2016

The Unaware, Accurate, and Overly Critical: Video Technology Use of Improving Public Speaking Competency

Luke LeFebvre
Iowa State University

Leah E. LeFebvre
University of Wyoming

Mike Allen
University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee

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

The Unaware, Accurate, and Overly Critical: Video Technology Use for Improving Public Speaking Competency

Luke LeFebvre
Iowa State University

Leah E. LeFebvre
University of Wyoming

Mike Allen
University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee

Approximately 1.3 million college students across the United States enroll in the basic communication course yearly (Beebe, 2013). The purpose of the basic course, which predominately focuses on public speaking (see Morreale, Worley, & Hugenberg, 2010), provides opportunities for students to develop public speaking skills. Public speaking constitutes the foundational course of the undergraduate curriculum in most speech and communication departments (Lucas, 1999; Morreale, Hanna, Berko, & Gibson, 1999). The basic course introduces students to communication skills, such as speaking, listening, and critiquing presentations (Morreale, Hugenberg, & Worley, 2006). Basic course fundamentals usually involve three or four speeches (Morreale et al., 2010). Verderber (1991) indicated that the informative and persuasive speeches represent the most commonly integrated assignments into the course curriculum, and represent an integral part of the basic communication course design. The basic course typically

requires students to present speeches and then later reflect on the quality of their presentations.

Yet, basic communication educators do not know how public speaking competency changes as students become exposed to and taught recognition skills for interpreting the video replay of the presentations (Kruger & Dunning, 1999). To date there are few studies (see Quigley & Nyquist, 1992; Hinton & Kramer, 1998) that sought to understand how to most effectively utilize video technology to enhance students' speechmaking skills. Currently, directors of the basic course in communication report that video is inconsistently utilized and self-evaluation varies for student self-assessment (e.g., LeFebvre, 2015b). This study takes a larger step to examine the use of video technology in the basic course.

When speakers lack sufficient recognition skills, they are not able to determine the quality of the speech or identify strengths or areas for improvement. Often the majority of students begin this course harboring inflated perceptions about their ability to speak in public competently (Falchikov & Boud, 1989). Thus, a critical component of the speechmaking process occurs prior to speaking when students first identify goals about how well they believe they will perform in relation to the instructional grading criteria (LeFebvre, 2013). Then after speaking, students are typically required to use video to self-evaluate one or more of the speeches and generate feedback about their presentation. Video replay of the speeches enables students to evaluate and estimate the quality and effectiveness of their speaking skills, and then ideally to adapt their goals and skills for subsequent speeches. A meta-analysis establishes the advantage of using videotapes to improve public speaking

instruction (Bourhis & Allen 1998). This study seeks to determine whether students' skill acquisition accuracy standardizes to match the perception of the instructor. The examination of information and communication technology, in the form of video, has been neglected with regard to determining its effectiveness on subsequent speech performances and continued use for skill improvement throughout the basic communication course. The present study is a starting point to build a more consistent framework with empirical support for using video self-evaluation and goal-setting applications to help students enhance their speechmaking skills.

Furthermore, there exists limited scholarship (LeFebvre, LeFebvre, Blackburn, & Boyd, 2015; Sorenson & Pickett, 1986) that has examined the differentiation of students' skill sets. Earlier research indicated the existence of different types of estimators, or levels of student perception of their own speechmaking. To understand more about how public speaking students self-evaluate their speaking abilities, the current study examined students' estimates of their speech presentations as depicted by estimation types (e.g., over-, accurate-, and under-estimators; see LeFebvre et al., 2015). Therefore, in two studies we explore how recognition skills vary across estimator types and how students' estimation categories relate to the instructors' evaluation of the speech. Once these estimation categories were identified we examined student goal-setting prior to the speaking occasion as a baseline for skill recognition and the potential impact of video technology on student skill acquisition in the basic communication course.

PUBLIC SPEAKING COMPETENCY

In the basic course: speechmaking becomes the *demonstration* of competency. A competency is "a combination of skills, abilities, and knowledge needed to perform a specific task" (U.S. Department of Education, 2001, p. 1). Video self-evaluation allows for *recognition* of competency, and the agreement between instructor evaluation and student self-evaluation becomes the *test* of competency. For students, novice speakers appear particularly susceptible to overestimating speaking abilities; therefore, the basic course introduces instruction in communication skills and knowledge that can help them improve interpretive skill assessment (Morreale et al., 2010).

Speaker Goals

The speech enables performance-based learning and video provides an opportunity for accurate performance analysis of the goals. A *goal* is an objective, aim, purpose, or intention (Locke & Latham, 1990) that an individual is trying to accomplish (Locke, Shaw, Saari, & Latham, 1981). Human behavior is directed by goals toward a desired outcome (Berger, 1997; Dillard, 1990; Locke et al., 1981; Wilson, 2002). An outcome differs from a performance. To explain, a performance is the execution of an action toward a desired outcome. In an academic setting, letter grades of *A*, *B*, *C*, *D*, and *F* are considered goals that surround standards of achievement for students (Bandura, 1989). For example, students striving to achieve an *A* on a particular speech set expectations for their grades, or a *grade goal* (Wood & Locke, 1987). These grade goals serve as a standard for

a student's level of competency for a given assignment or the overall course. Due to the nature of the basic course, where students learn the principles and acquire skills incrementally, grade goals aid students in anticipating and adapting speaking behaviors to achieve a desired outcome. By having students set grade goals, they learn how to respond to goal achievement and failure (see Boekaerts, Pintrich, & Zeider, 2000; Schutz & Davis, 2000). This process allows for student self-judgment about how their own skill sets relate to the outcome of the speech and adjustment of goals based on instructional grades and feedback.

A frequent method of goal setting utilizes *selected self-set goals* (LeFebvre, 2013; Mone & Baker, 1992). The selected self-set goals process requires students to identify the desired grade goal from the standards of achievement articulated on a rubric. Students must select the grade goal based on the specificity and difficulty described in the rubric of assessment. These goals are stated prior to attempting the speech (a test of their level of competency).

Sequentially, after determining selected self-set goals, *anticipatory* goals assist in regulating behavior through foresight (Bandura, 1986; Rubin, 1990). Anticipatory goals require students to determine how they will achieve their grade goals because goals driven by anticipatory intentions necessitate an individual to determine plans for attaining those goals. As Bandura (1986) attested "one can gain access indirectly to people's [anticipatory goals] by having them report beforehand what they intend to do" (p. 468). Thus, the following hypothesis is proposed:

    H[1]: Students will become more accurate in the prediction of their performance (anticipatory goals) from the first (informative) to the second (persuasive) speech.

Video Technology

Although video technology originated in the 1950s, its use in the basic communication course is still not consistently utilized for aiding enrolled students (LeFebvre, 2015b)[1]. Advances in information and communication technology have made the use of video technology relatively low cost, accessible, and easily portable to augment and improve feedback (Li, 2015). The information captured by video has the potential to influence the perceptions (distorted or accurate) speakers have about their speech and about themselves. Video provides an accurate rendering of the speech because both visual and aural information are documented in the collation of images. These video speech records allow for a detailed description and representation of the speaker and speechmaking. Both verbal and nonverbal communication captured by the camera lens allows speakers an opportunity to assess their speechmaking as the audience did during the speech. This method of assessment is *video self-evaluation*.

---

[1] In a recent national survey of the 121 basic course directors in the U.S. only 40 (33.1%) programs used video replay for public speaking self-evaluation (LeFebvre, 2015b). Results of the 40 basic courses that used video: six courses implement unstructured video replay (no self-evaluation), 30 courses use a self-evaluation for a single speech with video replay, and four courses use a self-evaluation for multiple speeches with video replay. No basic courses had identical questions for student self-evaluation forms.

Video self-evaluation is a process of formative assessment during which students analyze the speech's quality, compare the degree to which their speechmaking reflects the evaluation standards, and formulate actions for the future speaking occasions (Andrade & Valcheva, 2009; Palao, Hastie, Cruz, & Ortega, 2015; Levasseur, Dean, & Pfaff, 2004). Evaluating one's speech by way of video provides the potential as a tool to minimize and/or eliminate discrepancies between self and audience perceptions of behavior. The data provided by a video challenges and potentially changes the perceptual distortions related to one's own speechmaking. In short, video concurrently portrays the nuances and complexities of the speaker as well as the speech from the point of view of the audience, something nearly impossible to provide to speakers in any other manner.

