounds; comprehensive listening is used for understanding; therapeutic listening offers supportive listening without judgment; critical listening judges what is heard against a specific standard; and appreciative listening is used for enjoyment.

The majority, 14 of 17, of the texts, included critical listening. Of these 14 texts, 4 of them exclusively covered critical listening (Grice & Skinner, 1995; Osborn & Osborn, 1997; Sprague & Stewart, 1996; Zarefsky, 1996). Much more common was a text review of two to three types of listening, usually critical, comprehensive, and therapeutic, devoting a fair amount of space to all. Only one text (Gronbeck et al., 1998) cited all five types of listening found in Wolvin & Coakley's (1979, 1982, 1988, 1992, 1993, 1996) listening taxonomy.

Approaches to Teaching Listening

Certain approaches to learning skills are more successful than other approaches, and a consistent approach may indicate agreement. A similar, persuasive formula-based approach to teaching the listening section was taken by most of the textbooks. Texts used the formula of identifying the need for effective listening, distinguishing listening from hearing, presented listening barriers , and then offered a list of solutions.

Need for effective listening was established either by quoting statistics or by giving specific examples of when effective listening was not utilized. Many texts relied on the statistics of Barker's et al. (1980) study (Adler & Rodman, 1997; Grice & Skinner, 1995; Verderber, 1999), or Rankin's 1926 or 1930 study (Beebe & Beebe, 1997; Gamble & Gamble, 1996; Nelson & Pearson, 1996). Two texts cited both (DeVito, 1994; Pearson & Nelson, 1997). Both Rankin and Barker identifed listening as the communication behavior that adults and college students used most on a daily basis. Textbook authors concluded, some implicitly and some explicitly, that if listening is used most, it should be learned.

Listening was distinguished from hearing and further defined in 13 of the 16 textbooks. This distinction is critical, as hearing is the receiving of sound waves, while listening is the process by which one attaches meaning and understanding to the message. Hearing takes no effort, but listening takes effort and concentration. Hearing is passive, but listening is active.

At the end of most chapters, a list of barriers to listening was presented, and then strategies for developing better listening skills were given. Only one text, (Pearson & Nelson, 1997), offered solutions based on previous research (Capella, 1987). Most books provided a number of exercises or activities for students to improve their listening skills.

Automatic Transfer Between Listening and Speaking

Three texts presented the view of automatic transfer, though no text identified it as such. Sprague & Stuart (1996) supported the notion of automatic transfer from speaking to listening. Their coverage of listening in the public speaking text was condensed to 2 pages of a 457-page text. The authors stated "If you master the techniques in this 'speaker's' handbook, we guarantee that you will be a better listener" (p.17).

However, this notion of automatic transfer was supported by two texts,but in the opposite direction. These texts supported automatic transfer from listening to speaking skills. Nelson and Pearson (1996) suggested that one would become a more confident public speaker if one became a more confident listener. Similarly, Osborn and Osborn felt that "Good listeners tend to grow good speakers" (1997, p. 93). The other texts did not address the notion of automatic transfer.

Listening Ethics

Ethics are concerned with moral codes accepted by a society and practiced by the majority of its members. Spoken and unspoken support for ethical codes provides part of the glue that binds together a culture. A consistent code of ethics for the listener would imply a disciplinary agreement of the ethical rules. No such agreement existed in the basic course textbooks.

Nine textbooks referred to the ethical responsibilities of a listener (Beebe & Beebe, 1997; DeVito, 1999; Gamble & Gamble; 1996; Grice & Skinner, 1995; Gronbeck et al., 1998; Jaffee, 1998, Lucas, 1998; Osborn & Osborn, 1997; Verderber, 1999). Gamble and Gamble (1996, p. 180) began the listening chapter with the topic of listening ethics and concluded five pages later with "...everyone must assume 51 percent of the responsibility of communication" because everyone acts as the source and the receiver. Listening was considered in a variety of contexts from personal to professional, and the ethics of listening appeared to be synonymous with effective listening. Gronbeck et al. (1998) devoted almost a full page to listening ethics in the form of five components for which to critically listen. These five components, based on Wolvin and Coakley (1979), included the need to be wary of percentages instead of whole numbers and to watch for generic substitutions. Jaffee (1998) offered a discussion of ethical dilemmas. A portion of a 1992 Clinton transcript was cited, followed by questions addressing ethical dilemmas issues.

Additionally, the placement of the ethical listening section was not consistent, further calling into question the listener's ethical responsibilities. For example, DeVito (1999) placed the section on ethical listening in the chapter on public speaking preparation. Other texts (Beebe & Beebe, 1997; Grice & Skinner, 1995; Lucas, 1998) placed the ethical listening section within the chapter on the ethics of public speaking; but, the listening chapter was not presented until later in the text so no connection was made between listening research, listening practices, and ethics. Two texts (Adler and Rodman, 1997; Verderber, 1999) offered an ethical challenge to the reader to identify if one was obligated to listen to all messages; however, no specific guidelines were given to solving the dilemmas. Osborn and Osborn (1997) included ethics in the portion of the listening chapter that addressed critically evaluating speeches. They did reference the topic of ethics to a previous chapter; however, they reiterated the ethical responsibility of the speaker and did not specifically address the ethical responsibility of the listener. Nelson and Pearson (1996) had a separate chapter devoted to the ethical and effective use of evidence, proof, and arguments that follows the chapter on listening. Additionally, their listening chapter contained a section that concerned the speaker's ethical standards, and the listener was instructed to consider what the speaker was thinking as opposed to what the listener heard.

Listening, Gender, and Culture

The way one listens is affected by gender and culture (Borisoff, & Hahn, 1997; Brownell, 1996; Thomlinson, 1997), and it is important that students understand that gender and culture affect their listening style so that they can make accommodations when necessary. Listening and gender differences only were given attention by DeVito (1999). Tannen's research (1990; 1994a; 1994b; as cited in DeVito, 1999) was reviewed in a brief and objective fashion.

Some texts (Adler & Rodman, 1997; DeVito, 1999; Jaffee, 1998; Osborn & Osborn, 1997) addressed the issue of listening diversity in terms of the influence of cultural differences on listening. Jaffee (1998) devoted almost 50% of her chapter to the cultural differences of listening by addressing such topics as language and vocabulary differences, cultural allusions, and listening schemas as cultural expectations. Both Adler and Rodman, (1997) and Jaffee (1998) included and explained the Chinese character for listening.

Native Americans were the focus of 2 other books (Adler & Rodman, 1997; Osborn & Osborn, 1997) that linked listening to culture. In their introduction to listening, Osborn and Osborn (1997) explained the listening philosophies of two native American tribes, the Ojai and the Lakota, and suggested that silence and thinking before speaking would be incorporated into their chapter on listening. Likewise, Adler and Rodman (1997) explained the ritual of the "talking stick" found in another Native American tribe, the Iroquois. The rules of the "talking stick" were quite easy. One cannot talk or even think about what one is going to say unless one was holding the single talking stick. If one was not holding the talking stick, one must listen by devoting full attention to the speaker.

Listening and Critical Thinking

Critical thinking and critical listening are two separate skills; however, they often work in tandem with each other. Students should understand that competency in one does not necessarily translate to competency in the other.

Some texts seemed to use the listening chapter to introduce critical thinking as opposed to distinguishing listening and critical thinking as two separate skills (Beebe & Beebe, 1997; Gregory, 1996; Gronbeck at al., 1998; Zarefsky, 1996). Zeuschner (1997) tied both listening and critical thinking together; however, each received its own chapter and explanation and the listening chapter segued into the critical thinking chapter. Two texts (Adler & Rodman, 1997; Gamble & Gamble, 1996) had no separate chapter on critical thinking; however, a substantive portion of the listening chapter was devoted to critical listening and covered such topics as assessing speaker credibility and examining reasoning. Another author (DeVito, 1994) did not address the issues of critical thinking or critical listening in one text, but placed a separate section of critical thinking tailored for a specific topic at the end of each of the 15 chapters in another text (DeVito, 1999). Each chapter contained special questions and examples that one could ask within that specific communication context. For example, chapter 12 on public speaking preparation cited the importance of questioning the credibility of Internet sources since anyone can operate an Internet site. Similarly, Jaffee (1998) interspersed critical thinking segments throughout the book rather than devoting a separate chapter to critical thinking.

Hybrid versus Public Speaking Focus

If one accepts that listening is contextual (Borisoff & Purdy, 1997; Purdy, 1997; Wolvin & Coakley, 1996), then the coverage of listening in a hybrid or a public speaking focused text may be different. A hybrid text would consider listening in interpersonal, group, and public contexts, while a public speaking text would concern itself only with listening in the public arena.

The textbooks included in this study roughly approximated the split between a hybrid and a public speaking focused basic course. Fifty-nine percent (59%) of the most-used texts had a public speaking orientation (Beebe & Beebe, 1997; Gregory, 1996; Grice & Skinner, 1995; Gronbeck et al., 1998; Jaffee, 1998; Lucas, 1998; Nelson & Pearson, 1996; Osborn & Osborn, 1997; Sprague & Stuart, 1996; Zarefsky, 1996). Fifty-five percent (55%) of schools teaching the basic course focused on public speaking, and 30% used a hybrid approach (Morreale et al., 1999). It might appear logical that listening would be taught differently to students who had little opportunity to interact with the speaker in a public forum versus those that had interpersonal interactions. Overall, the difference with how listening content was addressed in the separate books was not great.

The primary difference between the hybrid and public speaking texts was in the therapeutic or empathic approach to listening. All of the texts with the hybrid approach (Adler & Rodman, 1997; DeVito, 1994; DeVito, 1999; Gamble & Gamble, 1996; Pearson & Nelson, 1997; Verderber, 1999; Zeuschner, 1997) described empathic listening, while only one of the public speaking texts (Gronbeck et al., 1998) gave mention to therapeutic listening.

Another notable difference between the hybrid texts and the public speaking texts was the concept of active listening. Active listening often was viewed as a four-step process that was defined as "(1) getting prepared to listen, (2) staying involved with the communication, (3) keeping an open mind while listening, and (4) reviewing and evaluating after the event" (Zeuschner, 1997, p. 41). Active listening was proposed by five of the seven hybrid texts (DeVito, 1994; DeVito, 1999; Gamble & Gamble, 1996; Pearson & Nelson, 1997; Zeuschner, 1997) but only one of the public speaking texts (Jaffee, 1998). Beebe and Beebe (1997) offered a different version of active listening, which includes resorting, rephrasing, and repeating.

Portion of Book Devoted to Listening Instruction

Textbook treatments can provide a sense of what listening content is addressed with students in the basic course. Educators generally perceive that the time spent teaching a subject is roughly equivalent to the amount of space devoted to the concept in the textbook. Each textbook from this study had at least one full chapter devoted to listening with the exception of Sprague and Stuart (1996), who devoted only two pages to listening. The average text only devoted a little more than 4 % of its space to listening. This is slightly less than the 7% of time reported by instructors in the Perkins' (1994) study. Two texts (Adler & Rodman, 1997; Verderber, 1999) did devote the equivalent of 7 % of their space on listening, but no text exceeded that amount.

DISCUSSION

This content analysis of the basic course texts affirms that the quality of the content included does not reflect current listening scholarship, and the amount of space allotted for listening instruction falls short of the premise that the speaker and the listener are of equal importance in the communication process. Speaking and listening instruction are not treated equally in communication instruction, as significantly more time is spent on instruction for the source, even though the average adult spends most of his time acting as a receiver (Barker et al., 1980; Rankin, 1926; Rankin 1930). Additionally, basic text authors do not agree on the definition or process of listening, and they do not appear to include current listening scholarship that supports their choices. If these listening chapters serve the basis for listening instruction, then students are not exposed to current listening findings.

Some listening instruction is taking place in the basic course; however, the amount and the type does not appear to be adequate to provide sufficient direct instruction for listening skill development. Scholars' work is not being reflected in the discipline, and basic course instructors, when using the basic text as a foundation, are not providing students with current research and theory on listening skills during the time that they provide listening instruction.

Listening accounts for 50% of the communication process, and listening instruction accounts for only 7% of the basic course instruction, with less than 50% of this time designated for skill development (Perkins, 1994). However, it is the instruction and practice of skills that change behaviors (Kirkpatrick, 1999; Steil et al., Wolvin & Coakley, 1994). Thus, the amount of time devoted to listening instruction should be increased, and the quality of time spent in listening instruction must improve by using current listening scholarship.

Findings from this study substantiate the lack of listening scholarship in basic course texts. No text offered new theories or knowledge substantiated by testing. Equally important, few texts accurately reflected the breadth and depth of listening scholarship today.

The lack of attention to listening scholarship ignores recent scholarship and research in critical areas of study. For example, the content analysis did not identify critical work in the field including listening theory (Bruneau, 1989; Fitch-Hauser & Hughes, 1992; Floyd & Reese, 1987; Nichols, 1987; Thomlison, 1987; and Walker, 1997; Witkin, 1990), listening conceptualization, assessment, and measurement (Bentley, 1997; Cooper, 1988; Fitch-Hauser & Hughes, 1992; Rhodes, Watson, & Barker, 1990; Shellen,1989; Steintjes, 1993; Watson & Barker, 1988, 1991), listening and cognitive processing (Fitch-Hauser & Hughes, 1988), listening constructs (Halone, Cunconan, Coakley & Wolvin, 1997; Witkin & Trochim, 1997), the impact of culture and gender on listening (Borisoff & Hahn, 1993; Cha, 1997; Emmert, Emmert, & Brandt, 1993; Marsnik, 1993; Ostermeier, 1993), the impact of age on listening (Coakley, Halone, & Wolvin, 1996; Halone, Wolvin & Coakley, 1997; Ross & Glenn, 1996; Wolvin, Coakley, & Halone, 1995), organizational listening (Cooper & Husband, 1993; Lobdell, Sonoda, & Arnold, 1993; Strine, Thompson, & Cusella, 1995), hearing loss and its affect on listening (Clark, 1991; Villaume, Darling, Brown, Richardson, & Clark-Lewis, 1993), state requirements on teaching listening (Witkin, Lundsteen, & Gallian, 1993), listening pedagogy (Janusik, 2001) the effects of media on listening (Ostermeier, 1991; Palmer, Sharp, Carter, & Roddenberry, 1991), and listenability (Glenn, Emmert, & Emmert, 1995).

