1962

The semantic differential as a measure of speech tension

William Ruemke Knowlton
The University of Montana

THE SEMANTIC DIFFERENTIAL AS A MEASURE OF SPEECH TENSION

by

Wm. R. Knowlton

B.A. Montana State University, 1962

Presented in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Arts

MONTANA STATE UNIVERSITY

1962

Approved by:

Chairman, Board of Examiners

Dean, Graduate School

AUG 1 4 1962

Date

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Grateful acknowledgement is given to Jack Baseheart, Scotty Hecht, Russ Jennings and Duane Pettersen for their aid in the collection of data.

Similar acknowledgement is accorded Miss Elma Knowlton, whose constructive role as a critical proof-reader was most helpful.

Sincerest appreciation is accorded Dr. Forrest L. Brissey, to whom the writer is permanently indebted not only for the guidance received with respect to the present thesis, but of longer range value is the mode of questioning which he has imparted to the writer.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER		PAGE
I	STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM	1
II	PROCEDURE	14
III	RESULTS	25
IV	DISCUSSION	41
V	SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS	52
	BIBLIOGRAPHY	55
	APPENDICES	58
	APPENDIX A	59
	APPENDIX B	91
	APPENDIX C	93
	APPENDIX D	95
	APPENDIX E	97
	APPENDIX F	100
	APPENDIX G	102
	APPENDIX H	104
	APPENDIX I	106
	APPENDIX J	108
	APPENDIX K	110
	APPENDIX L	112
	APPENDIX M	114
	APPENDIX N	141

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE PAGE

1. The Interjudge "Topic Stand" Scale Reliability of the Three Judges for 42 Speakers 27

2. The Tetrachoric Reliability Test-Retest Coefficients for Ten Semantic Differential Scales 29

3. The Sign Test Probabilities for the Ten Test-Retest Semantic Differential Scales 30

4. The Calculated & Corrected Tetrachoric Correlations of the Evaluative Factor Scores with the Speech Tension Ratings for 25 Ss on the First Set of Phrases . . 32

5. The Calculated & Corrected Tetrachoric Correlations of the Potency Factor Scores with the Speech Tension Ratings for 25 Ss on the First Set of Phrases . . 33

6. The Calculated & Corrected Tetrachoric Correlations of the Activity Factor Scores with the Speech Tension Ratings for 25 Ss on the First Set of Phrases . . 34

7. The Calculated & Corrected Tetrachoric Correlations of the Evaluative Factor Scores with the Speech Tension Ratings for 25 Ss on the Second Set of Concepts . 36

8. The Calculated & Corrected Tetrachoric Correlations of the Potency Factor

Scores with the Speech Tension Ratings for 25 Ss on the Second Set of Concepts . . 37

9. The Calculated & Corrected Tetrachoric Correlations of the Activity Factor Scores with the Speech Tension Ratings for 25 Ss on the Second Set of Concepts . . 38

10. The Calculated & Corrected Tetrachoric Correlations of the Factor Scores with the Topic Stand Ratings for the 25 Ss on the Three Speech Topic Concepts 39

CHAPTER ONE

STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

In introducing his monograph, Foundation of the Theory of Signs, Charles Morris comments, "Men are the dominant sign-using animals."[1] It is apparent that men communicate with one another primarily through the use of organized sign systems called languages. Social scientists have long recognized that the sharing of a common language among a group of people is one of the dominant forces which produces and preserves civilizations. Such authors as Gray and Wise,[2] Miller,[3] and Bridgman[4] have stressed the role and importance of communication in making society possible; indeed, it is difficult to imagine how interaction among people would take place without the aid of communication.

A number of different definitions have been employed in investigating and theorizing about the process of communication. Among these is the behavioral definition of Stevens: "Communication is the discriminatory response of an organism

---

[1] Charles W. Morris, Foundations of the Theory of Signs, (Chicago: University of Chicago, 1938), p. 1.

[2] G.W. Gray and C.M. Wise, The Bases of Speech, (3rd ed., New York: Harper and Brothers, 1959), p. 2.

[3] George A. Miller, Language and Communication, (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1951) p. 1.

[4] P.W. Bridgman, The Way Things Are, (Cambridge: Harvard University, 1959), p. 12.

to a stimulus."[5] Although the stimulus elements involved in human communication may take many forms other than those typically regarded as linguistic, the stimulus elements of a message are usually structured out of language, and it is this type of linguistic stimulus which is the concern of this study. The response to the stimulus elements may be verbal, nonverbal, or both. The remainder of this chapter evolves from an adoption of Stevens' definition and develops a research problem consistent with it.