Once the speech has been captured on video the student reviews the material after class. *Self-generated feedback* allows students to evaluate themselves and serve as their own source of feedback (Ilgen, Fisher, & Taylor, 1979). Feedback through the process of evaluation plays an important role in the development of oneself (Edwards, 1990). Self-evaluation places the student at the center of the learning experience (Harlin, 2014; Kusnic & Finley, 1993). Video allows individuals the opportunity to evaluate their speaking in a way that is intentional and reflective. Video self-evaluation asks students to think not only about what they have learned about speaking but about themselves as speakers (Kusnic & Finley, 1993). Students improve speaking skills when able to accurately perceive their own level of competency (Zabava Ford, Wolvin, & Chung, 2000). Thus, the following hypothesis is proposed:

H$_2$: Students will improve their ability to analyze how well the speech presentation went by reviewing the video replay.

Self-estimators

Individuals' perception of their communicative competency tends to vary from person to person; however, previous literature finds the majority of people hold mistakenly high estimations about their level of competency (Powers, Flint, & Breindel, 1988). Prior research has also demonstrated minimal convergence of self-perceptions and others' perceptions of communication competence (Sypher & Sypher, 1984). A necessity of competent public speakers is that these individuals understand the goals held by particular audiences and how audiences will view (in)appropriate, (un)desirable, or obligatory communicative behaviors within a specific context (Wilson & Sabee, 2003). In order to improve a speaker's ability to adapt to the audience and then effectively demonstrate verbal and nonverbal behaviors the speaker must possess: (a) speaking skills and (b) recognition of competent speaking skills.

Self-perceptions are an integration of sensory impressions formed from past experiences. Without the ability to recognize and identify competent forms of communication it is difficult to enact these skills. Essentially, poor speakers are significantly worse at distinguishing between competent and incompetent communication (Dunning, 2005). This lack of expertise by novice speakers forms discrepancies between perceptions of what actually occurred and what the speaker believes occurred during the speeches, which are called *feedback standard gaps* (Kluger & DeNisi, 1996). In order to

minimize inaccurate estimations of speech quality the speaker must become aware of his or her level of competency. This explanation is supported by the number of times speakers have been unsettled when observing their communication via video replay (Carrell & Willmington, 1996). The assumption is public speaking courses commonly require students to review performance videos as a means to improve the level of speaking competency, and thus simultaneously, increase speakers' skill for speaking.

In a recent study (LeFebvre et al., 2015) researchers categorized self-estimators into three categories: under-, accurate-, and over-estimators. *Under-estimators* underrate, or downplay, the estimate of speaking competency that reflects a more critical or negative evaluation of their work relative to that of the instructor. Other studies examining skill acquisition found that top performers consistently underestimate how superior or distinctive their performances are relative to their peers (Hodges, Regehr, & Martin, 2001).

Accuracy is defined as the degree of agreement between self- and course instructor. *Accurate-estimators* perceive their speaking competency similar to an instructor (Yammarino & Atwater, 1993). According to LeFebvre and colleagues (2015) student self-evaluation grades for accurate-estimators were nearly identical to that of the instructor grade for the speech. Accurate self-assessments allow students to become more autonomous learners, taking responsibility for gaining and improving both knowledge and skill (Dochy, Segers, & Sluijsmans, 1999).

The majority of people's self-perceptions are often flawed and overrated (Dunning, Heath, & Suls, 2004),

usually due to the failure to recognize poor performance. Perhaps the best example of this tendency is the "above-average effect" or the proclivity for individuals who are average or below to believe they are above average (Dunning, Griffin, Milojkovic, & Ross, 1990; Dunning, Meyerowitz, & Holzberg, 1989). As a result of the inability to accurately assess skills students overestimate performance. *Overestimators* inflate the estimation of their speaking competency when compared to an instructor's grades. When placed on a scale, overestimators form different groupings: *slight*, *moderate*, and *severe*. Slight overestimators narrowly inflate the estimation of their speaking competency. Moderate overestimators avoid the extremes when overvaluing the estimation of their speaking competency. Severe overestimators drastically exaggerate the estimation of their speaking competency. Lastly, the following hypothesis is proposed:

> H_3: Self-estimation accuracy for each estimation category will improve from the first (informative) to the second (persuasive) speech.

STUDY 1

Method

Participants. This study involved undergraduate students (majority freshmen) enrolled in a required public speaking class at a large Southwestern community college. Participants ($N = 102$; 54% female) were: Caucasian 57 (56%), Hispanic 21 (20%), African-American 14 (14%), Asian 5 (5%), and other 5 (5%). Ages ranged from 18 to 41 ($M = 19.77$, $SD = 2.94$).

Procedures. One researcher instructed all the students in this study. Students signed consent forms at the beginning of the course. The study received approval from the college's Institutional Review Board and students unwilling to participate had the opportunity to opt out of the study. Students were aware that their goal-setting exercises, self-evaluation forms, and speech grades, completed as part of the course curriculum, would be analyzed for research purposes only and remain confidential but were unaware of how the data would be analyzed.[2]

As part of the curriculum, students were required to present two speeches in the following order: (1) informative and (2) persuasive (each worth the same amount of points).[3] Sequentially, students first set the goal for the speech in a goal setting assignment. Unfortunately, not all assignments (164 student assignments) were saved. After cleaning the data for incomplete assignments, 102 students' assignments were retained for each of the speeches.

Goal setting assignment. Students completed a goal setting exercise prior to the informative and persuasive speeches (i.e., anticipatory goals). The assignment instructions read:

---

[2] Please contact the first author for copies of any of the assignments.

[3] Rubrics consist of four components: (a) task description, (b) scale, (c) dimensions, and (d) dimension descriptions (Stevens & Levi, 2005). The rubric provides students with detailed descriptions of levels of achievement or what constitutes acceptable and unacceptable levels of performance. This study's rubrics (see Schreiber, Paul, & Shibley, 2012) utilized for the basic communication course communicate to students the standards of achievement for the informative and persuasive speeches (LeFebvre, 2015a).

> "Identify the points you intend to achieve on your informative speech. Use the rubric to guide you as you identify your goal for each criterion to identify the level of achievement you wish to accomplish for the informative speech, and then total the points for each criterion for your overall grade goal."

Students were required to submit their goal setting assignment one week prior to presenting their first (informative) speech. Their informative speech was video recorded and videos were instantly available through the course management site upon the completion of their speech. Next, students completed a self-evaluation following the presentation from the video recordings before the assignment deadline (one week later).

Video self-evaluation. The self-evaluation form was available via the course management system for all students on the first day of the semester. The assignment instructions read:

> "When answering each question be specific and detailed, using examples from your presentation. A minimum of five to seven sentences is required for each area. Upon completion print the form, sign and date it, and deliver it to your instructor. Also, email a copy of the form as directed above."

As part of course credit, students answered three open-ended questions and two closed-ended questions regarding their speech. The first question (i.e., "What was the best thing(s) you saw yourself do during your presentation?") was used to assess what students valued as the best part of the speech in regards to their delivery and structural development. Next, to evaluate themselves students examined the various areas of the speaking rubric (i.e., introduction, delivery, organiza-

tion, contextual factors, conclusion, etc.) as it related to their speech (i.e., "What did you see that you would like to change or do differently?"). Finally, to assess the students' future goals, students described the strategies by which they intended to adjust the speaking method(s) in order to achieve greater success in the future (i.e., "How do you plan to adapt your goals to be more effective as a speaker for the next presentation?"). The subsequent close-ended questions asked about video viewing frequency and students' perception of their speechmaking (i.e., "How many times did you watch your presentation in its entirety?" and "What grade do you think you earned on your presentation?"). The former question had answers ranging between 0 and 10+ video recording views.

Upon handing in their video self-generated feedback, students received their instructor's grade within one week following the speech. Four weeks later, this same process was replicated for the second (persuasive) speech.