Although theoretical knowledge is important, much advancement in listening scholarship has occurred with current, more rigorous studies. Yet, a quick review of Appendix B shows that listening chapters included between 2 and 33 references to support their assertions. The majority of references were from the 1980's, even though all of the course texts were printed in the 1990's. Thus, more recent listening scholarship from the last 11 years was not included.

Also, only some of the references were from listening scholars while the rest were from a variety of sources including movies and pop culture. For example, only one of the seven references in Zarefsky's (1996) listening chapter deals specifically with listening. The others are more concerned with the reasoning process and rhetorical criticism, not considered listening scholarship.

Few text authors agreed on a definition of listening. As is evidenced in Appendix C, only six of the texts attempted to define the listening process, and no two processes were defined alike, with the exception of DeVito (1994, 1999). Listening scholars do not always agree upon the definition of listening, as it may depend upon which approach (speech communication, speech science, or cognitive psychology) the research is advancing. However, there are two generally accepted definitions that authors and instructors could use. The first is the ILA's definition of listening, "the process of receiving, constructing meaning from, and responding to spoken and/or nonverbal messages" (An ILA Definition of Listening, 1995, p. 4). The second option is derived from a content analysis of 50 definitions of listening that identified the top five factors to be perception, attention, interpretation, remembering, and response (Glenn, 1989). Basic text authors could either cite the controversy regarding the definition or select one of the accepted definitions of listening.

In addition to the lacking quantity and quality of listening scholarship, the prescription approach taken by most books does not reflect current hypothesis or theory development of recent scientific listening studies. Often cited in texts was Ralph Nichols, known as the "grandfather of listening", who pioneered listening research in the early part of the century. Nichols first began college listening instruction in the 1940's with the traditional approach of establishing need, identifying negative listening habits and then implementing the 10 guides to effective listening (Rhodes, 1985). This approach was appropriate in the 1940's; however, listening knowledge in terms of theories and concepts is much broader today.

Today, a research-based instructional approach to teaching listening is needed. Listening instruction should be approached as a process of what students can do to improve listening effectiveness before, during, or after the listening event (Imhof & Wolfgang, 1998; Stein, 1999). One example of an experiential classroom activity to improve students' listening skills is Janusik's (2000) in-class performance assignment. The exercise is a listening adaptation of Bales' (1950) Interaction Analysis that can assess students' use of listening skills in a class discussion. Finally, listening assessment should make use of validated listening tests, such as the Brown-Carlsen test; the Kentucky test, the Steinbrecher-Willmington test; and the Watson-Barker test.

Listening is a part of the communication process, and most texts addressed listening's critical placement in the communication process by placing the listening chapter in the first quarter of the text. The listening chapter appeared as the third or fourth chapter in 12 of the 16 texts that offered entire listening chapters. As a separate chapter, listening is distanced from the communication process. One innovative text, not recognized as one of the most widely used basic course texts, combines speaking and listening in every chapter throughout the book (Wolvin, Berko, & Wolvin, 1999). More texts should follow this type of format that more closely approximates listening's importance in the communication process.

For example, most of the authors positioned their listening chapters after the chapter on perception. Most listening scholars agree that perception is a key component in the listening process (Glenn, 1989). One's gender and culture influence one's perception (Borisoff, & Hahn, 1997; Brownell, 1996; Thomlinson, 1997). Listening theory and instruction could easily be integrated into the perception chapters. Instruction in the roles of gender and culture on the listening and communication process is critical for students as our world increasingly is becoming more diverse.

Chapters on critical listening and critical thinking are often integrated or placed next to each other; however, the explication of their connection is not made clear. Critical thinking can take place without critical listening; however, critical listening cannot take place without critical thinking; they happen simultaneously. Students must be able to distinguish between the two skills, and they should learn the interdependence of thinking and listening within the communication context.

The discussion of ethics is critical based on the challenges and changes of the modern world. In 9 of the 17 texts reviewed, speaking ethically was addressed; however, ethics and listening did not achieve a similar consistency. Perhaps the lack of consistency points to a lack of agreement among listening scholars, or perhaps textbook authors are not familiar with work on listening ethics (Clampitt; 1991; Larson, 1989; Purdy, 1995).

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Findings of this content analysis of the basic course texts affirm that the amount of space allotted for listening instruction is insufficient, and the quality of the content included does not reflect current listening scholarship. If these listening chapters serve the basis for listening instruction, then students are not exposed to current listening research , behaviors, and practices.

The inclusion of an entire chapter on listening in most of these texts legitimizes listening as an integral part of the communication process; yet, the material presented does not reflect listening scholarship. Some effort at direct instruction in listening skills is offered, but it is not enough to reflect the importance of listening. If short units of listening instruction impact students' perceptions of their listening competencies (Ford & Wolvin, 1993), then longer units might impact students' perception and behaviors even more.

The placement of a listening chapter in almost every text represents a significant advance in listening education. In an earlier era, direct instruction in listening was not included in the basic course because supporters of direct instruction assumed that training in speaking skills would transfer to improved listening skills. The assumption of automatic transfer, of course, has been demonstrated to be false. To learn a skill, the listener needs knowledge, training, and practice of that skill

(Kirkpatrick, 1999; Steil, Barker & Watson, 1983; Wolvin & Coakley, 1994).

Ideally, listening is treated early on in the course so that the knowledge, attitudes, and skills that are developed in this unit can be practiced, reinforced, and carried through the rest of the semester. Since listening is such a central skill, the importance of listening should receive a central place in the basic course curriculum and in the basic course texts.

The placement of the listening chapter early in these texts hopefully is consistent with where the listening unit is placed in the course. The value of this placement is that listening skills can be treated early in the course and then infused throughout the subsequent units in the course. What is not clear, though, is how this is accomplished. One of the risks here is that listening, then, is assumed to be carried through by the students with little attention to their listening practices. "Listening across the curriculum" in which listening is integrated into the other units within the basic course may not be enough of a focus to have much effect (Witkin, Lovern, & Lundsteen, 1996).

While those who research listening are encouraged that listening is treated in these texts, one must consider what a light, atheoretical treatment listening generally receives. The most current research on listening behavior does not inform what the authors tell the students. The foundation for students' listening competency is not built on theory and research, but rather unsubstantiated claims.

The good work of listening scholars that has been published for the past decade in the *Journal of the International Listening* largely goes unrecognized. Most communication scholars who write texts do not include work by scholars in the listening field, even though that work is substantial (Wolvin, et al., 1999). The ILA definition of listening, "...the process of receiving, constructing meaning from, and responding to spoken and/or nonverbal messages" (An ILA Definition of listening, 1995, p. 4), does provide a focus for our understanding of the construct of listening.

Meanwhile, the greater issue may well be the state of basic communication texts today and the finding that textbooks should be regarded as scholarship but do not reflect the current status of the field. To reflect current research, current findings must be included within the parameters of appropriate lag time. In the seminal *Scholarship Reconsidered* (1990), Boyer contends that academics must expand our notion of scholarship beyond academic press and professional journal publications. Textbooks should be regarded as scholarship, not dismissed as "just a textbook" by promotion and tenure committees. Boyer argues that "writing a textbook can be a significant intellectual endeavor," which "can reveal a professor's knowledge of the field, illuminate essential integrative themes, and powerfully contribute to excellence in teaching, too" (p. 35). The communication field, then, should take seriously the textbook as scholarship. In turn, authors will raise the scholarly standards in these efforts.

Clearly, there is still much to learn about listening education. Since a large part of listening education resides in the basic communication course, the treatment of listening in the textbooks must be substantial in content and attention. Four percent of the text space is not adequate, and it does not support the premise that the listener is as important in the speaker in the communication process.

A model for listening education (Wolvin & Coakley, 1994) that is based on systematic development of a listener's knowledge, attitudes, and skills already exists. Our goals as listening educators, thus, should be to ensure that this model is reflected in these basic communication course texts where many students receive their introduction to effective listening.

REFERENCES

Adler, R.B., & Rodman, G. (1997). *Understanding human communication* (6th ed.). Fort Worth, TX: Harcourt Brace College Publishers.

Alred, G.J., & Thelen, E.A. (1993). Are textbooks contributions to scholarship? *College Composition and Communication, 44* (4), 466-477.

An ILA definition of listening. (1995, April). *Listening Post, 53*, 4.

Barker, L., Edwards, R., Gaines, C., Gladney, K. & Holley, F. (1980). An investigation of proportional time spent in various communication activities by college students. *Journal of Applied Communication Research, 8*, 101-09.

Beebe, S.A., & Beebe, S.J. (1997). *Public speaking: An audience-centered approach* (3rd ed.). Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

Bentley, S.C. (1997). Benchmarking listening behaviors: Is effective listening what the speaker says it is? *International Journal of Listening, 11,* 51-68.

Borisoff, D., & Hahn, D.F. (1992). Dimensions in intimacy: The interrelationships between gender and listening. *Journal of the International Listening Association, 6*, 23-41.

Borisoff, D., & Hahn, D.F. (1997). Gender and listening. Values revalued. In D. Borisoff & M. Purdy (Eds.), *Listening in everyday life: A personal and professional approach* (2nd ed.) (pp. 55-78). Lanham, MD: University Press of America.

Boyer, E.L. (1990). *Scholarship Reconsidered Priorities of the Professoriate* Princeton NJ: The Carnegie Foundation.

Brownell, J. (1996). *Listening: Attitudes, principles, and skills.* Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Bruneau, T. (1989). Empathy and listening: A conceptual review and theoretical directions. *Journal of the international listening association, 3,* 1-20.

Burleson, B.R. (1994). Comforting messages: Features, functions, and outcomes. In J.A. Daly & J.M. Wiemann (Eds.), *Strategic interpersonal communication* (p. 140). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Capella, J.N. (1987). Interpersonal communication: Definitions and fundamental questions. In C.R. Berger & S. Chaffee, (Eds.), *Handbook of communication science* (pp. 216-217). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Cha, K-W. (1997). An investigation of English listening items on the Korean scholastic aptitude test. *International journal of listening, 11,* 39-50.

Clampitt. (1991). *Communicating for managerial effectiveness.* Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Clark, A.J. (1991). Figures for sub-threshold auditory stimuli in listening. *International Journal of Listening, 5,* 86-92.

Coakley, C.G., & Wolvin, A.D. (1990). Listening pedagogy and andragogy: The state of the art. *Journal of the International Listening Association, 4,* 33-61.

Coakley, C.G., & Wolvin, A.D. (1991, April). Listen to what's being said about listening training. *Performance and Instruction, 30.*4, 8-10.

Coakley, C.G., & Wolvin, A.D. (1997). Listening in the educational environment. In D. Borisoff & M. Purdy (Eds.), *Listening in everyday life: A personal and professional approach* (2nd ed.) (pp. 179-212). Lanham, MD: University Press of America.

Coakley, C.G., Halone, K.K., & Wolvin, A.D. (1996). Perceptions of listening across the life span: Implications for understanding listening competence. *International Journal of Listening, 10,* 21-48.

Conaway, M.S. (1982). Listening: Learning tool and retention agent. In A.S. Algier & K.W. Algier, (Eds.), *Improving reading and study skills,* (pp. 51-63). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Connors, R.J. (1986). Textbooks and the evolution of the discipline. *College Composition and Communication, 37* (2), 178-194.

Cooper, L., & Husband, R. (1993). Developing a model of organizational listening competency. *Journal of the International Listening Association, 7,* 6-34.

Cooper, M. (1988). NIU listening exam: Assessing college level listening skills. *Journal of the International Listening Association, 2*, 53-74.

Dearin, R.D. (1980). Public address history as part of the speech communication discipline. *Communication Education, 29*, 3, 348-356.

DeVito, J.A. (1994). *Human communication: The basic course* (6th ed.). New York: HarperCollins College Publishers.

DeVito, J.A. (1999). *Essentials of human communication* (3rd ed.). New York: Longman.

Duker, S. (1968). *Listening bibliography* (2nd ed.). Metuchen, NJ: Scarecrow Press.

Emmert, P., Emmert, V., U Brandt, J. (1993). An analysis of male-female differences on the listening practices feedback report. *Journal of the International Listening Association, Special issue*, 43-55.

Fitch-Hauser, M., & Hughes, M.A. (1988). Defining the cognitive process of listening. *Journal of the International Listening Association, 2*, 75-88.

Fitch-Hauser, M., & Hughes, M.A. (1992). The conceptualization and measurement of listening. *Journal of the International Listening Association, 6*, 6-22.

Floyd, J.J., & Reese, R.G. (1987). Listening theory in modern rhetorical thought. *Journal of the International Listening Association, 1*, 87-102.

Ford, W.Z., & Wolvin, A.D. (1993). The differential impact of a basic communication course on perceived communication competencies in class, work and social contexts. *Communication Education, 3,* 281-291.

Gamble, T.K., & Gamble, M. (1996). *Communication works* (5th ed.). New York: McGraw Hill.

Glenn, E. (1989). A content analysis of fifty definitions of listening. *Journal of the International Listening Association, 3,* 21-31

Glenn, E., Emmert, P., & Emmert, V. (1995). A scale for measuring listenability: The factors that determine listening ease and difficulty. *Journal of the International Listening Association, 9,* 44-61.

Gregory, H. (1996). *Public speaking for college and career* (4th ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill.