For Stevens, discriminatory responsiveness appears to constitute the sole criterion for communication. Other authors have stressed the view that the motivations of both transmitter and receiver are important factors in discriminatory responsiveness. From the social point of view, one of the prime motivations of people engaging in communication is the intent to influence other people's behavior; the behavior in question may be either verbal or nonverbal. For example, a transmitter may ask a receiver to open the window. If the requested action of opening the window is performed, then the receiver has successfully communicated. But the receiver may respond verbally by saying "Yes," although he still does not actually open the window. Often the nonverbal response in a communication situation is the

---

[5]S.S. Stevens, "A Definition of Communication," Journal of the Acoustical Society of America, 22(1950), p. 689.

most fundamental concern; in other situations, the verbal response is the focal point of communication. Thus successful communication, socially considered, involves eliciting specified responses, either verbal or nonverbal. Berlo sums this up by saying: "Our basic purpose in communication is to become an affecting agent . . . In short, we communicate to influence -- to affect with intent."[6]

Communication in Berlo's sense may be conceptualized as lying on a success continuum. If an individual is able to persuade another to engage in specified behavior relative to some situation, then he has successfully communicated; the more the receiver behavior deviates from the intended mode of behavior, from this point of view, the less successful is the communication. The success of the request to open the window may be judged by a number of criteria; the length of time it takes the receiver to open the window upon hearing the message, or the degree to which the window is raised, are two possible examples of such criteria. Many communication situations, such as the case of a politician making a campaign speech, are much more complex. The politician must wait until election day to assess the adequacy of his communication. The greater number of votes

---

[6]David K. Berlo, The Process of Communication, (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1960), pp. 11-12.

that he receives, the higher on the success continuum has been his communication effort. Socially considered, the transmitter's aim is to maximize the probability of obtaining the intended receiver behavior, and his success is judged by some specified criteria.

In order for a transmitter to engage in successful communication with a receiver, it is commonly accepted that they must in some measure share similar "meanings" for the language elements employed in the transmitter's message. A variety of conceptual views concerned with "meaning" have been employed in past literature. In their comprehensive review of the theories of meaning, Ogden and Richards list sixteen definitions which various schools of thought have attached to the term. The authors call meaning ". . . that pivotal term of every theory of language . . . ."[7] As communication is defined by Stevens and by Berlo, the meaning of the linguistic stimulus is the same as the receiver's response to that stimulus. From this point of view, saying that two people share a similar meaning is equivalent to saying that they respond similarly to the same stimulus; the stimulus may or may not be linguistic. Thus communication and meaning are identical in the sense that both terms refer to the receiver's responsiveness.

---

[7] C.K. Ogden and I.A. Richards, The Meaning of Meaning, (New York: Harcourt, Brace, and Company, 1956), p. 48.

Meaning is often spoken of in the psychological sense of "connotation." This use of "connotation" deals with the associations and feelings which a verbal stimulus evokes in an individual. These associations, however, presumably are related to a person's experiences with a particular verbal sign or set of signs. For example, the word "dog" might have quite different connotations for two people. One person might have been bitten by a dog as a child, so that a dog is now a fear object for that individual. Upon hearing the word "dog," associations of fear and avoidance are aroused. On the other hand, a person who has always had pleasant experiences with dogs responds with associations of reward and approach upon hearing the word "dog." To emphasize the role of individual differences in learning experiences, Berlo writes:

> ... connotative meaning involves words that do not report much about the world, but they tell a great deal about the person using them, since they indicate his values, judgments, attitudes, etc. Words that we label as connotative always tell us something of the state of the organism, about the user of that word.[8]

The above treatment of connotative meaning appears to have important implications for communication. Differences in receiver connotations could conceivably be one of the variables which influences the effectiveness of some social communication situations. Successful communication might

---

[8]David K. Berlo, p. 210.

require that the transmitter and receiver have had similar learning experiences with respect to the linguistic terms employed, such as in the example of the politician giving a campaign speech. If the politician presents his case with words and phrases which have negative connotations for his audience, then the probability of that audience's voting for him has quite likely been reduced. In the ideal communication situation, the transmitter would have a verbal case history of an individual's past learning experiences with respect to the words, phrases, etc., which the transmitter plans to employ in his message. The speaker would then know in principle what linguistic stimuli to include in the message to insure his success (eliciting the desired behavior). Some recent research developments have been reported which may provide some considerable assistance in situations where connotative meanings might be important.

The Semantic Differential

Osgood and his associates report that they have been concerned with just such a problem in developing the Semantic Differential,[9] which presumably indicates the connotative meanings an individual has for various linguistic stimuli. The Semantic Differential is a scaling technique by which

---

[9]Charles E. Osgood, George J. Suci, and Perch H. Tannenbaum, The Measurement of Meaning, (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1957).

subjects rate various verbal concepts on seven-step interval scales. The scales are composed of antonyms such as:

happy __:__:__:__:__:__:__: sad

Through factor-analysis, groups of scales were established on the basis of the intercorrelations among individual scales. The three general factors isolated were categorized by Osgood in the following order of purity: evaluation, potency, and activity. Representative examples of scales heavily loaded on the evaluative factor are "good-bad" and "kind-cruel"; the potency factor included such scales as "hard-soft" and "strong-weak"; for the activity factor, such scales as "fast-slow" and "active-passive" appeared.[10] Together, these three factors accounted for about 50 per cent of the total scale variance.