Estimation types. Based upon responses to the question (e.g., What grade do you think you earned on your presentation?), we established students' perceptions of their perceived level of speaking competency. There were 12 possible letter grade options ranging from A to F including plus (+) and minus (–) qualifiers (see LeFebvre et al., 2015). See Table 1 for grade distribution of informative and persuasive speeches. We calculated students' estimated and earned grades for composite scores using LeFebvre et al.'s estimator codes (e.g. under-, accurate-, and over-estimators). We then made a slight modification to the coding scheme. Previously LeFebvre et al. allowed for a two-grade margin for

slight variations in grade, which we applied to all three estimators; however, over-estimators (which were the majority of codes) had a large range of variation (ranging from –2 to –11). Therefore, we decided to modify the original coding scheme and include three new overestimation codes (e.g., slight, moderate, severe) to more accurately assess and test their differences.

Table 1
Study 1: Student Grade Distribution

Informative Speech

A	A–	B+	B	B–	C+	C	C–	D+	D	D–	F	Total
3	1	7	7	9	7	6	9	9	11	4	29	102

Persuasive Speech

A	A–	B+	B	B–	C+	C	C–	D+	D	D–	F	Total
16	10	5	8	7	8	6	10	3	10	5	12	102

Informative speech. The estimated and earned grades were originally based on letter grades that were converted to dummy-coded categories (e.g., A = 1, A- = 2…F = 12). Composite scores were calculated by assessing the difference between each student's estimated grade (M = 81.39, SD = 6.63) minus earned grade (M = 52.01, SD = 10.37). Composite scores were then grouped to reflect the accuracy of students' self-evaluations in terms of under-, accurate-, and slight, moderate, and severe over-estimators. *Underestimators* (n = 3) had positive composite scores (e.g., +2 or more). *Accurate estimators* (n = 27) are those whose composite scores fell between –1 and +1. *Slight overestimators* (n = 35) had

negative composite scores (e.g., –2 or -4). *Moderate overestimators* (*n* = 25) had negative composite scores (e.g., –5 or –7). *Severe overestimators* (*n* = 12) had negative composite scores (e.g., -8 or -11).

Persuasive speech. Again, composite scores were calculated by assessing the difference between each student's estimated grade (*M* = 81.98, *SD* = 7.11) minus earned grade (*M* = 58.25, *SD* = 10.59). *Underestimators* (*n* = 19) had positive composite scores (e.g., +2 or more). *Accurate estimators* (*n* = 29) are those whose composite scores fell between –1 and +1. *Slight overestimators* (*n* = 29) had negative composite scores (e.g., –2 to –4). *Moderate overestimators* (*n* = 19) had negative composite scores (e.g., –5 to –7). *Severe overestimators* (*n* = 6) had negative composite scores (e.g., -8 to -11).

Results

Hypothesis 1. The discrepancy score between predicted and actual grade score for the first (informative) speech (Δ = -3.42) is significantly greater, *t*(101) = 4.66, *p* < .05 than the discrepancy for the second (persuasive) speech (Δ = -1.75). Results demonstrate that students significantly became more accurate in the prediction of their performance from the first to the second speech. The level of difference between the expected and actual grade, while still negative (the person predicts a higher grade than the one actually earned), diminishes significantly.

Hypothesis 2. Accuracy of prediction improved by viewing of the video recording of the speech was partially supported, the viewing of the first (informative) speech significantly correlated with the first (informative) speech grade earned, *r* = .28, *p* > .05, and this was

true for the second (persuasive) speech, $r = .38$, $p < .05$. This indicates that students start to learn based on the video how well they are doing.

Comparing the correlations from the informative and persuasive speech indicates that the correlation significantly improves from the first to the second speech, $z = 2.22$, $p < .05$. This indicates that the students improve their ability to analyze how well the speech presentation went by reviewing the video replay.

Hypothesis 3. For the first (informative) speech, a one-way ANOVA demonstrates significant differences among the estimate types (means) based on level of estimation: underestimator (68.00), accurate estimator (60.79), slight overestimator (54.00), moderate overestimator (44.08), severe overestimator (38.42), $F(4, 97) = 41.35$, $p < .05$. The linear trend suggested was significant, $r = .76$, $p < .05$, indicating that the higher the grade, the more accurate the estimate of the person about performance.

For the second (persuasive) speech, a one-way ANOVA demonstrates significant differences among the estimate types (means) based on level of estimation: underestimator (69.79), accurate estimator (63.79), slight overestimator (55.00), moderate overestimator (47.47), severe overestimator (43.83), $F(4, 97) = 42.75$, $p < .05$.

The linear trend suggested was significant, $r = .79$, $p < .05$. Results indicate that generally the level of estimation when comparing the estimated grade to actual grade improved.

Discussion

In short, Study 1 revealed that student predicted scores improved between the informative (first) and per-

suasive (second) speeches. Additionally, number of viewings was somewhat associated with improved accuracy of video self-evaluation. Study 1 showed that students improved on accuracy of estimation, which indicated that students overestimation of their speechmaking becomes less drastic—minimizing the feedback standard gap.

Building on existing literature and the findings of Study 1, we designed a second study to combat the limitations in Study 1. The initial study was limited to one instructor at a large community college; the additional study (e.g., Study 2) expands the original study to examine how these findings could be generalizable across a multiple-section public speaking course, other levels of students (e.g., freshmen to seniors), multiple instructors, varying demographics (e.g., domestic and international students), and at a different university (e.g., large Southwestern community college to four-year Midwestern university). Additionally, another limitation of Study 1 was the sample size ($N = 102$); although, the sample was appropriate, the overall participation in the Study 1 was limited. In order to draw more generalizable conclusions, sampling a larger pool of participants with more diverse demographics helped to generalize the findings to a broader public speaking student population as demonstrated in Study 2.

STUDY 2

Method

Participants. A new sample was collected for Study 2. This study involved undergraduate students (majority sophomore and junior students) enrolled in a re-

quired public speaking course at a large Midwest university. Participants ($N = 828$; 38% female) identified themselves as US Citizen 776 (93.7%) or International 52 (6.3%); Domestic students were classified as: Caucasian 617 (80%), Hispanic 44 (6%), African-American 31 (4%), Asian 25 (3%), two or more races 31 (4%), and other 28 (4%). Ages ranged from 18 to 59 ($M = 21.2$, $SD = 2.77$).

Procedures. Eleven graduate teaching assistants (GTA) oversaw the laboratory sections of the course, which consisted of a total of 32 course sections. GTA received an intense 30-hour weeklong orientation; in addition, first-year GTA were paired with a second-year GTA during student speeches in an effort to establish grade norming for grade standardization across course sections. GTA were not aware of how the data would be analyzed. All GTA utilized the same rubrics and grading sheets (as in Study 1).

The same procedures were utilized for the goal-setting assignment and video self-evaluation procedures as outlined for Study 1 (see above). Unfortunately, not all instructors saved their assignments (622 students' assignments were saved). After cleaning the data for incomplete assignments, 618 students' assignments were retained for the first (informative) speech and 601 students' assignments were retained for the second (persuasive) speech analysis.

Estimation Types

Again, based upon responses to the question (e.g., What grade do you think you earned on your presentation?), we established students' perceptions of their perceived level of speaking competency. There were 12 pos-

sible letter grade options ranging from A to F including plus (+) and minus (–) qualifiers (see LeFebvre et al., 2015). See Table 2 for grade distribution of informative and persuasive speeches. The informative and persuasive speech estimation types were calculated in the same manner; additionally, the estimation means, standard deviations, and specific information for this sample vary from Study 1.

Table 2
Study 2: Student Grade Distribution

Informative Speech

A	A–	B+	B	B–	C+	C	C–	D+	D	D–	F	Total
16	50	48	46	119	59	68	73	24	26	30	59	618

Persuasive Speech

A	A–	B+	B	B–	C+	C	C–	D+	D	D–	F	Total
92	68	74	74	98	40	33	38	17	25	15	27	601

Informative speech. Composite scores were calculated by assessing the difference between each student's estimated grade (M =9.17, SD =1.8) minus earned grade (M = 7.96, SD = 3.21). Composite scores were then grouped to reflect the accuracy of students' self-evaluations in terms of under-, accurate-, and slight, moderate, and severe overestimators. Study 2 included: 101 *under-*, 174 *accurate-*, 163 *slight over-*, 118 *moderate over-*, and 62 *severe overestimators* for informative speeches.