Grice, G.L., & J.F. Skinner. (1995). *Mastering public speaking* (2nd ed.). Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

Gronbeck, B.E., German, K., Ehninger, D., & A.H. Monroe. (1998). *Principles of speech communication* (13th brief ed.). New York: Longman.

Halone, K.K., Cunconan, T.M., Coakley, C.G., & Wolvin, A.D. (1998). Toward the establishment of general dimension underlying the listing process. *International Journal of Listening, 12,* 12-28.

Halone, K.K., Wolvin, A.D., & Coakley, C.G. (1997). Accounts of effective listening across the life span: Expectations and experiences associated with competent listening practices. *International Journal of Listening, 11,* 15-38.

Hynes, G. E., & Bhatia, V. (1996). Graduate business students' preferences for the managerial communication course curriculum. *Business Communication Quarterly, 59* (2), 45-55.

Imhof, M., & Wolfgang, J. (1998). What makes a good listener? Listening behavior in instructional settings. *International Journal of Listening, 12,* 81-105.

Jaffee, C. (1998). *Public speaking: Concepts and skills for a diverse society.* (2nd ed.). Belmont, CA: Wadsworth Publishing Company.

James, M.L. (1992). Essential topics and subtopics of business communication: Are we teaching what employers want? *Business Education Forum, 46* (4), 8-10.

Janusik, L.A. (2000, November). *Listening Self-Assessment. Paper presented at the meeting of the National Communication* Association, Seattle, Washington.

Janusik, L.A. (2001, March). *The Teaching of Listening. What We do Know; What We Should Know.* Paper presented at the meeting of the International Listening A Association, Chicago, Illinois.

Kirkpatrick, D.L. (1999). *More quotes on listening* [online]. Available: http://www.listen.org/pages/morequotes.html [1999, January 27].

Larson, C.U. (1989). *Persuasion: Reception and responsibility.* Belmont, CA: Wadsworth Publishers.

Lobdell, C.L., Sonoda, K.T., & Arnold, W.A. (1993). The influence of perceived supervisor listening behavior on employee commitment. *Journal of the International Listening Association, 7,* 92-110.

Lucas, S.E. (1998). *The art of public speaking* (6th ed.). Boston: McGraw Hill.

Maes, J.D., Weldy, T.G., & Icenogle, M.L. (1997). A managerial perspective: Oral communication competency is most important for business students in the workplace. *The Journal of Business Communication, 34* (1), 67-80.

Marsnik, N. (1993). The impact of gender on communication. *Journal of the International Listening Association, Special issue,* 32-42.

McDevitt, T.M., Sheenan, E.P., & McMenamin, N. (1991). Self-reports of academic listening activities by traditional and non-traditional college students. *College Student Journal, 25* (1), 478-486.

Morreale, S.P., Hanna, M.S., Berko, R.M., & Gibson, J.W. (1999). The basic communication course at U.S. colleges and universities: VI. *Basic communication course annual 1999.* Boston: American Press.

Nelson, P.E., & Pearson, J.C. (1996). *Confidence in public speaking* (6th ed.). Boston: McGraw Hill.

Nichols, R.G. (1987). Manipulation versus persuasion. *Journal of the International Listening Association, 1*, 15-28.

O'Heren, L., & Arnold, W.E. (1991). Nonverbal attentive behavior and listening comprehension. *International Journal of Listening, 5,* 86-92.

Osborn, M.O., & Osborn, S.O.. (1997). *Public speaking* (4th ed.). Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co.

Ostermeier, T.H. (1991). Fast talkers and speeding listeners: Television/radio and commercials. *Journal of the International Listening Association, 5,* 22-35.

Ostermeier, T.H. (1993). Perception of nonverbal cues in dialogic listening in the intercultural interview. *Journal of the International Listening Association, Special issue,* 64-75.

Palmer, B.C., Sharp, M.F., Carter, B., Roddenberry, Y. (1991). The effects of music and structured oral direction s on auding and reading comprehension. *Journal of the International Listening Association, 5,* 7-21.

Papa, M.J., & Glenn, E.C. (1988). Listening ability and performance with new technology: A case study. *Journal of Business Communication, 25,* 5-15.

Pearson, J.C., & Nelson, P.E. (1997). *An introduction to communication: Understanding and sharing* (7th ed.). Madison, WI: Brown & Benchmark.

Perkins, T.M. (1994). A survey of listening instruction in the basic speech course. *Journal of the International Listening Association, 8,* 80-97.

Purdy, M. (1995, December). *Listening ethics: Little things mean a lot.* Paper presented to the Listening Association Convention.

Purdy, M. (1997). What is listening? In D. Borisoff & M. Purdy (Eds.) *Listening in everyday life: A personal and professional approach* (2nd ed.) (pp. 1-20). Lanham, MD: University Press of America.

Purdy, M. (1997). Why listening? In D. Borisoff & M. Purdy (Eds.) *Listening in everyday life: A personal* *and professional approach* (2nd ed.) (pp. xiii-xiv). Lanham, MD: University Press of America.

Rankin, P.T. (1926). The measurement of the ability to understand spoken language. *Dissertation Abstracts, 12*, 847.

Rankin, P.T. (January 1930). Listening ability: Its importance, measurement, and development. *Chicago School Journal, 12*, 177-179.

Rhodes, S.C. (1985). What the communication journals tell us about teaching listening. *Central States Speech Journal, 36*, 24-32.

Rhodes, S.C., Watson, K.W., & Barker, L.L. (1990). Listening assessment: Trends and influencing factors in the 1980's. *Journal of the International Listening Association, 4*, 62-82.

Ridge, A. (1993). A perspective of listening skills. In A.D. Wolvin & C.G. Coakley (Eds.) *Perspectives on listening* (pp. 1-14). Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

Ross, C.S.,& Glenn, E.C. (1996). Listening between grown children and their parents. *Journal of the International Listening Association, 10*, 49-64.

Shellen, W.N. (1989). Some evidence that listening tests measure "normal" listening. *Journal of the International Listening Association, 3*, 62-71.

Silverman, D. (2001). *Interpreting qualitative data. Methods for analysing talk, text and interaction.* (2nd ed.). London: Sage.

Smeltzer, L.R., & Watson, K.W. (1985). A test of instructional strategies for listening improvement in a simulated business setting. *Journal of Business Communication, 22,* 33-42.

Spaeapan, S., & Oskamp, S. (1992). *Helping and being helped: Naturalistic studies. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.*

Sprague, J., & Stuart, D. (1996). *The speaker's handbook* (4th ed.). Fort Worth, TX: Harcourt Brace College Publishers.

Steil, L.K., Barker, L.L., & Watson, K.W. (1983). *Effective listening: Key to your success.* Reading, MA: Addison–Wesley.

Steil, L.K., Summerfield, J., & de Mare, G. (1983). *Listening: It can change your life.* New York: John Wiley & Sons.

Stein, S.K. (1999). Uncovering listening strategies: Protocol analysis as a means to investigate student listening in the basic communication course. Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Maryland, College Park, MD.

Steintjes, M. (1993). Empowerment through employability skills: The ACT work keys listening assessment. *Journal of the International Listening Association, Special Issue,* 36-63.

Stine, M., Thompson, T., & Cusella, L. (1995). The impact of organizational structure and supervisory listening indicators on subordinate support, trust, intrinsic motivation, and performance. Glenn, E. (1989). A content analysis of fifty definitions of listening. *Journal of the International Listening Association, 9,* 84-91.

Strine, M., Thompson, T., & Cusella, L. (1995). The impact of organizational structure and supervisory listening indicators on subordinate support, trust, intrinsic motivation, and performance. *International Journal of Listening, 9,* 62-83.

Swanson, C.H. (1993). Empower your teaching by meeting your listeners' needs. *Journal of the International Listening Association, Special issue,* 17-26.

Tannen, D. (1990). *You just don't understand: Women and men in conversation*. NY: Morrow.

Tannen, D. (1994a). *Gender and discourse*. NY: Oxford University Press.

Tannen, D. (1994b). Talking from 9 to 5: How women's and men's conversational styles affect who gets heard, who gets credit, and what gets done at work. NY: William Morrow.

Thomlison, T.D. (1987). Contributions of humanistic psychology to listening: Past, present, and future. *International Listening Association, 1,* 54-77.

Thomlison, T. D. (1997). Intercultural listening. In D. Borisoff & M. Purdy (Eds.) *Listening in everyday life: A personal and professional approach* (2nd ed.) (pp. 79-120). Lanham, MD: University Press of America.

Titscher, S., Meyer, M., Wodak, R., & Vetter, E. (2000). *Methods of text and discourse analysis*. London: Sage.

Vangelisti, A.L. (1994). Couples' communication problems: The counselor's perspective. *Journal of Applied Communication Research, 22,* 106-126.

Verderber, R.F. (1999). *Communicate!* (9th ed.). Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.

Villaume, W.A., Darling, R., Brown, M., Richardson, D., & Clark-Lewis. (1993). The multidimensionality of presbycusis: Hearing losses on the content and relational dimensions of speech. *Journal of the International Listening Association, 7,* 111-124.

Walker, K.L. (1997). Do you ever listening: Discovering the theoretical underpinnings of empathic listening. *International Journal of Listening 11,* 127-137.

Waner, K.K. (1995). Business communication competencies needed by employees as perceived by business faculty and business professionals. *Business Communication Quarterly, 58* (4), 51-56.

Watson, K.W., & Barker, L.L. (1988). Listening assessment: The Watson-Barker listening test. *International Journal of Listening, 2,* 20-32.

Willmington, S.C. (1992). Oral communication skills necessary for successful teaching. *Educational Research Quarterly, 16* (2), 5-17.

Winsor, J.L., Curtis, D.B., & Stephens, R.D. (1997). National preferences in business and communication education: A survey update. *JACA, 3,* 170-179.

Witkin, B.R. (1990). Listening theory and research: The state of the art. *Journal of the International Listening Association, 4,* 7-32.

Witkin, B.R., Lundsteen, S., & Gallian, R. (1993). State requirements for listening in curriculum. *Journal of the International Listening Association, Special issue,* 27-31.

Witkin, B.R., Lovern, M.L., & Lundsteen, S.W. (1996). Oral communication in the English language arts curriculum: A national perspective. *Communication Education, 45,* 40-58.

Witkin, B.R., & Trochim, W.W.K. (1997). Toward a synthesis of listening constructs: A concept map analysis. *International Journal of Listening, 11,* 69-87.

Wolff, F.I., & Marsnik, N.C. (1992). *Perceptive listening* (2nd ed.). Fort Worth, TX: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich.

Wolvin, A.D., Berko, R.M., & Wolvin, D.R. (1999). *The public speaker/The public listener* (2nd ed.) Los Angeles, CA: Roxbury.

Wolvin, A.D. & Coakley, C.G. (1979). *Listening Instruction.* Urbana IL: ERIC Clearinghouse on Reading and Communication Skills.

Wolvin, A.D., & Coakley, C.G. (1982). *Listening.* Madison, WI: Brown & Benchmark.

Wolvin, A.D., & Coakley, C.G. (1985). *Listening* (2nd ed.). Madison, WI: Brown & Benchmark.

Wolvin, A.D., & Coakley, C.G. (1988). *Listening* (3rd ed.). Madison, WI: Brown & Benchmark.

Wolvin, A.D., & Coakley, C.G. (1991). A survey of the status of listening training in some Fortune 500 corporations. *Communication Education, 40,* 152-164.

Wolvin, A.D., & Coakley, C.G. (1992). *Listening* (4h ed.). Madison, WI: Brown & Benchmark.

Wolvin, A.D., & Coakley, C.G. (1993). A listening taxonomy. In A.D. Wolvin & C.G. Coakley (Eds.) *Perspectives on listening* (pp. 15-22). Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

Wolvin, A.D., & Coakley, C.G. (1994). Listening competency. *Journal of the International Listening Association, 8*, 148-160.

Wolvin, A.D., & Coakley, C.G. (1996). *Listening* (5th ed.). Madison, WI: Brown & Benchmark.

Wolvin, A.D., Coakley, C.G., & Disburg, J.E. (1991). An exploratory study of listening instruction in selected colleges and universities. *Journal of the International Listening Association, 5*, 68-85.

Wolvin, A.D., Coakley, C.G., & Disburg, J.E. (1992). Listening instruction in selected colleges and universities. *Journal of the International Listening Association, 6*, 59-65.

Wolvin, A.D., Coakley, C.G., & Halone, K.K. (1995). A preliminary look at listening development across the life span. *International Journal of Listening, 9,* 62-83.

Wolvin, A.D., Halone, & Coakley, C. (1999). Assessing the "intellectual discussion" on listening theory and research. *International Journal of Listening, 13,* 111-129.

Zarefsky, D. (1996). *Public speaking: Strategies for success.* Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

Zeuschner, R. (1997). *Communicating today* (2nd ed.). Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

APPENDIX A

The Most-Used Basic Communication Course Textbooks:

Adler, R.B., & Rodman, G. (1997). *Understanding human communication* (6th ed.). Fort Worth, TX: Harcourt Brace College Publishers.

Beebe, S.A., & Beebe, S.J. (1997). *Public speaking: An audience-centered approach* (3rd ed.). Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

DeVito, J.A. (1994). *Human communication: The basic course* (6th ed.). New York: HarperCollins College Publishers.

DeVito, J.A. (1999). *Essentials of human communication* (3rd ed.). New York: Longman.

Gamble, T.K., & Gamble, M. (1996). *Communication works* (5th ed.). New York: McGraw Hill.

Gregory, H. (1996). *Public speaking for college and career* (4th ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill.

Grice, G.L., & Skinner, J.F. (1995). *Mastering public speaking* (2nd ed.). Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

Gronbeck, B.E., German, K., Ehninger, D., & A.H. Monroe. (1998). *Principles of speech communication* (13th brief ed.). New York: Longman.