Persuasive speech. Composite scores were calculated by assessing the difference between each student's estimated grade (M = 9.48, SD = 1.62) minus earned

grade (M = 9.58, SD = 2.47). This study included: 173 *under*-, 294 *accurate*-, 78 *slight over*-, 42 *moderate over*-, and 14 *severe overestimators* for persuasive speeches.

Results

Hypothesis 1. The discrepancy score between predicted and actual grade score for the first (informative) speech (Δ = 1.22) is significantly greater t (509) = 11.92, $p < .05$ than the discrepancy for the second (persuasive) speech (Δ = -.09). Results demonstrate that students significantly became more accurate in the prediction of their performance from the first to the second speech. The level of difference between the expected and actual grade, while still negative (the person predicts a higher grade than the one actually earned), diminishes significantly.

Hypothesis 2. Accuracy of prediction did not improve by viewing the video recording of the speech, the viewing of the informative speech is not significantly correlated with the first (informative) speech grade earned, r = .17, $p > .05$, and this was true for the second (persuasive) speech, r = .33, $p < .05$. Comparing the correlations from informational and persuasive speeches indicates that the correlation significantly improves from the first to the second speech, z = 2.88, $p < .05$. This indicates that the students improve their ability to analyze how well the speech presentation went by reviewing the video replay.

Hypothesis 3. For the first (informative) speech, a one-way ANOVA demonstrates significant differences among the estimate types (means) based on level of estimation: underestimator (68.0), accurate estimator (60.8), slight overestimator (54.0), moderate overestima-

tor (44.1), severe overestimator (38.4), $F(18, 560) = 80.56$, $p < .05$. The linear trend suggested was significant, $r = .84$, $p < .05$, indicating that the higher the grade, the more accurate the estimate of the person about performance.

For the second (persuasive) speech, a one-way ANOVA demonstrates significant differences among the estimate types (means) based on level of estimation: underestimator (69.4), accurate estimator (64.0), slight overestimator (55.0), moderate overestimator (47.3), severe overestimator (43.8), $F(18, 522) = 56.61$, $p < .05$. The linear trend suggested was significant, $r = .77$, $p < .05$. Results indicate that generally the level of estimation of grade compared to actual grade in terms of estimation corresponds to the predicted grade.

Discussion

In sum, Study 2 replicated the primary results of Study 1 within a larger basic communication course at a university. Again, Study 2 revealed that student predicted scores improved between the informative (first) and persuasive (second) speech. Additionally, students improved their ability to recognize competent speaking behaviors when reviewing the video replay (see Jensen & Harris, 1999). Finally, Study 2 confirmed the findings of Study 1 and found that students improved their accuracy of estimation from the first to the second speech, which indicated that student's overestimation of their speechmaking becomes less drastic.

OVERALL DISCUSSION

Video technology aids in the promotion of a more valid interpretation of speechmaking. These results offer several implications for the basic communication course. Most apparent, video allows students to evaluate the quality of their speaking whereby they can reinforce aspects of acceptable performance, decide to make improvements and/or adjust goals for the next speech.

Public Speaking Competency Implications

Public speaking competency is a combination of skills and knowledge. The acquisition of speechmaking knowledge and skill appear to be more effectively regulated by the learner when using a three-phase approach to the basic communication course curriculum: (1) forethought about the speech with goal-setting, (2) speech performance, and (3) self-reflection through the use of video.

Student accuracy for setting an anticipatory grade goal increases dramatically between speeches. These findings demonstrate that students are more clearly defining the speechmaking task and have learned from their first speech and the video replay. The enhancement of recognition competencies indicates these students have a clearer conception of what is needed to more expeditiously actualize their speaker goals. The knowledge of the competent task completion, partnered with video documentation of the speech, allows students to begin to reflect consciously and intentionally about fulfilling speech expectations (Bandura, 1997). Therefore, the goals and self-evaluation become a "reality check."

Viewing the speech presentation via video reduces misconceptions speakers have about their performance. When coupled with using a rubric for self-evaluation, this process influences the accuracy of student self-perceptions of skills demonstrated during a speaking occasion. Lucas (1999) argued that the basic course could provide exposure to speechmaking concepts and some opportunity for students to develop their own skills. With the use of video self-evaluation the opportunity for developing student speechmaking skills is further enhanced (Sims, 2003). Moreover, this study shows the benefit of having students view more than one of their speeches. A beneficial trajectory of viewing multiple speech recordings allows students to improve their ability to recognize and apply practical skills associated with public speaking.

The overall estimation of the presentation quality is also positively impacted when using video self-evaluation. The majority of students overestimated their abilities for the first speech (Study 1: 70% Study 2: 56%); however, the overestimation diminished greatly on the second speech (Study 1: 53%; Study 2: 22%). This shift between estimation categories demonstrated that students incrementally improved in their self-evaluation skills—perhaps more importantly, severe over-estimators, those individuals who most drastically overrate their skills, diminished by over half when assessing their performance on the second speech for both studies. This increased accuracy of self-assessment is a positive outcome for learner self-awareness and self-regulation and supports the findings of LeFebvre et al. (2015) previous study. Video appears to assist learners to be more accurate and less likely to overestimate the quality of

BASIC COMMUNICATION COURSE ANNUAL

their speaking abilities because the speech "data" is present for the learner.

Pedagogical Implications

These results emphasize the utility of video technology in the basic course for student self-evaluations. As the basic course progresses students ideally became more competent evaluators with their subsequent speech signifying that their evaluation of public speaking competence began to converge with that of the educator. Integration of video self-evaluation was a salient factor contributing to student ability to be more accurate self-evaluators and should become a standardized practice of all basic communication courses. Although it is not reported in basic course communication scholarship about how many public speaking courses utilize (or do not utilize) video replay—the effects are apparent in these results, but a recent survey (LeFebvre, 2015b) indicates video is not as prevalent or consistently utilized as might be assumed.

Morreale et al. (2010) indicated in their eighth basic course series that media and technology is the most significant change affecting the basic course. Specifically, they articulated how the digitized age has provided the ability to upgrade recording and critiquing processes. The survey found that the dramatic increase in technology was attributed to the growth of PowerPoint; thus, we are still left to ask, "What is the prevalence of video technology and how is it being utilized across communication programs?" Basic course educators still have rudimentary questions that have not been answered about what is the prevalence of video, what service does video provide, and how does this assist in exemplifying the

course's core learning objectives? Therefore, the importance of video and its application to serving students in the basic communication course (by Morreale and colleagues) should also inquire about use of technology and its influence on public speaking competencies.

The ability of students to observe and provide self-reflections on their own speeches appears invaluable to students and to the overall purpose of improving public speaking competencies (Quigley & Nyquist, 1992). In order for students to evaluate and improve speechmaking skills, they must first observe themselves and this can only be accomplished with the assistance of video. These findings continue to amplify the evidence for instructors to employ video for self-evaluation for more than a single speech in basic communication and skill-based courses.

Limitations

One limitation of this study is self-report video self-evaluations; this requires that students are accurately reporting their views. Additionally, the self-report of video self-evaluation does not take into consideration partial or repetitive incomplete viewing of particular speech performances. The results only indicate that the self-regulatory process produces improvement. The question of what the student learns or pays attention to when reviewing the video remains unclear.

The results indicated a great deal of learning from the first to the second speech. The students learning to more accurately understand what is transpiring during the presentation. However, whether this process of improvement continues over additional speeches remains unclear. The research (Hodges, Regehr, & Mar-

tin, 2001) only illustrates the potential to begin a process of self-reflection but does not provide a basis for understanding what skills or perspective is necessary to develop that self-insight. The argument in favor of such learning has been that feedback and video permits the student to "see themselves as other see them." However potentially accurate, the research does not provide enough information to indicate how that process is taking place and what can be done to maximize and continue such efforts.

Future Directions

Future research should focus on *what* processes of training would aid and enhance students' interpretation of the information captured on video as they watch. Tips and guidelines for how to self-analyze video replay, what questions might help students improve recognition skills, and how to make students more targeted in their evaluation skills would be essential to student learning and improvement in public speaking competency.

Additionally, future research should begin to identify what types of questions should be used to prompt student self-evaluation and how should these questions should be phrased to help students reflect upon and evaluate their performance (LeFebvre et al., 2015). Moreover, different questions may need to be used for different estimator types to help minimize oversight throughout the assessment process.