Jaffee, C. (1998). *Public speaking: Concepts and skills for a diverse society.* (2nd ed.). Belmont, CA: Wadsworth Publishing Company.

Lucas, S.E. (1998). *The art of public speaking* (6th ed.). Boston: McGraw Hill.

Nelson, P.E., & Pearson, J.C. (1996). *Confidence in public speaking* (6th ed.). Boston, MA: McGraw Hill.

Osborn, M.O., & S.O. Osborn. (1997). *Public speaking* (4th ed.). Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co.

Pearson, J.C., & Nelson, P.E. (1997). *An introduction to communication: Understanding and sharing* (7th ed.). Madison, WI: Brown & Benchmark.

Sprague, J., & Stuart, D. (1996). *The speaker's handbook* (4th ed.). Fort Worth, TX: Harcourt Brace College Publishers.

Verderber, R.F. (1999). *Communicate!* (9th ed.). Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.

Zarefsky, D. (1996). *Public speaking: Strategies for success.* Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

Zeuschner, R. (1997). *Communicating today* (2nd ed.). Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

APPENDIX B

Numbers and Dates of References and Footnotes Cited in the Listening Chapters

Author	Publication Date	# of Citations*	Dates
Adler & Rodman	1997	33	40's – 2 50's – 1 60's – 1 70's – 1 80's - 16 90's - 11
Beebe & Beebe	1997	8	30's – 1 50's – 2 60's – 1 70's – 1 80's – 2
DeVito	1994	8	20's – 1 70's – 4 80's – 8 90's – 1
DeVito	1999	10	70's – 2 80's – 3 90's – 5
Gamble & Gamble	1996	27	20's – 1 50's – 4 60's – 1 70's – 5 80's – 7 90's – 9

Gregory	1996	17	Unknown–2 60’s – 2 70’s – 2 80’s – 10 90’s - 1
Grice & Skinneer	1995	7	80’s – 5 90’s – 2
Gronbeck et al.	1998	2	80’s – 2
Jaffee	1998	16	70’s – 4 80’s – 3 90’s – 9
Lucas	1998	14	09 – 1 50’s – 2 60’s – 1 80’s – 2 90’s – 7
Nelson & Pearson	1996	17	20’s – 1 50-s – 7 60’s – 1 70’s – 4 80’s – 5 90’s – 4
Osborn & Osborn	1997	27	60’s – 1 70’s – 4 80’s – 13 90’s – 10
Pearson & Nelson	1997	18	20’s – 1 40’s – 1 50’s – 3 70’s – 4 80’s – 9

Sprague & Sruart	1992	0	--
Verderber	1996	16	80's – 6 90's – 10
Zarefsky	1996	7	60's – 1 70's – 2 80's – 4 90's – 2
Zeuschner	1997	13	70's – 1 80's – 7 90's - 5

*Some citations contain more than one reference; hence the total number of dates may exceed the total number of references.

APPENDIX C

Variations in the Steps of the Listening Models

Author	Date	Model					
Adler & Rodman	1997	Attend	Understand	Respond	Remember		
Beebe & Beebe	1997	Select	Attend	Understand	Remember		
DeVito	1994/1999	Receive	Understand	Remember	Evaluate	Respond	
Grice & Skinner	1995	Receive	Select	Interpret	Understand	Evaluate	Resolve
Nelson & Pearson	1996	Receive	Select	Organize	Interpret		
Verderber	1999	Attend	Understand	Remember	Analyze Critically	Respond	

d/Deafness and the Basic Course: A Case Study of Universal Instructional Design and Students Who are d/Deaf in the Oral (aural) Communication Classroom

Julia R. Johnson
Susan M. Pliner
Tom Burkhart

> *Any situation in which some individuals prevent others from engaging in the process of inquiry is one of violence.*
>
> — Paulo Freire, 1970

Hart and Williams (1995) argue that "students with physical disabilities are often treated differently," particularly by able-bodied instructors, "and thus receive a different level of education" than their able-bodied counterparts (p. 152). In part, the differential treatment students with disabilities receive can be attributed to the discomfort able-bodied persons experience when interacting with persons with disabilities (Braithwaite & Braithwaite, 1997; Hart & Williams, 1995). Discomfort does not occur in a vacuum, however. Comfort and discomfort are responses to our ways of understanding the world and educational contexts. Furthermore, our limited understandings and the academic structures that support those understandings — howeve, benign in our/their intentions — prevent students from accessing the process of inquiry. When our teaching practices deny students access to learning, we are engaging in the epistemic violence Freire (1970) describes above.

An important step educators can take to make classrooms and educational institutions accessible to all students is to unpack our assumptions about who we are, about how we teach, and about the students who populate our classrooms. Most important, we need to examine our relationship to privilege, particularly those moments we feel discomfort as we face/meet difference. Because, in spite of a teacher's conscious desire to treat students fairly, when a teacher is a member of a dominant social group, the experience of discomfort is evidence of (able-bodied) privilege: To be uncomfortable interacting with persons with disability reflects a privilege of not having had to previously address ability as a social norm. Even in cases of able-bodied people having more knowledge of people with disabilities, interactions between able-bodied persons and persons with disabilities may reduce "uncertainty of the ablebodied person", it doesn't "increase their *acceptance*" of the person with a disability, nor may it benefit persons with disabilities (Braithwaite, 1991, p. 271).

The purpose of this essay is to share our experience expanding our curriculum to address the learning needs of one d/Deaf[1] student (and thus all students) enrolled in Oral Communication (public speaking), a general education requirement at a Southern California University where the first and third authors taught[2]. Based on our experience accommodating[3] one student's learning needs, we challenged our assumptions about ability both in terms of dominant cultural constructions of ability and also in terms of d/Deaf cultures. Furthermore, we learned to better create curriculum that is universally accessible to all students, regardless of their disability status.

---

[1] "d/D" is used to highlight the distinction between the audiological condition of deafness and Deafness as a cultural identity constructed around the use of a common language, ASL. Persons who identify as Deaf do not believe that deafness is a deficit to be remedied.

The starting point for this case study is the assumption that Deafness is a cultural identity as much as an audiological condition. As we address in subsequent portions of this paper, creating universally inclusive curricula[4] and classroom spaces for all students, including those with disabilities, is best accomplished when the cultural identifications associated with the body are examined so that difference can be addressed respectfully. In the case of this study, by sharing our experience of including d/Deaf and hard-of-hearing (hoh) students in presentation classes populated primarily by hearing teachers and students, we call into question not only how accommodations are provided students with disabilities, but also how culture, power and identity are central to understanding the relationship between communication and instruction.

---

[2] The first version of this paper was based on research conducted by Johnson and Burkhart. Since that time, this paper has undergone major revisions based on collaborations between Johnson and Pliner, a disability identity scholar, educator and administrator.

[3] We use the term accommodation within the framework of the 1991 American's With Disabilities Act; however, our goal was to create a universally inclusive curriculum that supported the needs of all students regardless of their disability status.

[4] By universally inclusive curriculum, we mean curriculum that, at its inception, is designed to provide equal access to learning to all students regardless of their disability status.

The topic of d/Deafness offers important contributions to an understanding of how public speaking is taught. Clearly, public speaking is one of the most important courses taught in (Speech) Communication departments. Not only is public speaking a premiere service course, it is also a well-established location of disciplinary identification. By examining how we engage diverse experiences and languages in public speaking, we help ensure its healthy development and survival. In addition, ableist[5] beliefs influence the ability of people with and without disabilities from recognizing that d/Deaf persons are as skilled with communication as their hearing counterparts (Grupido, 1994). More careful engagement of d/Deafness provides opportunity to challenge assumptions about communication competence theoretically and practically. Finally, the Americans With Disabilities Act clearly outlines the imperative for educators to provide equal access to the educational environment for students with disabilities. Despite this legal imperative, many teachers do not know how to develop a curriculum that is universally designed to be inclusive for all students and many teachers remain resistant to serving the learning needs of students with disabilities.

---

[5] Ableism is the discourse that privileges able-bodied persons and pathologizes persons whose bodies, cognitive function, physiology or mental state does not conform to dominant constructions of "full functioning" (i.e. those labeled disabled).

This essay is organized as follows: First, we contextualize this case study in a discussion of d/Deafness as a cultural identity and in the philosophy of Universal Instructional Design (UID). Second, we explain our process of researching appropriate accommodations, followed by an articulation of how the process was implemented in our public speaking/oral communication classroom. Finally, we offer some specific suggestions for making classrooms accessible to all students.

DEAFNESS AS A CULTURAL IDENTIFICATION: COMMUNICATION AND EMBODIMENT

As educators committed to humane and rigorous teaching, we believe it is imperative that we consider the cultural logics that influence our curriculum design as well as how we engage our roles as educators. One way — perhaps one of the most important ways — we can create empowering learning experiences for our students and for ourselves is to approach teaching and learning as a cultural process. At this historical juncture, educators are more compelled than ever before to address issues of culture in the classroom, if only because classrooms are becoming more and more diverse. The approach we advocate in this paper is not to treat culture ex post facto, but to assess the cultural (i.e. ideological) assumptions that give rise to the very choices we make about what we teach and how to teach it as we design curricula.[6] Assessing cultural assumptions means that we interrogate the process of our own socialization to discern how our gendered, racialized, classed or, in this case, ableized social locations influence how we teach. As McIntyre (1997) notes in her examination of racial identity among white teachers,

---

[6] For a discussion of the ideological dimensions of communication education, see Cooks (1993), Johnson (1997), or Sprague (1992a;

> Reflections on [our] attitudes, beliefs and life experiences, and an examination of how these forces can oftentimes work to limit [our] understanding of the multiple forms of discriminatory educational practices that exist in our schools, is an important "first step" in understanding how we can teach more effectively. (p. 5)

In the same way that whiteness has been naturalized, resulting in the attitude among many whites that our color does not shape our experience, ableism often results in the attitude among able-bodied people that they are "normal." To challenge the hegemony of ableism, we contend that the visible and non-visible differences that are the basis for defining ability and disability must be considered.

As with members of any dominant cultural group, the way able-bodied people move through the world is naturalized. As Gramsci (1971) and others so compellingly argue, we consent, usually unconsciously to the standards of the dominant (able-bodied) culture. The able-bodied learn that our bodies function "appropri-

---

1992b, 1994). Extensive research has been conducted into the ideological dimensions of education in Cultural Studies, specifically in the "field" of Critical Pedagogy. Germinal studies from this "tradition" include Bowles & Gintis (1976) and Freire (1970). More contemporary examinations of the ideological dimensions of education include Gore (1993), Giroux (1992), Gonzalez Gaudiano & Alba (1994) and hooks (1994), to name only a few.

ately" and are rarely, if ever, confronted with situations that call our ability into question.[7] The ideology of ableism is often reflected in the construction of persons with disabilities as "handicapped." Although it is politically important to define disabilities culturally and legally, by defining disability as deprivation or inferiority, we are perpetuating the "othering" of people who are visibly or non-visibly disabled. In the case of d/Deafness, it reflects a kind of hearing hegemony to imagine that d/Deafness is a matter of what Wrigley (1996) calls "sensory 'deprivation'".

A more inclusive and critical approach to conceptualizing identity is to imagine Deafness as a socially constructed identity as opposed to a biologically determined reality.[8] Wrigley (1996) continues,

> . . . a contrasting view might see a world built around the valence of visual rather than aural channels for processing languages — not just semiotic signs, but languages of visual modality...in a political framing

---

[7] Most often, if persons born "fully abled" confront the naturalization of able-bodiedness, it is usually through illness, such as cancer or as a result of an accident that transforms able-bodiedness into disability.

[8] The construction of d/Deafness as deprivation is enmeshed in a logic of biological determinism in which the body is essentialized and thus addressed as a stagnate geographical space. Within this discourse of ableism, deafness can only be imagined as a condition to be controlled and/or erased. We contend that it is more theoretically useful and politically astute to theorize the body (reality) as a social construction, "made real" through language. When we combine the interpretive study of the body with the critical concern with power, we can begin to theorize the body as a site of meaning construction on which power is inscribed and meaning/reality (re)constructed through individual agency.

> this shift rejects the site of the body and relocates meaning and its production onto the social. (p. 3)[9]

In other words, the visual mode influences the "structure" (i.e. construction and performance) of Deaf culture.

In 1972, James Woodward proposed that a distinction be made between those who are "*d*eaf" – people whose hearing was impaired – and "*D*eaf" – a particular group of people who share a language and a culture (Pelka, 1997). Padden and Humphries (1988), who have written extensively on Deaf culture, clarify:

> We use the lowercase deaf when referring to the audiological condition of not hearing, and the uppercase *Deaf* when referring to a particular group of deaf people who share a language — American Sign Language (ASL) — and a culture. The members of this group have inherited their sign language, use it as a primary means of communication among themselves, and hold a set of beliefs about themselves and their connection to the larger society. We distinguish them from, for example, those who find themselves losing their hearing because of illness, trauma or age; although these people share the condition of not hearing, they do not have access to the knowledge, beliefs, and practices that make up the culture of Deaf people. (p. 88).

By expanding a definition of deafness to include cultural identification (Deafness), we can begin to move beyond an emphasis on biology to examine what it means to be Deaf in a world where hearing is normalized.

---

[9] To take Wrigley's point beyond the trappings of the visual, we must also consider that a "visual" language can also be used and communicated through touch, as evidenced by the communication of persons who are d/Deaf and b/Blind.

As scholars of culture and communication claim, a defining feature of cultural group membership is the use of a shared language. For members of Deaf culture and communities, the use of American Sign Language marks their cultural membership. While there are other sign systems used by d/Deaf and hoh people (Reagan, 1988), a defining feature of Deafness is the use of hands, arms, eyes and the face as hearing people would use the larynx. [10] Wrigley (1996) further clarifies the importance of language in Deaf culture:

> Those within Deaf communities differentiate between the simple inability to hear and their self-identification as Deaf. The degree of hearing loss matters relatively little. What is important, and what is deemed primary evidence for membership within the broader community, is the use of sign language. (p. 15)

Embodiment means something quite different in Deaf cultures and communities. On a very basic level, the use of ASL and other signed languages transforms how the body is used and conceptualized as people communicate; words are articulated through the hands, arms, eyes and face.[11] To be articulate in ASL requires a highly developed use of the face, use of sign space (that space used to speak using the arms and hands) and increased visual acuity to pick up nuances of meaning encoded by a speaker.

---

[10] Additional modes of signed language are used as manual codes of English, such as Seeing Essential English, Signing Exact English or Pidgin Signed English. These modes refer "to a wide range of signing behaviors which incorporate varying amounts of ASL and English" (Reagan, 1988, p. 2).

[11] It is not enough to say that nonverbal communication takes precedence in signed languages. In fact, the very use of the term nonverbal assumes aural/oral communication. In ASL, the body does not compliment sound, language is articulated through the body.

In order to fully address the learning needs of all students, including the specific needs of students who are d/Deaf or hoh, requires a non-traditional approach to pedagogy. Quite simply, the dominant instructional modalities used on college classrooms generally (such as a reliance on lecture/banking information) and public speaking classrooms specifically (public speaking requires the use of audiological voice) cannot meet the complex learning styles and needs many students bring with them to a classroom. The educational philosophy of UID offers useful and practical guidelines for creating inclusive curricula and instructional strategies.

Principles of UID

Universal curriculum design is defined as "a design of instructional materials and activities that allows learning goals to be attainable by individuals with wide differences in their abilities to see, hear, speak, move, read, write, understand English, attend, organize engage and remember" (Orkwis, 1999, p. 3). The benefit of making curriculum accessible through UID for learning is that the "physical, sensory, affective, or cognitive barriers" often built into our curriculum are mitigated and educators can provide all students access to curriculum "without having to adapt the curriculum repeatedly to meet special needs" (p. 3).

Orkwis (1999) outlines several "essential features" for creating accessible curriculum for all students. The essential features of UID include "multiple means of representation," "multiple means of expression," and "multiple means of engagement" (p. 3). Multiple means of representation refers to the presentation of subject matter in ways that appeal to students "who learn best from visual or auditory information, or for those who need differing levels of complexity" (p. 3). Orkwis describes multiple means of expression as allowing students to respond to course material using "their preferred means of control," including different cognitive styles and motor-system controls (p. 3). Multiple means of engagement refers to the relationship between student interest in learning combined with "the mode of presentation and their preferred means of expression" (p. 3). More simply, Orkwis argues that curricular materials have to be flexible, diverse, and sufficiently challenging (difficult).

In many ways, Orkwis' (1999) description of UID sounds like what we might consider good pedagogy. And, in the most general sense, UID is good pedagogy. But, more importantly, UID does not privilege one particular modality over another or one kind of cognitive function over another. Rather, creating a universally inclusive curriculum requires actively engaging all students in learning regardless of the disability status.

In Silver, Bourke and Strehorn's (1998) survey of faculty response to UID, surveyed faculty believed that the principals of UID that were useful for students with disabilities were also consistent with a trend in higher education to create curriculum which appeals to a broader base of learning styles. The principles/strategies mentioned by faculty included:

> ...cooperative learning, team approach, contextual learning, computer-assisted instruction, constructive learning, scaffolding, on-line instruction and assess-

> ment, prepared materials and advance organizers before class, multi-modal instruction, peer editing/peer groups, criterion-based learning, extended time for exams and projects, putting all materials on reserve, testing in the same manner as teaching, modeling, prompting, and cueing. (p. 49)

While certain of these principles/strategies might be of particular benefit to some students, integrating these modalities in the classroom enhances the performance of students overall.

The aforementioned are essential components of UID; however, there are a variety of ways to incorporate these principles and strategies into a specific classroom. In what follows, we explain our process of implementing UID, including the specific elements of the public speaking curriculum we attempted to make inclusive and what, in retrospect, we might have done to further enhance our inclusiveness.

THE CASE

In January 1997, the Office of Students with Disabilities contacted our department to request a course substitution for a deaf student, "Joseph."[12] Because public speaking was a general education requirement at our institution, Joseph needed to take public speaking in order to graduate; however, he was concerned that he could not be fairly assessed in a public speaking course because his ideas would be audiologically voiced through a sign interpreter. Joseph's case manager, "Maria," shared his concern.[13]

---

[12] The student and his case-manager have been assigned pseudonyms.

The first step in addressing this case included researching how to include[14] students who are d/Deaf or hoh in a public speaking classroom and including the student in discussions about how accommodations would be provided. Based on conversations with disability service providers at several local universities, we confirmed that in schools with majority hearing populations, d/Deaf and hoh students are usually required to enroll in public speaking classes and provided sign interpreters for class sessions and presentations. Second, in line with Braithwaite and Braithwaite's (1997) recommendation that persons with disabilities should define if and how accommodations are provided, we met with Joseph and Maria to learn about Joseph's specific concerns and learning needs. In that meeting, Joseph shared his desire to be assessed according to how *he* gave voice to ideas. We agreed to research appropriate accommodations with the caveat that if Joseph and Maria did not agree to the fairness of the finalized accommodations, Joseph could substitute another course for the course in public speaking.

---

[13] Maria initially served as Joseph's case manager and contacted our department to request accommodations on his behalf. Her role in this process was primarily that of an advocate for Joseph and as a resource for explaining her experience working with/in Deaf communities.

[14] In line with our efforts to create universally inclusive curriculum, we use the terms included or inclusive instead of "mainstreamed".

The second phase of our research process took us to the National Center on Deafness (NCOD).[15] Established in 1964, the National Center on Deafness is a nationally recognized organization designed to provide "quality education to the deaf and hard-of-hearing in a mainstream university environment," including "student support services," "technical assistance and training to schools," and "transition and career services" (National Center on Deafness Homepage). At the NCOD, we met with a Student Personnel Specialist and Public Speaking Instructor to learn how d/Deaf and hard-of-hearing students are assessed in public speaking classes designed specifically for students who use American Sign Language (ASL) and other sign systems.

We gained preliminary understanding of the culture of ASL classrooms as we participated in a public speaking class designed for d/Deaf students. That brief observation experience proved extremely useful in enhancing our understanding of the complexity of speaking through sign interpreters. Two sign language interpreters were provided as an accommodation for us during the observation; one interpreted for the professor and the other interpreted for the students. The interpreters also gave voice to our communication for the class. We had two significant experiences that influenced our structuring of the class and assessment protocol that warrant description here.

First, we were unexpectedly asked to give a brief presentation explaining our educational backgrounds and interest in attending the class. As people used to speaking to predominantly hearing audiences, it took time to get used to the experience of speaking and having our words "translated"[16] into ASL. We were not accustomed to the interpretation process, including how to adapt to various patterns of speech without hearing the words people were saying. Furthermore, our embodiment was transformed; we were no longer in a context where our physical tools such as our voice, gestures, or even eye contact were useful. The dominant mode of communication was ASL, a language we did not speak. As seasoned public speakers, we became more keenly aware of the value we placed on tonality, inflection and body language — skills that we had learned to use strategically were no longer within our control. Because we couldn't read the ways that the interpreters used inflection and tone, our authority was displaced, which is (grossly) uncomfortable for professors.

---

[15] Special thanks go to Barbara Boyd at the NCOD for her conversations with us, her recommendations for the assessment protocol and for allowing us to visit her public speaking classroom.

Second, as the sign interpreters worked together, we gained insight into the challenges to communication that often occur when speaking through an interpreter (Liu, 1995). One interpreter would translate a sentence only to have the second interpreter correct her/him, for example. This kind of "correction" was often followed by a brief discussion of what was being communicated by a given speaker.[17] In short, we learned that it was often difficult to glean the meaning of a speaker through an interpreter, even though those persons acting as sign interpreters were highly qualified and proficient in both English and ASL.

---

[16] It is important, here, to distinguish between possible descriptions of what we are defining as the translation process. We use the term translation deliberately to indicate that we consider ASL a language, as opposed to a transliteration of English such as conceptual signed English or literal Signed English (Hayes, 1993). While the term "translate" provides conceptual clarity in this sentence, the preferred term to describe the communication of meaning from ASL to another language is "interpret".

In sum, the visit to the NCOD provided insight into the cultural and linguistic dimensions of Deafness, particularly how the public speaking curriculum would need to be further (re)conceptualized for a diverse student body. We were also reminded of the ways that culture and power are intrinsic to how we learn, what counts as knowledge, the purpose of schooling, and how identities are positioned in the classroom. We felt more empowered to create an inclusive public speaking classroom, and now needed to create a curriculum that empowered *all* of our students.

Based on this field research, we generated a speech assessment protocol and scheduled another meeting with Joseph. Because Joseph felt comfortable that he would be graded according to how he gave voice to ideas (as did his case manager), he enrolled in a public speaking class the following term. In what follows, we explain the specific choices we made in expanding the public speaking curriculum and offer specific suggestions for how to utilize UID.

---

[17] It is important to note that the interpreters were interpreters-in-training, so some behaviors described here might well be attributed to their status as students.

THE CLASSROOM EXPERIENCE

The Partially Inclusive Oral Communication Curriculum

It is important to explain our department's general approach to Oral Communication in order to address what we did to expand the inclusiveness of our curriculum the semester Joseph enrolled in public speaking. Our faculty and departmental teaching assistants worked collaboratively to construct a curriculum for our public speaking course that engaged a variety of presentational styles, organizational patterns and cultural logics. We expanded our curriculum to include various organizational patterns that reflected both linear and non-linear logic. Furthermore, we required that students read essays that examine how multiple linguistic realities are negotiated (Lee, 1993), and essays that address language and oracy skills in African education (Reagan, 1995). One of the first articles we had students read is the essay "Movimientos de rebeldia y las culturas que traicionan" from Gloria Anzaldua's book, *Borderlands/La Frontera*, in which Anzaldua interrogates the many cultural identifications she negotiates as a Chicana lesbian feminist. Not only does this article offer a meaningful framework for discussing the ways culture is influenced by and gives rise to communication, but Anzaldua's discussion of borderlands offers class participants a metaphor for examining the lived reality of intercultural exchange.[18] All of these articles were selected because they opened our approach to teaching public speaking so that we might substantively include the needs and interests of an ethnically and linguistically diverse student body. We had already begun a process of creating a universally inclusive curriculum, although we were remiss in assessing the needs of students who were d/Deaf. Yet, because this framework was already in place, we felt that we would be better able to avoid essentializing or fetishizing Joseph's deafness[19] as we expanded our curriculum.

---

[18] The metaphor of the borderland is relevant for any of us who experience the reality of negotiating multiple cultural realities

Creating an Interactive and "Safe" Classroom Culture

Many public speaking teachers are interested in creating highly interactive classroom environments that encourage participation from even the most apprehensive student. For Joseph's instructor, this meant dedicating a large portion of class time to activities and discussion. Furthermore, the instructor's class collaboratively established several ground rules by which they

---

(Valenzuela, 1998), including people who are d/Deaf and hard-of-hearing interacting in predominantly hearing contexts. Although we recognize border metaphors can essentialize differences, instructors problematized the metaphor in class discussions and assignments as well. Furthermore, this essay is presented in both Spanish and English, which afforded us an opportunity to have bi/multi-lingual students engage multiple languages in the classroom.

[19] At no point in our research process did Joseph claim Deafness as an identity. When he was asked about this identification, Joseph discussed deafness as an audiological condition. It was unclear to us whether Joseph's response was about maintaining a sense of distance, a lack of identification, where he was in developing a Deaf identity or a combination thereof.

would operate. Specific ground rules included the following: First, Joseph should be addressed directly (i.e., don't speak to the interpreter). Second, everyone should attend to Joseph as he was speaking rather than looking at the interpreter as the primary speaker (Siple, 1993). Third, students would need to raise their hands prior to speaking so that the interpreter could identify the person speaking, thereby allowing Joseph to follow the flow of the conversation more readily and, as a result, respond appropriately. Additionally, the instructor pointed out that the interpreter would need to stand beside any speaker at the front of the room so that Joseph would be able to observe the speaker's performance as well as see the interpreter.

Two primary challenges emerged in the classroom community. To begin, early during the course, students had a difficult time speaking in front of the room with someone standing next to them (the movement of hands immediately next to them affected concentration levels), but their discomfort seemed to diminish with each speech. Second, a challenge to the classroom culture emerged when Joseph and the sign interpreters chose to sit on one side of the room. His physical positioning in the class mirrored the distance created by the contrast between the use of ASL and spoken English. Although the hearing students were generally "good" about adapting to the Joseph's use of language, the gap between d/Deaf and hearing remained.[20]

---

[20] Perhaps the gap between Joseph and his hearing peers was a reflection of the translation process, Joseph's personal communication style and/or the discomfort hearing students felt interacting with Joseph. Many times, Joseph and his classmates avoided interpersonal interaction with each other. It is important to question the possible

Suggestions for Creating and Inclusive Community: In order to create a more inclusive classroom community generally, and classrooms inclusive of students who are d/Deaf or hoh, we offer four suggestions: First and foremost, class guidelines should highlight the needs of all students. Our mistake was that we focused on what Joseph would need, thus singling him out as "the different one." Second, have a conversation with the student and interpreter to learn what interpreter-speaker positioning is appropriate. All the students in class would have been well served by having the interpreter positioned so that Joseph could read the sign and positioned so that speaking space was maintained. Third, instructors should structure communication so that students from diverse backgrounds interact with each other one-on-one. For example, instructors could form and rotate working groups for class activities so more students are given an opportunity to interact directly. Another option would be to arrange the class in a circle so that it is more difficult for a student to be distanced from the class interaction. Fourth, in an inclusive system, students have time to raise their hands to ask a question and time is negotiated so that all students can process information. When an interpreter is in a classroom, space needs to be made for information

---

reasons why communication between Joseph and his peers was hindered, including the instructor's role in perpetuating cultural divisions. Perhaps Joseph's personal communication style shaped interactions. It is imperative, however, to recognize that d/Deaf and hard-of-hearing students in inclusive environments are constrained in their ability to "shape or control their communication environment" (Foster, Barefoot & DeCaro, 1989, p. 566), which constrains their ability to connect with hearing counterparts.

processing and for time between student contributions. In a public speaking class, this means that time needs to be reconceptualized for general class discussions and for question and answer periods following speeches. Furthermore, students who are d/Deaf should be given equal speaking time; in other words, some additional time should be given to account for the time needed for ideas to be interpreted and communicated to a hearing audience.