Lastly, future research should explore the forms of feedback self-generated at the micro-level of the rubric. Identifying the focus of certain estimators and how they discuss or do not discuss certain evaluation criteria could prove insightful for the development of self-evalu-

ation questions. For example, having students self-grade their speeches with the same rubric via video replay, and then compare their evaluation scores to the instructor's evaluation. During the comparison phase students would answer the following questions: (1) What similarities and differences do you find when comparing your self-evaluation of speech 1 to the feedback from your instructor? (2) In which areas did you overestimate the quality of your performance? In what areas did you underestimate? (3) What might explain the discrepancies (if any) between your and your instructor's perceptions of your performance on Speech 1? (4) What will you do to try to reduce such discrepancies on Speech 2? This type of comparative self-evaluation would allow for identification of student focus during self-evaluation and where feedback standard gaps are occurring by estimation type.

CONCLUSION

These studies provide a better understanding to the forethought students place in their speaking skills, how they assess their performance via video replay, and how accurate their overall assessment of the speech is when compared to the instructor. Video seems to be the appropriate technology to aid students' adaptation of goals and formulate more accurate self-perceptions about their speaking competencies. Moreover, the use of video self-evaluation aids students to more systematically self-regulate speaking behaviors for the basic communication course. Public speaking pedagogy improves from the consistent use of video replay to aid speakers' recognition and demonstration of public speaking skills.

These studies' findings confirm the efficacy of skill recognition improves in subsequent speeches as well as goal-setting strategies. Furthermore, these studies offer important empirical evidence that has been overlooked in the implication of a technology without findings to support its merit; for often instructors are utilizing the technology without understanding its effectiveness (or any support beyond anecdotal or personal experiences). Public speaking, as a basic course, is the primary per-formative course in our discipline—"our front porch" (Beebe, 2013). Providing basic course educators and, perhaps more importantly, basic course students with sound and effective strategies to use video technology to improve communication is foundational to the course's role in higher education.

REFERENCES

Andrade, H., & Valtcheva, A. (2009). Promoting learn-ing and achievement through self-assessment. *Theory Into Practice, 48,* 12-19. doi:10.1080/004058 40802577544

Bandura, A. (1986). *Social foundations of thought and action: A social cognitive theory.* Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Bandura, A. (1989). Self-regulation of motivation and action through internal standards and goal systems. In L.A. Pervin (Ed.), *Goal concepts in personality and social psychology* (pp. 19-85). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Bandura, A. (1997). *Self-efficacy: The exercise of control.* New York, NY: W. H. Freeman and Company.

Beebe, S.A. (2013, May). Our "front porch." *Spectra, 49*(2), 3, 22.

Berger, C.R. (1997). *Planning strategic communication: Attaining goals through communicative action.* Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Bourhis, J., & Allen, M. (1998). The role of videotaped feedback in the instruction of public speaking: A quantitative synthesis of published empirical research. *Communication Research Reports, 15,* 256-261. doi:10.1080/08824099809362121

Carrell, L.J., & Willmington, C. (1996). A comparison of self-report and performance data in assessing speaking and listening competence. *Communication Reports, 9,* 185-191. doi:10.1080/08934219609367650

Darwin, C. (1871). *The descent of man.* London: John Murray.

Dillard, J.P. (1990). A goal-driven model of interpersonal influence. In J.P. Dillard (Ed.), *Seeking compliance: The production of interpersonal influence messages* (pp. 41-56), Scottsdale, AZ: Gorsuch Scarisbrick.

Dochy, F., Segers, M., & Sluijsmans, D. (1999). The use of self-, peer and co-assessment in higher education: A review. *Studies in Higher Education, 24,* 331-350.

Dunning, D. (2005). *Self-insight: Roadblocks and detours on the path to knowing thyself.* New York, NY: Psychology Press.

Dunning, D., Griffin, D. W., Milojkovic, J.D., & Ross, L. (1990). The overconfidence effect in social prediction.

Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 58, 568-581. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/00223514.58.4.568

Dunning, D., Heath, D., & Suls, J.M. (2004). Flawed self-assessment: Implications for health, education, and the workplace. *Psychological Science in the Public Interest, 5,* 69-106.

Dunning, D., Meyerowitz, J.A., & Holzberg, A D. (1989). Ambiguity and self-evaluation: The role of idiosyncratic trait definitions in self-serving assessments of ability. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 57,* 1082-1090. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.57.6.1082

Edwards, R. (1990). Sensitivity to feedback and the development of self. *Communication Quarterly, 38*, 101-111. doi:10.1080/01463379009369747

Falchikov, N., & Boud, D. (1989). Student self-assessment in higher education: A meta-analysis. *Review of Education Research, 59,* 395-430.

Harlin, E. (2014). Watching oneself teach—long-term effects of teachers' reflections on their video recorded teaching. *Technology, Pedagogy and Education, 23,* 507-521. doi:10.1080/1475939X.2013.822413

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*, 151-161. doi:10.1080/03634529809379119

Hodges, B., Regehr, G., & Martin, D. (2001). Difficulties in recognizing one's own incompetence: Novice phy-

sicians who are unskilled and unaware of it. *Academic Medicine, 76,* S87-S89.

Ilgen, D.R., Fisher, C.D., & Taylor, M.S. (1979). Consequences of individual feedback on behavior in organizations. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 64,* 349-371. doi:10.1037/0021-9010.64.4.349

Jensen, K.K., & Harris, V. (1999). The public speaking portfolio. *Communication Education, 48*, 211-227. doi:10.1080/03634529909379170

Kluger, A.N., & DeNisi, A. (1996). The effects of feedback interventions on performance: A historical review, a meta-analysis, and a preliminary feedback intervention theory. *Psychological Bulletin, 119*, 254-284. doi:10.1037/0033-2909.119.2.254

Kopelman, R.E. (1986). *Managing productivity in organizations: A practical, people-oriented perspective.* New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.

Kruger, J., & Dunning D. (1999). Unskilled and unaware of it: How difficulties in recognizing one's own incompetence lead to inflated self-assessments. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 77,* 1121-1134. doi:http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/00223514.77.6.1121

Kusnic, E., & Finley, M. (1993). Student self-evaluation: An introduction and rationale. *New Directions for Teaching and Learning, 56,* 5-14. doi:10.1002/tl.37219935603

LeFebvre, L. (2013). Effect of goal-setting and self-generated feedback on student speechmaking. *Basic Communication Course Annual, 25,* 283-329.

LeFebvre, L. (Ed.). (2015a). *A speechmaker's reference* (Custom edition). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson Custom Publishing.

LeFebvre, L. (2015b). *The inconsistent use of video technology in the basic communication course.* Unpublished manuscript. Iowa State University.

LeFebvre, L., LeFebvre, L.E., Blackburn, K., & Boyd, R. (2015). Student estimates of public speaking competency: The Meaning Extraction Helper and video self-evaluation. *Communication Education.* Advance online publication. doi:10.1080/03634523.2015.1014384

Levasseur, D.G., Dean, K.W., & Pfaff, J. (2004). Speech pedagogy beyond the basics: A study of instructional methods in the advanced public speaking course. *Communication Education, 53,* 234-252. doi:10.1080/036345204200265170

Li, C. (2015). A comparative study of video presentation modes in relation to L2 listening success. *Technology, Pedagogy and Education.* Advanced online publication. doi:10.1080/1475939X.2015.1035318

Locke, E.A., & Latham, G.P. (1990). *A theory of goal setting and task performance.* Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Locke, E.A., Shaw, K.N., Saari, L.M., & Latham, G.P. (1981). Goal setting and task performance: 1969-1980. *Psychological Bulletin, 90*, 125-152.

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.

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

Morreale, S.P., Hugenberg, L., & Worley, D. (2006). The basic communication course at U.S. colleges and universities in the 21st century: Study VII. *Communication Education, 55*, 415-437.