Assessing Presentations

For instructors teaching the basic course in public speaking, a primary challenge will be to create grading criteria that can be used to evaluate all students fairly. Because public speaking has from its inception privileged orality, it can feel challenging to reconceptualize an assessment protocol so that it can be used to evaluate multiple voicings of ideas. After meeting with teachers and students at the NCOD, we learned that the only areas of the assessment protocol that required revision pertained to delivery.

Generally, we measured delivery using five categories: Posture, eye contact, volume, clarity (enunciation) and speed. Because posture, eye-contact, use of hands (in Joseph's case, use of sign space) and facial expressions are instrumental to communication in ASL, we did not have to revise measures for assessing posture and eye contact. What we needed to consider more fully were the nonverbal differences expressed by sign-speakers and oral communicators. As we note above, use of the body is significantly different for ASL-speakers. For example, persons using ASL rely on visual acuity to de-code messages and attend differently (more carefully) to the nuances of eye-contact, use of sign space and posture than their hearing counterparts. To create a more inclusive assessment protocol, we should have better educated ourselves about how to read differences in body language so that Joseph's nonverbal performance could have been better assessed. Discussions with disability services specialists, ASL speakers and/or sign interpreters would have been useful to this end.

In order to evaluate Joseph's language use, assessment measures needed to be adapted so that Joseph would be evaluated according to the ways he used language as opposed to what was *heard* through the sign interpreters. As we note above, the complexity of the interpretation process often results in a transformation of the ideas spoken by a speaker. Therefore, all students' use of language was measured by assessing written work (i.e. outlines) for all speeches presented according to their shared language, English. Clearly, when a student gives voice to her/his own ideas as they speak, public speaking instructors attend to inflection, tone and word choice.

Suggestions for Creating Inclusive Assessment Protocols: We offer two suggestions for creating an inclusive assessment process. First, we would have been better able to assess Joseph's delivery inclusively had factors such as facial expression, general appearance, gestures and movement been incorporated into the assessment of Joseph. The absence of these elements pointed to a flaw in the adapted evaluation protocol generally, which has subsequently been revised to include these items. Second, if an interpreter is provided for a student, the instructor should support student requests for rehearsal time with an interpreter. At most colleges and universities, interpreters are paid by the class hour. Because students will often need time to rehearse with an interpreter in order to practice placing proper emphasis on language, instructors may need to help students substantiate the claim for this need.

Additional Suggestions

Overall, our process of creating a UID curriculum was productive, both in terms of being able to meet the learning needs of a wider variety of students and because of what we learned about our assumptions about teaching and learning. The knowledge gained by teaching Joseph and subsequent study suggests the following:

1. Be open to the idea that creating inclusive curriculum to support all students, including students with disabilities, can change the way one teaches. Teaching diverse student populations will and should offer continual opportunities to change our teaching.
2. Be willing to examine your teaching style and make appropriate changes that meet student needs, but do not isolate or punish any student for her/his learning needs. There is value for all students in creating an inclusive curriculum.
3. Be open to constructive feedback. Joseph and Maria offered important suggestions for creating a universally inclusive curriculum and feedback about the classroom assignments and process. By actively involving them in our process, we believe

a more humane and practical classroom experience emerged.

4. Finally, provide extra time for clarifying concepts either before or after class and/or be available through email. While it is important to be available to all students, the interpretation process helped us better understand the value of communicating with students outside of class.

Additional suggestions for improving communication with students about course content include:

1. Make class notes available to students outside of class. This can be done by placing notes on reserve in the library, in your office, or on a course website.
2. Provide outlines of lectures prior to class so that students can follow your lecture/discussion and take more thorough notes.
3. Utilize technologically inclusive pedagogy and integrate technology into the course. For example, students can be required to engage in on-line discussions of concepts posted to a faculty webpage. By having students discuss/post messages about course concepts in cyberspace once a week, apprehensive students have a more anonymous forum for participating and, in the case of a student who is d/Deaf or hoh, s/he can communicate without the use of an interpreter. It is important to note that not all students have equal access to technology, which may limit the applicability of this suggestion.

CONCLUSION

Assessing the process of providing Joseph accommodations was complex and wrought with contradictions. On one level, we acknowledge the reality of working in a predominantly hearing community, which necessitates a process for including d/Deaf and hard-of-hearing students. Accommodations are often the best (or only) option to provide to students with disabilities. It is also important to acknowledge that for d/Deaf students, being included in a predominantly hearing classroom has specific constraints. Liu (1995) argues, for example, that while the logic and practice of mainstreaming may provide students with "equal access to school facilities, it does not provide equal opportunity to obtain knowledge" (p. 243). Furthermore, Holcomb, Coryell & Rosenfield (1992) explain that "inclusive deaf students frequently experience social isolation, loneliness and rejection" or poor self concept (p. 18). Being aware of these constraints can help instructors include all students in curriculum design and implementation and assist instructors in engaging students respectfully.

As Silver, Bourke and Strehorn (1998) contend, if UID becomes "part of the institution's instructional methodologies, students with disabilities in higher education will no longer need to rely as heavily on support systems that are secondary to the primary instructional programs" (p. 47). By addressing accessibility as a part of all instructional planning, we can transform the classroom space and curriculum from one that privileges ableism into one that is inherently accessible and, therefore, inherently more likely to empower all students to succeed. When we design curriculum that at its inception includes the multiple modalities that appeal to a broad range of learning needs, we communicate to our students and each other that there are multiple ways of knowing — multiple intelligences — all of which have a place in life-long learning. Furthermore, implementing strategies such as study guides, class notes, untimed examinations, discussion groups for studying and so forth are "representative of effective instructional practices" (p. 48). And, even more importantly, if we accept the challenge to create inclusive curriculum in all ways, we are more likely to create respectful learning environments for our increasingly diverse student populations.

Joseph offered important feedback about our particular efforts to design a universally inclusive curriculum. Joseph stated that he benefited from learning in an inclusive environment: "After I took the class I realized that that's what I'm going to be confronting in the real world is I'm going to be giving presentations through an interpreter." Furthermore, he felt that he learned valuable skills by taking a public speaking course. In spite of the challenges of learning in a predominantly hearing environment, Joseph said that he "was able to communicate clearly with the people, they were able to understand me." He also noted, "I was able to develop my confidence. I was able to communicate — use eye contact, use vocabulary — so that I am more clearly understood . . ." He also gained confidence in his "physical appearance" and the way he "approached individuals."

Our experience creating a UID curriculum prompted by Joseph's request for accommodation provided us an important opportunity to assess our assumptions about teaching and learning. The case detailed herein validates the usefulness of critical approaches to teaching for analyzing and evaluating the linguistic and cultural spaces of our public speaking classrooms. Furthermore, to the extent that we create curriculum that is inaccessible to particular student populations, we are not only precluding equal access to education, we are perpetuating a form of epistemic violence. To substantiate this point, we return to the quotation included at the beginning of this essay: "Any situation in which some individuals prevent others from engaging in the process of inquiry is one of violence. The means used are unimportant; to alienate human beings from their own decision-making is to change them into objects" (Freire, 1970, p. 66). By creating UID curriculum, we mitigate the risk of objectifying students as we create a space for all students to inquire and to develop some of the skills that will help them become beings-for-themselves.

REFERENCES

Anzaldua, G. (1987). *Borderlands/La Frontera.* San Francisco: Spinsters/Aunt Lute.

Bowles, S., & Gintis, H. (1976). *Schooling in capitalist America: Educational reform and the contradictions of economic life*. Basic Books.

Braithwaite, D. O., & Braithwaite, C. A. (1997). Understanding communication of persons with disabilities as cultural communication. In L. A. Samovar and R. E. Porter (Eds.), *Intercultural communication: A* *reader* (8th edition, pp. 154-164). Belmont, CA: Wadsworth Publishing.

Cooks, L.M. (1993). *Critical pedagogy as communication education: Researching the possibilities.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Ohio, Athens.

Foster, S., Barefoot, S. M., & DeCaro, P.M. (1989). The meaning of communication to a group of deaf college students: A multidimensional perspective. *Journal of Speech and Hearing Disorders, 54*, 558-569.

Freire, P. (1970). *Pedagogy of the oppressed.* New York, NY: The Seabury Press.

Giroux, H.A. (1992). Resisting difference: Cultural studies and the discourse of critical pedagogy. In L. Grossberg, C. Nelson & P. Treichler (Eds.), *Cultural studies* (pp. 199-212). New York: Routledge.

Gonzalez Gaudiano, E., & de Alba, A. (1994). Freire: Present and future possibilities. In P. L. McLaren and C. Lankshear (Eds.), *Politics of liberation: Paths from Freire* (pp. 123-142). New York and London: Routledge.

Gore, J.M. (1993). *The struggle for pedagogies: Critical and feminist discourses as regimes of truth.* New York: Routledge

Gramsci, A. (1971). *Selections from the prison notebooks.* New York: International Publishers.

Grupido, N. (1994). Growing up deaf. *Perspectives*, 11-17.

Hart, R.D., & Williams, D.E. (1995). Able-bodied instructors and students with physical disabilities: A relationship handicapped by communication. *Communication Education, 44*(2), 140-154.

Hayes, P.L. (1993). Clarifying the role of classroom interpreters. *Perspectives, 11*(5), 8-10, 24.

Holcomb, T.K., Coryell, J., & Rosenfield, E. (1992). Designing a supportive mainstream environment. *Perspectives*, 17-19. hooks, b. (1994). *Teaching to transgress: Education as the practice of freedom.* New York: Routledge.

Johnson, J.R. (1997). *The social construction of whiteness: Teacher power, personhood and performance in the classroom.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Massachusetts, Amherst.

Lee, C.R. (1993). The faintest echo of our language. In G. Hongo (Ed.), *Under Western Eyes: Personal Essays From Asian America,* (pp. 212-223). New York: Anchor Books.

Liu, A. (1995). Full inclusion and deaf education: Redefining equality. *Journal of Law and Education, 24*(2), 241-266.

McIntyre, A. (1997). *Making meaning of whiteness: Exploring racial identity with white teachers.* Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

McLaren, P. (1989). Life in schools: An introduction to Critical Pedagogy in the foundations of education. New York and London: Longman.

National Center on Deafness Homepage at http://ncod.csun.edu.

Orkwis, R. (1999). *Curriculum access and UID for learning*. Washington, D.C. (ERIC No. EDO-EC-99-14)

Padden, C. & Humphries, T. (1988). *Deaf in America: Voices from a culture*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Pelka, F. (1997). *The ABC-CLIO companion to the Disability Rights Movement.*. Santa Barbara, CA: ABC-CLIO, Inc.

Proctor II, R.F., Douglas, A. T., Garera-Izquierdo, T., & Wartman, S.L. (1994). Approach, avoidance, and apprehension: Talking with high-ca students about getting help. *Communication Education, 43*(4), 312-321.

Reagan, T. (1985). The deaf as a linguistic minority: Educational considerations. *Harvard Educational Review, 55*, 265-277.

Reagan, T. (1988). Multiculturalism and the deaf: An educational manifesto. *Journal of Research and Development in Education, 22*(1), 1-5.

Reagan, T.G. (1995). Language and the skills of oracy in traditional African education. *Journal of Research and Development in Education, 28*(2), 106-111.

Silver, P., Bourke, A., & Strehorn, K.C. (1998). Universal Instructional Design in higher education: An approach for inclusion. *Equity & Excellence in Education 31*(2), 47-51.

Siple, L. A. (1993). Working with the sign language interpreter in your classroom. *College Teaching, 41*(4), 139-141.

Sprague, J. (1992a). Critical perspectives on teacher empowerment. *Communication Education, 41*,

Sprague, J. (1992b). Expanding the research agenda for instructional communication: Raising some unasked questions. *Communication Education, 41,* 1-25.

Sprague, J. (1994). Ontology, politics and instructional communication research: Why we can't just 'agree to disagree' about power. *Communication Education, 43*(4), 273-290.

Valenzuela, R. (1998). *The Rhetoric of Gloria Molina as an organic intellectual: the postcolonial politics of immigration.* Unpublished Master's thesis, California State University, Los Angeles.

Woodward, J. (1982). How you gonna get to heaven if you can't talk with Jesus: On depathologizing deafness. Silver Spring, MD: T. J. Publishers.

Wrigley, O. (1996). *The politics of Deafness.* Washington, D.C.: Gallaudet University Press.

Author Identifications

Karen Anderson (M.A., Texas Tech University, 1999). Doctoral student at the University of Kansas. Ms. Anderson's research interests include evaluation and assessment of the basic communication course.

Tom Burkhart (M.A., California State University, Los Angeles, 1998). Doctoral student at the University of Iowa.

Robert E. Carlson (Ph.D., Purdue University, 1978). Professor of Speech Communication at the University of Nebraska at Omaha. Many of Professor Carlson's publications focus on communicative attitudes and anxiety. His current research interests are in evaluation and assessment of public speaking and communication apprehension. In addition, he is actively involved in distance education and teaching the basic speech course internationally.