Morreale, S.P., Worley, D.W., & Hugenberg, B. (2010). The basic communication course at two- and four-year U.S. colleges and universities: Study VIII—The 40th anniversary. *Communication Education, 59*, 405-430. doi:10.1080/03634520600879162

Palao, J.M., Hastie, P.A., Cruz, P.G., & Ortega, E. (2015). The impact of video technology on student performance in physical education. *Technology, Pedagogy and Education, 24,* 51-63. doi:10.1080/1475939X.2013.813404

Power, W.G., Flint, L.J., & Breindel, K.A. (1988). Self-perceptions of communication effectiveness: An exploratory study. *Communication Research Reports, 5*, 103-107. doi:10.11080/08824098809359809

Quigley, B.L., & Nyquist, J.D. (1992). Using video technology to provide feedback to students in performance courses. *Communication Education, 41*, 324-334. doi:10.1080/03634529209378892

Rubin, R.B. (1990). Communication competence. In G. Phillips & J.T. Woods (Eds.), *Speech communication:*

Basic Communication Course Annual

Essays to commemorate the 75th anniversary of the Speech Communication Association (pp. 94-129). Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois University Press.

Schreiber, L.M., Paul, G.D., & Shibley, L.R. (2012). The development and test of the public speaking competence rubric. *Communication Education, 61*, 205-233. doi:10.1080/03634523.2012.670709

Sims, J.R. (2003). Streaming student speeches on the internet: Convenient and "connected" feedback in the basic course. *Basic Communication Course Annual, 15,* 1-40.

Stevens, D.D., & Levi, A.J. (2005). *Introduction to rubrics: An assessment tool to save grading time, convey effective feedback and promote student learning.* Sterling, VA: Stylus.

Sypher, B.D., & Sypher, H. (1984). Seeing ourselves as others see us: Convergence and divergence in assessments of communication behavior. *Communication Research, 11*, 97-115. doi:10.1177/00936508401 1001005

U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics. (2001). *Defining and assessing learning: Exploring, competency-based initiatives.* Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics.

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

Wilson, S.R., & Sabee, C.M. (2003). Explicating communicative competence as a theoretical term. In J. O.

Greene & B.R. Burleson (Eds.), *Handbook of communication and social interaction skills* (pp. 3-50). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Wilson, S. R. (2002). *Seeking and resisting compliance: Why people say what they do when trying to influence others.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Yammarino, F.J., & Atwater, L.E. (1993). Understanding self-perception accuracy: Implications for human resource management. *Human Resource Management, 32*, 231-247.

Zabava Ford, W.S., Wolvin, A.D., & Chung, S. (2000). Students' self-perceived listening competencies in the basic speech communication course. *International Journal of Listening, 14,* 1-13. doi:10.1080/10904018.2000.10499032

APPENDIX A

Informative Speech Rubic of Assessment

CRITERIA	4	3	2	1	0
LEVELS OF ACHIEVEMENT					
INTRODUCTION					
Attention Getter	Excellent attention getter; creative technique, clearly engages listeners' interests and demands attention to the subject.	Good attention getter.	Attention getter is mundane or cliché'; audience is not engaged to listen or develop interest in message.	Irrelevant opening, or does not begin with attention getter, or states topic in overly direct manner, such as, "Today I am going to talk about…"	No opening technique.
Thesis Statement	Clearly states thesis in the form of a single, declarative sentence; intentions of the speech are clear, direct, effective, and easily remembered and relevant to the audience.	Discernable thesis statement; thesis is generally appropriate; clarity of position and/or intention for audience is somewhat unclear or broad for the listeners.	Awkwardly composed thesis statement; thesis asserts little regarding the intentions of the speech; delivery of thesis may be ineffectively roundabout or vague for the audience.	Thesis statement can be deduced but is not explicitly stated; audience is most likely lost as to the topic.	No thesis statement.
Preview	Preview of main points specific and memorable; logically identifies main points of the speech in a straightforward manner; listeners easily know the organization and how ideas will be presented.	Previews main points; provides organization for how ideas will be presented.	Main points not clearly or completely forecasted to listeners. Pattern of organization somewhat unclear.	Main points of the speech may be deduced but are not explicitly stated. Pattern of organization is indiscernible.	No preview of main points.

DELIVERY					
Eye Contact	Consistently maintains the quality of directness in speech delivery by utilizing scanning to connect to listeners.	Well-developed eye contact with listeners; few if any distractions occur with connecting to the audience.	Maintains eye contact regularly, notes are occasionally a distraction affecting eye contact with their listeners.	Focus is directed away from the audience members the majority of the time (e.g., notes, visual aid, floor, walls, over the heads of the audience).	Predominately avoids eye contact.
Facial Expression	Facial expressions are animated and demonstrate a natural, normal correspondence to the tenor of the speech; establishes natural rapport with the audience where appropriate through the use of facial expressions.	Facial expressions are appropriate and timely in the speech.	Generally facial expressions are used but could be utilized more to add to the message and connect to the audience.	At times, facial expression appears to be uncomfortable for the circumstances of the speech.	Expressions are minimal or deadpan; facial features are out of character or indifferent or overly unexpressive.
Word Choice	Language is exceptionally clear, economical, imaginative and vivid; completely free from bias, grammatical errors and inappropriate usage.	Language appropriate to the goals of the presentation; no conspicuous errors in grammar; no evidence of bias.	Language selection adequate; some errors in grammar at times misused (e.g., jargon, slang, awkward structure).	Grammar and syntax need to be improved as can level of language sophistication; occasionally biased.	Many errors in grammar and syntax; extensive use of jargon, slang, sexist/racist terms or mispronunciations.
Vocal	Excellent use of vocal variation, intensity, pacing, and pauses; vocal expression natural and enthusiastic; avoids fillers (e.g., um, uh, like).	Good vocal variation and pace; vocal expression suited to assignment; tone generally has a conversational quality; few if any fillers (e.g., um, uh, like).	Demonstrates some vocal variation; enunciates clearly and speaks audibly; monotone at times; generally avoids fillers (e.g., um, uh, like).	Sometimes uses voice too soft or articulation too indistinct for listeners to comfortably hear; often uses fillers (um, uh, like); pace difficult to follow or inappropriate for audience.	Speaks inaudibly; enunciates poorly; speaks in monotone; poor pacing; distracts listeners with fillers (e.g., um, uh, like).

Purposeful Movement	Gesturing is natural, appropriate, spontaneous, and easily seen by each audience member; posture blends nicely to message, demonstrating confidence; movement has purpose.	Gesturing is generally natural for the occasion and audience; majority of movement appears appropriate; posture appears to exude poise.	Gestures do not appear to be coordinated with the message conveyed; movement is attempted but seems awkward, unplaced, or distracting; fidgeting (i.e., grooming gestures, crossing legs, etc.); posture awareness is absent.	Body is ramrod straight and remains steadily positioned in one place without movement (i.e., "talking head"), or gestures are overly exaggerated, distracting, or disconnected from message.	Body is not used to aid message.
Physical Appearance	Personal appearance is completely appropriate for the occasion and the audience. Appearance adds to speaker's credibility.	Personal appearance is appropriate for the occasion and audience.	Personal appearance is generally appropriate for the occasion and audience; some aspects of appearance reflect a lack of sensitivity to nuances of the occasion or expectations of the audience.	Personal appearance looks like everyday clothing that does not enhance the credibility of the speaker or relate to the topic.	Personal appearance is inappropriate for the occasion and audience.
STRUCTURE					
Topic	Topic is appropriately challenging, well suited, and engaging for the audience; topic is worthwhile, timely, and presents new information to the audience.	Topic is appropriate to audience and situation and provides useful information to the audience; however, some elements of the topic may be too complex.	Topic is untimely or lacks originality; provides scant new information to audience.	Topic is too trivial, too complex, or inappropriate for audience; topic is not suitable for the situation or cannot be deduced by listeners.	A single topic cannot be deduced.
Audience-Situational Adaptation	Speaker shows how information is personally important to audience; speech is skillfully	Speaker implies the importance of the topic to the audience; presentation is adapted	Speaker assumes but does not articulate the importance of topic; presentation is mini-	The importance of topic is not established; very little evidence of audience adaptation;	Speech is contrary to audience beliefs, attitudes, and values; message is generic or

	tailored to audience beliefs, attitudes, and values; speaker makes allusions to culturally shared experiences. Equipment is prepared, and speaker is comfortable operating the equipment; audience can easily see the speaker at all times, interact with the speaker, and room layout displays perspective taking on the part of the speaker for presentation.	to audience beliefs, attitudes, and values; an attempt is made to establish common ground. Speaker is prepared when operating equipment, managing the proximity with the audience, and appears comfortable in the environment of the presentational performance.	mally adapted to audience beliefs, attitudes, and values; some ideas in speech are removed from audience's frame of reference or experiences. Audience members have to work to view or listen to the speaker.	speaker needs to more clearly establish a connection or common ground with the audience. Speaker is not familiar with technology or spatial arrangements of room.	canned; no attempt is made to establish common ground. Speaker does not incorporate technology that would aid message or is not familiar with how to use the room to create a connection with the audience.
Organization	Very well organized; main points are clear, mutually exclusive (functionally and effectively as separate entities) and cohesive (when points are taken together they create uniformity), and directly relate to thesis and are previewed in the introduction. Transitions between main points exhibit exceptional use of connectives; movement between points is effortless for the audience.	Organizational pattern is evident, main points are apparent in the body of the speech; sequence of ideas is logical and easily followed. Transitions are present between main points.	Organizational pattern somewhat evident; main points are present but not mutually exclusive or exactly as previewed. Transitions are present but are minimally effective.	Speech did not flow well; speech is not logically organized; transitions are present but not well formed.	No organizational pattern; no transitions; sounded as if information is randomly presented.