Karen Kangas Dwyer (Ph.D., University of Nebraska, Lincoln, 1995). Associate Professor of Speech Communication and Basic Course Director at the University of Nebraska at Omaha. Professor Dwyer has authored a textbook, instructor's manual, student workbook, and several articles related to the basic communication course. Her research interests are in instructional communication, especially communication apprehension and avoidance. Her work has involved developing and teaching special public speaking classes and workshops for highly apprehensive communicators. She has co-authored a Dutch public speaking trade book. As part of a hobby, she has written three cookbooks published by St. Martin's Press.

Nancy Rost Goulden (Ed.D., University of Northern Arizona, 1989). Assistant Professor of Rhetoric/Communication and Director of the Basic Course at Kansas State University. Professor Rost Goulden has authored a textbook, teacher's manual, student public speaking workbook for use with electronic database, and a variety of journal articles. Her professional interests include the basic course, K-12 oral communication education, public speaking assessment, and the rhetoric of girl's classic literature.

Stephen K. Hunt (Ph.D., Southern Illinois University, 1998). Assistant Professor and Co-Director of the Basic Communication Course at Illinois State University. Professor Hunt's research interests include the communication needs of students at-risk, students' learning/cognitive styles, training graduate students, and assessment.

Laura A. Janusik (M.A., University of Maryland at College Park, 1999). Doctoral student in the Department of Communication at the University of Maryland. Ms. Janusik's research interests include listening pedagogy and curriculum development for higher education and the corporate classroom.

Karla Kay Jensen (Ph.D., University of Kansas, 1994). Assistant Professor at Nebraska Wesleyan University. Professor Jensen's interests include evaluation and assessment of the basic communication course.

Julia R. Johnson (Ph.D. University of Massachusetts, Amherst). Lecturer in Rhetoric and Public Address at California State University at Long Beach. Professor Johnson is particularly interested in the examination of how identity is constructed within unequal relationships of power. She has worked with the basic course for over ten years and has developed inclusive pedagogy as a Basic Course and TA Director.

Sally A. Kahre (M.A., University of Nebraska at Omaha, 1999). Consultant for the Methodist Employee Assistance Program. Sally researches, develops, designs, and presents education-based seminars to clients throughout the Midwest. Her main research interests are public speaking and interpersonal communication. Her graduate thesis focuses on communication apprehension and lab-supported speech classes.

Susan M. Pliner (Ed.D., University of Massachusetts, Amherst). Educational Consultant and adjunct faculty member at Lesley University and the Coordinator of the Speaking, Arguing and Writing Program at Mount Holyoke College. Dr. Pliner has earned a Masters Degree in Special Education and a Doctorate in Human Development and Social Justice Education. She has been working in the field of disabilities, multicultural education and social justice education for eleven years.

Cheri J. Simonds (Ph.D., University of Oklahoma, 1995). Assistant Professor and Co-Director of the Basic Communication Course at Illinois State University. Prof. Simonds has co-authored a book on classroom communication and has published articles on teacher clarity and challenge behavior in the college classroom. Her major research interests include graduate student training and development, evaluation issues, and assessment.

Calvin L. Troup (Ph.D., Pennsylvania State University, 1994). Assistant Professor of Communication, Affiliated Departments of Communication and English at Duquesne University. Professor Troup's research interests include: history and theory of rhetoric; rhetoric, religion, and public life; and public relations.

Andrew D. Wolvin (Ph.D., Purdue University). Professor and Basic Course Director in the Department of Communication at the University of Maryland. Professor Wolvin's research focuses on the study of listening behavior and communication pedagogy.

Index

BASIC COMMUNICATION COURSE ANNUAL VOLUMES 1-13

Volume 1, 1989

Gray, P. L. The basic course in speech communication: An historical perspective. 1-27.

Seiler, W. J., & McGukin, D. What we know about the basic course: What has the research told us? 28-42.

Gray, P. L., Buerkel-Rothfuss, N. L., & Thomas, R. W. A comparison between PSI and self-contained formats of instruction in the introductory speech communication course. 43-69.

Smitter, R. D. Using plays and novels as case studies in the basic course. 70-81.

Phelps, L. A. A unit on relationship termination in the basic course. 82-94.

Haskins, W. A. Teaching ethics in the basic survey speech communication course. 95-105.

Greenberg, K. J. The necessity of separating idealized accountability from realized accountability: A case study. 106-133.

Wallace, S., & Morlan, D. B. Implications of student and instructor involvement in the basic course. 134-149.

Smilowitz, M., & Phelps, L. A. The interaction of teacher and student social styles and learning outcomes of the basic communication course. 150-168.

Trank, D. M. Training or teaching: A professional development program for graduate teaching assistants. 169-183.

Weaver, R. L., II, & Cotrell, H. W. Teaching basic courses: Problems and solutions. 184-196.

Volume 2, 1990

Pearson, J. L., & Nelson, P. The future of the basic course. 1-26.

Bourhis, J., & Berquist, C. Communication apprehension in the basic course: Learning styles and preferred instructional strategies of high and low apprehensive students. 27-46.

Yook, E., & Seiler, B. An investigation into the communication needs and concerns of Asian students in basic communication performance courses. 47-75.

Schliessmann, M. R., & Haleta, L. B. The required course and the advanced student: A placement perspective. 76-88.

Haynes, W. L. Beyond writing: The case for a speech-based basic course in a vid-oral world. 89-100.

Troester, R. A communication based model of friendship for the interpersonal communication course. 101-120.

Foster, T. J., Smilowitz, M., Foster, M. S., & Phelps, L. A. Some student perceptions of grades received on speeches. 121-142.

Goulden, N. R. A program of rater training for evaluating public speeches combining accuracy and error approaches. 143-165.

Bendtschneider, L. B., & Trank, D. M. Evaluating the basic course: Using research to meet the communication needs of the students. 166-191.

Buerkel-Rothfuss, N. L., & Kosloski, D. L. The basic course: What do we know? What do we need to know? Where do we go from here? 192-232.

Gibson, J. W., Hanna, M. S., & Leichty, G. The basic speech course at United States colleges and universities: V. 233-257.

Volume 3, 1991

Verderber, R. F. The introductory communication course: The public speaking approach. 3-15.

Pearson, J. C., & West, R. The introductory communication course: The hybrid approach. 16-34.

Brilhart, J. L. Small group communication as an introductory course. 35-50.

Donaghy, W. C. Introductory communication theory: Not another skills course. 51-72.

DeVito, J. A. The interpersonal communication course. 73-87.

Hugenberg, L. W., Owens, A. W., II, & Robinson, D. J. The business and professional speaking course. 88-105.

Trank, D. M., & Lewis, P. The introductory communication course: Results of a national survey. 106-122.

Sandmann, W. Logic and emotion, persuasion and argumentation: "Good reasons" as an educational synthesis. 123-144.

Braithwaite, C. A., & Braithwaite, D. O. Instructional communication strategies for adapting to a multicultural introductory course. 145-160.

Gray, P. L. The R3A3 processing system for experiential learning in the classroom. 161-178.

Sprague, J. Reading our own speech critiques as texts that reveal educational goals, instructional roles and communication functions. 179-201.

Neer, M. R., & Kirchner, W. F. Classroom interventions for reducing public speaking anxiety. 202-223.

Dawson, E. J., & Yoder, D. D. Measurement of communication motivation in public speaking: An exploratory study and scale development based on expectancy theory. 224-246.

Buerkel-Rothfuss, N. L., & Gray, P. L. Models for graduate teaching assistant (GTA) training: The "real," the "necessary," and the "ideal." 247-268.

Hugenberg, L. W., & Yoder, D. D. Summary of the issues discussed during the seminar on the introductory course in speech communication. 269-280.

Volume 4, 1992

Lubbers, C. A., & Gorcyca, D. A. Academic success in the basic course: The influence of apprehension and demographics. 1-15.

Hess, J. A., & Pearson, J. C. Basic public speaking principles: An examination of twelve popular texts. 16-34.

Ford, W. S. Z., & Wolvin, A. D. Evaluation of a basic communication course. 35-47.

Sandmann, W. Critical thinking is/as communication 48-71.

Newburger, C., & Hemphill, M. Video-modeling and pre-performance apprehension: Is ignorance bliss? 72-79.

Weaver, R. L., II, & Cotrell, H. W. Directing the basic communication course: Eighteen years later. 80-93.

Gill, M. M., & Wardrope, W. J. To say or not; to do or not -- those are the questions: Sexual harassment and the basic course instructor. 94-114.

Leff, M. Teaching public speaking as composition. 115-122.

Isserlis, J. A. Be relevant, careful, and appropriate: Scary advice on the use of humor to the novice public speaker. 123-140.

Whitecap, V. A. The introduction of a speech: Do good introductions predict a good speech? 141-153.

Vicker, L. A. The use of role models in teaching public speaking. 154-161.

Volume 5, 1993

Russell, B. W. The effect of computer-generated instructional feedback and videotape on the speaking performance of college students in the basic speech course. 1-26.

Gray, P. L., Murray, M. G., & Buerkel-Rothfuss, N. L. The impact of perceived research and teaching competence on the credibility of a basic course director: A case study. 27-42.

Willer, L. R. Are you a REAL teacher? Student perceptions of the graduate student as instructor of the basic communication course. 43-70.

Buerkel-Rothfuss, N. L., & Fink, D. S. Student perceptions of teaching assistants (TAs). 71-100.

Hess, J. A. Teaching ethics in introductory public speaking: Review and proposal. 101-126.

Beall, M. L. Teaching thinking in the basic course. 127-156.

Murphy, J. M. The ESL oral communication lesson: One teacher's techniques and principles. 157-181.

Rolls, J. A. Experiential learning as an adjunct to the basic course: Student responses to a pedagogical model. 182-199.

Troester, R., & McGukin, D. The status of the introductory and advanced interpersonal communication courses at U.S. colleges and universities: A national survey. 200-220.

Weber, D. R., Buerkel-Rothfuss, N. L., & Gray, P. L. Adopting a transformational approach to basic course leadership. 221-246.

Hugenberg, L. W., & Yoder, D. D. Communication competence: A commentary. 247-260.

Volume 6, 1994

Cronin, M. W., & Kennan, W. R. Using interactive video instruction to enhance public speaking instruction. 1-18.

Cronin, M. W. Interactive video instruction for teaching organizational techniques in public speaking. 19-35.

Jensen, K. K., & McQueeney, P. Writing as a tool for teaching public speaking: A campus application. 36-61.

Hill, L. B., & Ragan, S. L. Literacy enhancement and writing across the curriculum: A motivational addendum. 62-69.

McKinney, B. C., & Pullum, S. J. Obstacles to overcome in the implementation of a program to reduce communication apprehension in the basic public speaking course. 70-86.

Williams, D. E., & Stewart, R. A. An assessment of panel vs. individual instructor ratings of student speeches. 87-104.

Buerkel-Rothfuss, N. L., Fink, D. S., & Amaro, C. A. The incorporation of mentors and assistant basic course directors (ABCDs) into the basic course program: Creating a safety net for new teaching assistants. 105-128.

Gray, P. L., & Murray, M. G. TA mentoring: Issues and questions. 129-159.

Willmington, S. C., Neal, K. E., & Steinbrecher, M. M. Meeting certification requirements for teacher certification through the basic course. 160-182.

Sandmann, W. The basic course in communication theory: A shift in emphasis. 183-206.

Cooper, P. Stories as instructional strategy: Teaching in another culture. 207-216.

Ayres, J., & Ayres, D. M. The role of performance visualization in the basic public speaking course: Current applications and future possibilities. 217-227.

Newburger, C., Brannon, L., & Daniels, A. Self-confrontation and public speaking apprehension: To videotape of not to videotape student speakers? 228-236.

Santoro, G. M., & Phillips, G. M. Computer-mediated communication in the basic communication course. 237-248.

Volume 7, 1995

Wood, J. T. Gerald M. Phillips' devotion to basic communication skills. 1-14.

Treadwell, D., & Applbaum, R. L. The basic course in organizational communication: A national survey. 15-35.

Mino, M., & Butler, M. N. Improving oral communication competency: An interactive approach to basic public speaking instruction. 36-58.

Williams, G. TA training beyond the first week: A leadership perspective. 59-82.

Yoder, D. D., & Wallace, S. P. Context vs. process: Revising the structure of the basic course. 83-99.

Dwyer, K. K. Creating and teaching special sections of a public speaking course for apprehensive students: A multicase study. 100-124.

Morreale, S. P., Hackman, M. Z., & Neer, M. R. Predictors of behavioral competence and self-esteem: A study assessing impact in a basic public speaking course. 125-141.

Volume 8, 1996

Kramer, M. W., & Hinton, J. S. The differential impact of a basic public speaking course on perceived communication competencies in class, work, and social contexts. 1-25.

Williams, G. [En]visioning success: The anatomy and functions of vision in the basic course. 26-57.

Whaley, B. B., & Langlois, A. Students who stutter and the basic course: Attitudes and communication strategies for the college classroom. 58-73.

Spano, S. Rethinking the role of theory in the basic course: Taking a "practical" approach to communication education. 74-96.

Hickson, M., III. Rethinking our rethinking retrospectively: A rejoinder to Spano. 97-107.

Wood, J. Should class participation be required in the basic communication course? 108-124.

Handford, C. J. The basic course: A means of protecting the speech communication discipline. 125-135.

Hugenberg, L. W. Introduction to cultural diversity in the basic course: Differing points of view. 136-144.

Goulden, N. R. Teaching communication behaviors/skills related to cultural diversity in the basic course classroom. 145-161.

Oludaja, B., & Honken, C. Cultural pluralism: Language proficiency in the basic course. 162-174.

Kelly, C. Diversity in the public speaking course: Beyond audience analysis. 175-184.

Sellnow, D. D., & Littlefield, R. S. The speech on diversity: A tool to integrate cultural diversity into the basic course. 185-196.

Powell, K. A. Meeting the challenges of cultural diversity: Ideas and issues for the public speaking course. 197-201.

Volume 9, 1997

Osborn, M. Three metaphors for the competencies acquired in the public speaking class. 1-11.

Yoder, D. D., & Davilla, R. A. Perceptions of basic communication texts: Factors in student learning and textbook adoption decisions. 12-36.

Jensen, K. K., & Lamoureux, E. R. Written feedback in the basic course: What instructors provide and what students deem helpful. 37-58.

Yook, E. L. Culture shock in the basic communication course: A cast study of Malaysian students. 59-78.

Heaton, D. W. The em-powter-ing of America: Using info-mercials to teach persuasion and popular discourse in the basic communication course. 79-93.

Miller, J. J. The use of simulation in the beginning public speaking classroom: Let's make it realistic, relevant and motivating. 94-104.

Kasch, C. R. Computer-mediated learning environments: Theory and research into practice. 105-129.

Williams, G. Two heads are better than one? Setting realizable goals in the basic course. 130-159.

Hugenberg, L. W., & Moyer, B. S. A commentary: the basic communication course, general education and assessment. 160-179.

Volume 10, 1998

Wolvin, A. D. The basic course and the future of the workplace. 1-6.

Morreale, S. P., Hackman, M. Z., & Neer, M. R. Predictors of self-perceptions of behavioral competence, self-esteem, and willingness to communicate: A study assessing impact in a basic interpersonal communication course. 7-26.

Lubbers, C. A., & Seiler, W. J. Learning style preferences and academic achievement within the basic communication course. 27-57.

Quigley, B. L., Hendrix, K. G., & Freisem, K. Graduate teaching assistant training: Preparing instructors to assist ESL students in the introductory public speaking course. 58-89.

Schaller, K. A., & Callison, M. G. Applying multiple intelligence theory to the basic public speaking course. 90-104.

Spano, S. Delineating the uses of practical theory: A reply to Hickson. 105-124.

Hickson, M., III. Theory and pedagogy in the basic course: A summary from Spano and Hickson. 125-132.

Jensen, K. K., & Williams, D. E. Teaching the honors public speaking course. 133-156.

Hugenberg, L. W., & Moyer, B. S. Commentary: The research foundation for instruction in the beginning public speaking class. 157-170.

Volume 11, 1999

Morreale, S. P., Hanna, M. S., Berko, R. M., & Gibson, J. W. The basic communication course at U.S. colleges and universities: VI. 1-36.

Buerkel-Rothfuss, N. L. How basic course directors evaluate teaching assistants: Social constructionism in basic course land. 37-54.

Williams, G., & Johnson-Jones, J. M. Get your modem runnin'. Get out on the I-way: Encouraging Internet investigations in the basic course. 55-78.

Mino, M. Will the dazzling promise blind us?: Using technology in the beginning public speaking course. 79-107.

Dwyer, K. K., & Fus, D. A. Communication apprehension, self-efficacy and grades in the basic course: Correlations and implications. 108-132.

Cutspec, P. A., McPherson, K., & Spiro, J. H. Branching out to meet the needs of our students: A model for oral communication assessment and curriculum programs. 133-163.

Schnell, J. Analyzing C-SPAN in the basic communication course. 164-174.

Yoder, D. D. An idea for restructuring the basic communication course: A "time when needed" modular approach. 175-184.

Volume 12, 2000

Titsworth, B. Scott. The effects of praise on student motivation in the basic communication course.

Sellnow, Deanna D. & Golish, Tamara. The relationship between a required self-disclosure speech and public speaking anxiety: Considering gender equity.

Huffman, Karla J., Carson, Christy L. & Simonds, Cheri J. Critical thinking assessment: The link between critical thinking and student application in the basic course.

Gring, Mark A. & Littlejohn, Jera W. Assessment of the repeated speech performance as a pedagogical tool: A pilot study.

Heisler, Jennifer M., Bissett, Susan M. & Buerkel-Rothfuss, Nancy L. An examination of male and female students' perceptions of relational closeness: Does the basic course have an influence?

Hendrix, Katherine G. Peer mentoring for graduate teaching assistants: Training and utilizing a valuable resource.

Worley, David W. An acrostic approach to teaching public speaking in the hybrid communication course.

Volume 13, 2001

Hunt, Stephen K., Daradirek Ekachai, Darin L. Garaard, & Joseph H. Rust. Students' perceived usefulness and relevance of communication skills in the basic course: Comparing university and community college students.

Cox, Stephen A. & Timothy S. Todd. Contrasting the relationships between teacher immediacy, teacher credibility, and student motivation in self-contained and mass lecture classes.

Treinen, Kristen & John T. Warren. Antiracist pedagogy in the basic course; teaching cultural communication as if whitness matters.

Hess, Jon A. Rethinking our approach to the basic course: Making ethics the foundation of introduction to public speaking.

Schwartzman, Roy. What's basic about the basic course? Enriching the ethosystem as a corrective for consumerism.

Dixson, Marcia D. Teaching social construction of reality in the basic course: Opening minds and integrating contexts.

Arnett, Ronald C., & Janie M. Harden Fritz. Communication and professional civility as a basic service course: dialogic Praxis between department and situated in an academic home.

AUTHOR INDEX
BASIC COMMUNICATION COURSE ANNUAL
VOLUMES 1-13

Amaro, Charlotte A. *1994*
Applbaum, Ronald L. *1995*
Arnett, Ronald C., *2001*
Ayres, Debbie M. *1994*
Ayres, Joe. *1994*
Beall, Melissa L. *1993*
Bendtschneider, Lyn B. *1990*
Berko, Roy M. *1998*
Berquist, Charlene. *1990*
Bissett, Susan *2000*
Bourhis, John. *1990*
Braithwaite, Charles A. *1991*
Braithwaite, Dawn O. *1991*
Brannon, Linda. *1994*
Brilhart, John L. *1991*
Buerkel-Rothfuss, Nancy L. *1989, 1990, 1991, 1993, 1993, 1993, 1994, 1999, 2000*
Butler, Marilynn N. *1995*
Callison, Marybeth G. *1998*
Carson, Christy L. *2000*
Cooper, Pamela. *1994*
Cotrell, Howard W. *1989, 1992*
Cox, Tephen A., *2001*
Cronin, Michael W. *1994, 1994*
Cutspec, Patricia A. *1999*
Daniel, Arlie. *1994*
Davilla, Roberta A. *1997*
Dawson, Edwin J. *1991*
DeVito, Joseph A. *1991*
Dixson, Marcia D., *2001*
Donaghy, William C. *1991*
Dwyer, Karen Kangas. *1995, 1999*
Ekachai, Daradirek, *2001*
Fink, Donn S. *1993, 1994*
Ford, Wendy S. Zabava. *1992*
Foster, Marilyn S. *1990*
Foster, Ted J. *1990*
Freisem, Karen. *1998*
Fritz, Janie M. Harden, *2001*
Fus, Dennis A. *1999*
Garrard, Darin L., *2001*
Gibson, James W. *1990, 1997*
Gill, Mary M. *1992*
Golish, Tamara *2000*
Gorcyca, Diane Atkinson. *1992*

Goulden, Nancy Rost. *1990, 1995*
Gray, Pamela L. *1989, 1989, 1991, 1991, 1993, 1993, 1994*
Greenberg, Karen J. *1989*
Gring, Mark A. *2000*
Hackman, Michael Z. *1995, 1997*
Haleta, Laurie B. *1990*
Handford, Charlene J. *1996*
Hanna, Michael S. *1990, 1999*
Haskins, William A. *1989*
Haynes, W. Lance. *1990*
Heaton, Daniel W. *1997*
Heisler, Jennifer M. *2000*
Hemphill, Michael. *1992*
Hendrix, Katherine G. *1998, 2000*
Hess, Jon A. *1992, 1993, 2001*
Hickson, III, Mark. *1996, 1997*
Hill, L. Brooks. *1994*
Hinton, J. S. *1996*
Honken, Connie. *1996*
Huffman, Karla J. *2000*
Hugenberg, Lawrence W. *1991, 1991, 1993, 1996, 1997, 1998*
Hunt, Stephen K., *2001*
Isserlis, Judythe A. *1992*
Jensen, Karla Kay. *1994, 1997, 1998*
Johnson-Jones, Joni M. *1999*
Kasch, Chris R. *1997*
Kennan, William R. *1994*
Kelly, Christine. *1996*
Kirchner, W. Faye. *1991*
Kosloski, David L. *1990*
Kramer, Michael W. *1995*
Lamoureux, Elizabeth R. *1997*
Langlois, Aimee. *1996*
Leff, Michael. *1992*
Leichty, Greg. *1990*
Lewis, Pat. *1991*
Littlefield, Robert S. *1996*
Littlejohn, Jera W. *2000*
Lubbers, Charles A. *1992, 1997*
McGukin, Drew. *1989, 1993*
McKinney, Bruce C. *1994*
McPherson, Kevin. *1999*
McQueeney, Pat. *1994*
Miller, John J. *1997*
Mino, Mary. *1995, 1999*
Morlan, Don B. *1989*
Morreale, Sherwyn P. *1995, 1997, 1999*
Moyer, Barbara S. *1997, 1998*
Murphy, John M. *1993*
Murray, Martin G. *1993, 1994*
Neal, Kay E. *1994*
Neer, Michael R. *1991, 1995, 1997*
Nelson, Paul. *1990*
Newburger, Craig. *1992, 1994*
Oludaja, Bayo. *1996*
Osborn, Michael. *1997*
Owens, Alfred W., II. *1991*
Pearson, Judy C. *1990, 1991, 1992*
Phelps, Lynn A. *1989, 1989, 1990*
Phillips, Gerald M. *1994*
Powell, Kimberly A. *1996*
Pullum, Stephen J. *1994*
Quigley, Brooke L. *1998*
Ragan, Sandra L. *1994*
Robinson, David J. *1991*
Rolls, Judith A. *1993*
Russell, Bruce W. *1993*
Rust, Joseph H., *2001*

Sandmann, Warren. *1991, 1992, 1994*
Santoro, Gerald M. *1994*
Schaller, Kristi A. *1998*
Schliessmann, Michael R. *1990*
Schnell, Jim. *1999*
Schwartzman, Roy, *2001*
Seiler, William J. (Bill). *1989, 1990, 1997*
Sellnow, Deanna D. *1996, 2000*
Simonds, Cheri, *2000*
Smilowitz, Michael. *1989, 1990*
Smitter, Roger, D. *1989*
Spano, Shawn. *1996, 1997*
Spiro, Julie H. *1999*
Sprague, Jo. *1991*
Steinbrecher, Milda M. *1994*
Stewart, Robert A. *1994*
Thomas, Richard W. *1989*
Titsworth, B. Scott, *2000*
Timothy s. Todd, *2001*
Trank, Douglas, M. *1989, 1990, 1991*
Treadwell, D. *1995*
Treinen, Kristen P., *2001*
Troester, Rod. *1990, 1993*
Verderber, Rudolph, F. *1991*
Vicker, Lauren A. *1992*
Wallace, Sam. *1989, 1995*
Wardrope, William J. *1992*
Warren, John T., *2001*
Weaver, Richard. L., II. *1989, 1992*
Weber, Dawn R. *1993*
West, Richard. *1991*
Whaley, Bryan B. *1996*
Whitecap, Valerie A. *1992*
Willer, Lynda R. *1993*
Williams, David E. *1994, 1998*
Williams, Glen. *1995, 1996, 1997, 1999*
Willmington, S. Clay. *1994*
Wood, Jennifer. *1996*
Wood, Julia T. *1995*
Wolvin, Andrew D. *1992, 1998*
Worley, David W. *2000*
Yoder, Donald, D. *1991, 1991, 1993, 1995, 1997, 1999*
Yook, Eunkyong Lee (Esther). *1990, 1997*

Submission Guidelines

The Basic Course Commission invites submissions to be considered for publication in the *Basic Communication Course Annual.* The *Annual* publishes the best scholarship available on topics related to the basic course and is distributed nationally to scholars and educators interested in the basic communication course. Each article is also indexed in its entirety in the ERIC database.

Manuscripts published in the *Annual* are not restricted to any particular methodology or approach. They must, however, address issues that are significant to the basic course. Articles in the *Annual* may focus on the basic course in traditional or non-traditional settings. The *Annual* uses a blind reviewing process. Three members of the Editorial Board read and review each manuscript. However, manuscripts without a focus on the basic course should be submitted to other journals. The Editor will reject a manuscript without review if it is clearly outside the scope of the basic course.

Manuscripts submitted to the *Annual* must conform to the *Publication Manual of the American Psychological Association, 5th edition* (1994). Submitted manuscripts should be typed and double-spaced. They should not exceed 30 pages, exclusive of tables and references, nor be under consideration by any other publishing outlet at the time of submission. By submitting to the

Annual, authors maintain that they will not submit their manuscript to another outlet without first withdrawing it from consideration for the *Annual*. Each submission must be accompanied by an abstract of less than 200 words and a 50-75-word author identification paragraph on each author. A separate title page should include (1) the title and identification of the author(s), (2) the address, telephone number, and email address of the contact person, and (3) data pertinent to the manuscript's history. All references to the author(s) and institutional affiliation should be removed from the text of the manuscript. Send four (4) copies of your submission materials to:

Deanna D. Sellnow, Editor
Basic Communication Course Annual
Department of Communication
North Dakota State University
Box 5075, University Station
Fargo, ND 58105

If you have any questions about the *Annual* or your submission, contact the Editor:
telephone at (701) 231-8221
email at <deanna.sellnow@ndsu.nodak.edu>.

All complete submissions must be received by MARCH 1, 2002 to be considered for publication in the next *Basic Communication Course Annual*. Submissions received after that date will be considered for subsequent issues.