Understandable Directions	Instructions are simple, easy to follow commands or techniques are effortless to recall; process is adept, naturally progressive, and marked by a clear method or system of doing something to accomplish or produce a specific result.	Instructions are clear and recognizable; overall the process is discernable for the audience.	Instructions are somewhat clear and can be recalled with some effort; process, with a few exceptions, is progressive and can be actuated by the audience.	Instructions can be followed, but are not easily remembered or simplified; sequence of procedure is logical and can be followed, but only with absolute focus extensive lists of are included that make it difficult for the audience to retain.	Instructions are vague or overly complex and are not understandable; there is no logical process or system offered.
Support Material	All key points are well supported with a variety of credible materials (e.g., facts, statistics, quotes, etc.); sources provide excellent support for thesis; all sources clearly cited and are of the highest quality available for topic.	Main points are supported with appropriate material; sources corresponded suitably to thesis; nearly all required sources cited.	Points were generally supported using an adequate mix of materials; some evidence supports thesis; source citations need to be clarified.	Some points are not supported; a greater quantity/quality of material needed; some sources of very poor quality.	Supporting materials are nonexistent or are not cited.
Credibility	Firmly establishes credibility; ethos of the speaker demonstrates believability, integrity, and dignity in regards to handling the subject fairly; competence is acquired throughout the presentation through personal proof and outside sources of informa-	Credibility is established; speaker appears trustworthy and respectful of content and audience.	Generally establishes credibility; ethical behaviors are apparent; competence and honesty are present but not enhanced; seems to respect the audience.	Somewhat establishes credibility; speaker does not foster an inclusive or sensitive approach to the topic; fallacies are present; accuracy of message is questionable.	Little attempt to build credibility; ethos is not present or considered; competence is not established; demonstrates a disregard for the dealing with the topic fairly.

Volume 28, 2016

			CONCLUSION		
	tion; speaker exhibits honesty and respects the best interests of the audience.				
Restate Thesis	Thesis is reiterated in the form of a single, declarative sentence; position of the speaker's intentions is clear, direct, effective, and easily recapped for the audience.	Thesis restatement is generally appropriate; clarity of position is still somewhat unclear or broad for the listeners.	Awkwardly recomposed thesis statement; thesis still asserts little or expresses nothing regarding the intentions in the speech; listener is still unsure of the speech's position.	Restatement of thesis asserts little or expresses nothing regarding the intentions of the speech just covered; listener is lost.	No restatement of thesis.
Review	Logically summarizes the main points of the speech in a straightforward manner' listeners easily know what was discussed; listeners easily reminded of the organization and how ideas were presented.	Main points are reviewed in the order previewed and discussed in the body of the speech; reiterates organization for how ideas were presented.	Provides some summary of main points. Pattern of organization that was used throughout speech is unclear.	Main points are not clearly or completed reviewed to the listeners.	Summary of the main points is absent of unstated.
Final Statement	Strong closing statement applied, challenges listeners to put to use what has been presented; final impression is powerful, authoritative, and confident.	Final impression is clear and motivates listeners.	Final impression is applied to motivate listeners but is not fully connected to the subject and/or does not demand absolute attention by the audience; closing technique can be strengthened.	Ends in a tone at odds with the rest of the speech.	Speech ends abruptly and without closure.

ADDITIONAL PERFORMANCE STANDARDS					
Time	Presentation seamlessly conforms to the time specifications and is well rehearsed fitting effectively and naturally within the allotted time.	Presentation conforms to the time specifications.	Presentation conforms to the time specifications, but speaker appears rushed to finalize the speech or stalls to meet the time parameters.	Presentation exceeded by 15 seconds or fell short of the time specifications by 15 seconds.	Presentation is stopped due to being excessively over time (more than 15 seconds) or drastically short of the time specifications (more than 15 seconds).
Presentational Aids	Exceptional explanation and presentation of visual aids; visuals provide powerful insight into speech topic; visual aids of high professional quality.	Visual aids well presented; use of visual aids enhances understanding; visual aids good quality.	Visual aids are generally well displayed and explained; minor errors present in visuals.	Speaker is not well practiced with visuals; visuals not fully explained; quality of visuals needs improvement.	Use of visual aids distracts from the speech; visual aids not relevant; visual aids poor professional quality.

Volume 28, 2016

APPENDIX B
Persuasive Speech Rubic of Assessment

CRITERIA	LEVELS OF ACHIEVEMENT				
	4	3	2	1	0
	INTRODUCTION				
Attention Getter	Excellent attention getter; creative technique, clearly engages listeners' interests and demands attention to the subject.	Good attention getter.	Attention getter is mundane or cliché'; audience is not engaged to listen or develop interest in message.	Irrelevant opening, or does not begin with attention getter, or states topic in overly direct manner, such as, "Today I am going to talk about…"	No opening technique.
Thesis Statement	Clearly states thesis in the form of a single, declarative sentence; intentions of the speech are clear, direct, effective, and easily remembered and relevant to the audience.	Discernable thesis statement; thesis is generally appropriate; clarity of position and/or intention for audience is somewhat unclear or broad for the listeners.	Awkwardly composed thesis statement; thesis asserts little regarding the intentions of the speech; delivery of thesis may be ineffectively roundabout or vague for the audience.	Thesis statement can be deduced but is not explicitly stated; audience is most likely lost as to the topic.	No thesis statement.
Preview	Preview of main points specific and memorable; logically identifies main points of the speech in a straightforward manner; listeners easily know the organization and how ideas will be presented.	Previews main points; provides organization for how ideas will be presented.	Main points not clearly or completely forecasted to listeners. Pattern of organization somewhat unclear.	Main points of the speech may be deduced but are not explicitly stated. Pattern of organization is indiscernible.	No preview of main points.

DELIVERY

Eye Contact	Consistently maintains the quality of directness in speech delivery by utilizing scanning to connect to listeners.	Well-developed eye contact with listeners; few if any distractions occur with connecting to the audience.	Maintains eye contact regularly, notes are occasionally a distraction affecting eye contact with their listeners.	Focus is directed away from the audience members the majority of the time (e.g., notes, visual aid, floor, walls, over the heads of the audience, etc.).	Predominately avoids eye contact.
Facial Expression	Facial expressions are animated and demonstrate a natural, normal correspondence to the tenor of the speech; establishes natural rapport with the audience where appropriate through the use of facial expressions.	Facial expressions are appropriate and timely in the speech.	Generally facial expressions are used but could be utilized more to add to the message and connect to the audience.	At times, facial expression appears to be uncomfortable for the circumstances of the speech.	Expressions are minimal or deadpan; facial features are out of character or indifferent or overly unexpressive.
Word Choice	Language is exceptionally clear, economical, imaginative and vivid; completely free from bias, grammatical errors and inappropriate usage.	Language appropriate to the goals of the presentation; no conspicuous errors in grammar; no evidence of bias.	Language selection adequate; some errors in grammar; language at times misused (e.g., jargon, slang, awkward structure).	Grammar and syntax need to be improved as can level of language sophistication; occasionally biased.	Many errors in grammar and syntax; extensive use of jargon, slang, sexist/racist terms or mispronunciations.

Vocal	Excellent use of vocal variation, intensity, pacing, and pauses; vocal expression natural and enthusiastic; avoids fillers (e.g., um, uh, like).	Good vocal variation and pace; vocal expression suited to assignment; tone generally has a conversational quality; few if any fillers (e.g., um, uh, like).	Demonstrates some vocal variation; enunciates clearly and speaks audibly; monotone at times; generally avoids fillers (e.g., um, uh, like).	Sometimes uses voice too soft or articulation too indistinct for listeners to comfortably hear; often uses fillers (e.g., um, uh, like); pace difficult to follow or inappropriate for audience.	Speaks inaudibly; enunciates poorly; speaks in monotone; poor pacing; distracts listeners with fillers (e.g., um, uh, like).
Purposeful Movement	Gesturing is natural, appropriate, spontaneous, and easily seen by each audience member; posture blends nicely to message, demonstrating confidence; movement has purpose.	Gesturing is generally natural for the occasion and audience; majority of movement appears appropriate; posture appears to exude poise.	Gestures do not appear to be coordinated with the message conveyed; movement is attempted but seems awkward, unplaced, or distracting, fidgeting (i.e., grooming gestures, crossing legs, etc.); posture awareness is absent.	Body is ramrod straight and remains steadily positioned in one place without movement (i.e., "talking head"), or gestures are overly exaggerated, distracting, or disconnected from message.	Body is not used to aid message.
Physical Appearance	Personal appearance is completely appropriate for the occasion and the audience. Appearance adds to speaker's credibility.	Personal appearance is appropriate for the occasion and audience.	Personal appearance is generally appropriate for the occasion and audience; some aspects of appearance reflect a lack of sensitivity to nuances of the occasion or expectations of the audience.	Personal appearance looks like everyday clothing that does not enhance the credibility of the speaker or relate to the topic.	Personal appearance is inappropriate for the occasion and audience.

STRUCTURE

Topic	Topic is appropriately challenging, well suited, and engaging for the audience; topic is worthwhile, timely, and presents new information to the audience.	Topic is appropriate to the audience and situation and provides some useful information to the audience; however, some elements of the topic may be too complex.	Topic is untimely or lacks originality; provides scant new information to audience.	Topic is too trivial, too complex, or inappropriate for audience; topic is not suitable for the situation or cannot be deduced by listeners.	A single topic cannot be deduced.
Audience-Situational Adaptation	Speaker shows how information is personally important to audience; speech is skillfully tailored to audience beliefs, attitudes, and values; speaker makes allusions to culturally shared experiences. Equipment is prepared, and speaker is comfortable operating the equipment; audience can easily see the speaker at all times, interact with the speaker, and room layout displays perspective taking on the part of the speaker for presentation.	Speaker implies the importance of the topic to the audience; presentation is adapted to audience beliefs, attitudes, and values; an attempt is made to establish common ground. Speaker is prepared when operating equipment, managing the proximity with the audience, and appears comfortable in the environment of the presentational performance.	Speaker assumes but does not articulate the importance of topic; presentation is minimally adapted to audience beliefs, attitudes, and values; some ideas in speech are removed from audience's frame of reference or experiences. Audience members have to work to view or listen to the speaker.	The importance of topic is not established; very little evidence of audience adaptation; speaker needs to more clearly establish a connection or common ground with the audience. Speaker is not familiar with technology or spatial arrangements of room.	Speech is contrary to audience beliefs, attitudes, and values; message is generic or canned; no attempt is made to establish common ground. Speaker does not incorporate technology that would aid message or is not familiar with how to use the room to create a connection with the audience.

Organization	Very well organized; main points are clear, mutually exclusive (function clearly and effectively as separate entities) and cohesive (when points are taken together they create uniformity), and directly relate to thesis and are previewed in the introduction. Transitions between main points exhibit exceptional use of connectives; movement between points is effortless for the audience.	Organizational pattern is evident, main points are apparent in the body of the speech; sequence of ideas is logical and easily followed. Transitions are present between main points.	Organizational pattern somewhat evident; main points are present but not mutually exclusive or exactly as previewed. Transitions are present but are minimally effective.	Speech did not flow well; speech is not logically organized; transitions are present but not well formed.	No organizational pattern; no transitions; sounded as if information is randomly presented.
Reasoning	Logically sound explanations are offered as a basis for why listeners should accept the conclusion; supports claims with powerful/credible evidence; completely avoids reasoning fallacies.	Logic supports conclusion; claims supported with evidence and examples; sound reasoning evident; clear call to action.	Logic not completely connected; most claims are supported with evidence; generally sound reasoning; recognizable call to action.	Logic is unclear; claims not fully supported with evidence; some reasoning fallacies present; call to action is absent or vague.	Logic is absent; claims not supported with evidence; poor reasoning; no call to action.

The Unaware, Accurate, and Overly Critical   *163*

Support Material	All key points are well supported with a variety of credible materials (e.g., facts, statistics, quotes, etc.); sources provide excellent support for thesis; all sources clearly cited and are of the highest quality available for topic.	Main points were supported with appropriate material; sources corresponded suitably to thesis; nearly all required sources cited.	Points were generally supported using an adequate mix of materials; some evidence supports thesis; source citations need to be clarified.	Some points were not supported; a greater quantity/quality of material needed; some sources of very poor quality.
				Supporting materials are nonexistent or are not cited.
Credibility	Firmly establishes credibility; ethos of the speaker demonstrates believability, integrity, and dignity in regards to handling the subject fairly; competence is acquired throughout the presentation through personal proof and outside information; speaker exhibits honesty and respects the best interests of the audience.	Credibility is established; speaker appears trustworthy and respectful of content and audience.	Generally establishes credibility; ethical behaviors are apparent; competence and honesty are present but not enhanced; seems to respect the audience.	Somewhat establishes credibility; speaker does not foster an inclusive or sensitive approach to the topic; fallacies are present; accuracy of message is questionable.
				Little attempt to build credibility; ethos is not present or considered; competence is not established; demonstrates a disregard for the dealing with the topic fairly.
Emotion	Appeal to audience's need is clearly declared, dramatic, vividly and boldly maintained, and linked to sound reasoning in a creative and purposeful manner.	Appeal to the audience's need is evoked. Examples and/or personal testimony are present to develop pathos.	Appeal to the audience's need is present.	Appeal to the audience's need is vague and difficult to distinguish.
				Appeal to the audience's need is not asserted.

Volume 28, 2016

CONCLUSION

Restate Thesis	No restatement of thesis.	Restatement of thesis asserts little or expresses nothing regarding the intentions of the speech just covered; listener is lost.	Awkwardly recomposed thesis statement; thesis still asserts little or expresses nothing regarding the intentions covered in the speech; listener is still unsure of the speech's position.	Thesis restatement is generally appropriate; clarity of position is still somewhat unclear or broad for the listeners.	Thesis is reiterated in the form of a single, declarative sentence; position of the speaker's intentions is clear, direct, effective, and easily recapped for the audience.
Review	Summary of the main points is absent of unstated.	Main points are not clearly or completed reviewed to the listeners.	Provides some summary of main points. Pattern of organization that was presented throughout speech is unclear.	Main points are reviewed in the order previewed and discussed in the body of the speech; reiterates organization for how ideas were presented.	Logically summarizes the main points of the speech in a straightforward manner' listeners easily know what was discussed; listeners easily reminded of the organization and how ideas were presented.
Final Statement	Speech ends abruptly and without closure.	Ends in a tone at odds with the rest of the speech.	Final impression is applied to motivate listeners but is not fully connected to the subject and/or does not demand absolute attention by the audience; closing technique can be strengthened.	Final impression is clear and motivates listeners.	Strong closing statement applied, challenges listeners to put to use what has been presented; final impression is powerful, authoritative, and confident.

BASIC COMMUNICATION COURSE ANNUAL

The Unaware, Accurate, and Overly Critical   *165*

ADDITIONAL PERFORMANCE STANDARDS				
Time	Presentation seamlessly conforms to the time specifications and is well rehearsed fitting effectively and naturally within the allotted time.	Presentation conforms to the time specifications.	Presentation conforms to the time specifications, but speaker appears rushed to finalize the speech or stalls to meet the time parameters.	Presentation exceeded by 15 seconds or fell short of the time specifications by 15 seconds.

Presentation is stopped due to being excessively over time (more than 15 seconds) or drastically short of the time specifications (more than 15 seconds).

Volume 28, 2016