Briefly, the technique involves requesting subjects to mark scales with respect to verbal concepts with which he is presented. Since numerical values are attached to the scale intervals, both the direction (plus or minus) and the intensity (plus one to three or minus one to three) are determined for each concept on every scale. Osgood et. al. hypothesized that this successive judging by subjects of concepts on a set of scales generates a "semantic space."[11] The connotative meaning of a concept for an in-

---

[10] Osgood, p. 50.

[11] Osgood, p. 25.

dividual is defined as: " . . . that point in the semantic space specified by a series of differentiation judgments,"[12] or in other words, the set of factor scores representing each concept.[13] Thus the Semantic Differential may be regarded as a technique for operationally quantifying connotative meaning.

Researchers in the field of speech and communication have employed the Semantic Differential in several interesting ways. In a recent study, Nebergall defined message clarity as: " . . . the degree that a speaker's intended meaning for a message agrees with the audience's obtained meaning from the same message."[14] The Semantic Differential was used to measure the similarity of meaning between the speaker and his audience. Each communicator was shown an abstract painting and asked to explain his meaning for it "so that anyone hearing your explanation will understand the picture just as you understand it."[15] The messages were recorded and later transcribed into written form. Five audiences of 20 to 25 persons each heard the recorded messages, and similar audiences read the same messages. The results indicated that individuals vary considerably in their ability

---

[12] Osgood, p. 26.

[13] Osgood, p. 87.

[14] Roger E. Nebergall, "An Experimental Investigation of Rhetorical Clarity," Speech Monographs, 25(1958), p. 242.

[15] Nebergall, p. 245.

to convey their intended meanings, and that the written form of the message seemed to be more effective than the recorded form of the message.

Manis used a procedure similar to that of Nebergall. Five undergraduate students wrote short passages explaining their views on (a) fraternities and (b) the University of Pittsburgh;the same students rated each of the message topics on nine scales of the Semantic Differential. Next, the two sets of messages were distributed to two successive undergraduate classes. The students read each message and then predicted how the writer had rated the topic on each of the nine Semantic Differential scales. A positive correlation was found between the transmitters' and receivers' evaluative factors, but not for the potency and activity factors.[16]

Garrett, in an unpublished masters thesis, used the Semantic Differential as a measure of the effect that different speech constructions have on subjects when two speeches are identical in content. Five concepts common to both speeches were judged by subjects before and immediately after hearing one of the speeches. It was found that: "A speech employing relatively greater use of 'figures of speech' and 'vividness' in word choice will produce greater changes in factor scores ... of the Semantic Differential than will a speech in which

---

[16]Melvin Manis,"Assessing Communication with the Semantic Differential," American Journal of Psychology, 72(1959),p. 112.

there is relatively little use of these devices."[17]

Garrett recognized the need for obtaining validating evidence for the Semantic Differential when he wrote:

> The greatest value of the Semantic Differential as a measure of the effects of speeches will not be realized until the relationship of Semantic Differential scores and non-verbal behavior is explored and defined.[18]

There appears to be little evidence presented for the predictive validity of the Semantic Differential in the sense referred to by Garrett. An exception is the 1952 election study reported by Osgood et. al., which used voting behavior as the criterion.[19] Subjects were asked to place themselves in a "for Eisenhower," "for Stevenson," or "don't know" category. The subjects also rated ten political issue concepts and ten political person concepts which were current at that time on ten Semantic Differential scales. The voting behavior of the eighteen "don't know" subjects was predicted from the average evaluative factor score of the "very certain" subjects for both Eisenhower and Stevenson. Fourteen voted as predicted, which was significant at the five per cent level. When the potency factor was combined with the evaluative factor, seventeen of the eighteen voted as

---

[17]Merrill F. Garrett, "Semantic Differential in Measuring Effects of Speeches," (Unpublished Masters Thesis, Montana State University, 1960), p. 94.

[18]Garrett, pp. 94-95.

[19]Osgood et.al., pp. 142-143.

predicted, which was significant at the one per cent level. Addition of the activity factor lowered the total prediction success. Thus to a limited extent, these results support the assumption of Osgood and his associates that there is a predictable relationship between an individual's sets of connotative meanings for certain concepts, as measured by the Semantic Differential, and certain of his overt behaviors. This relationship is essentially what is meant by predictive validity.

Statement of the Problem

The central problem of this thesis is to explore the predictive validity of the Semantic Differential in relation to overt speech behaviors. As the basis of this study, it was assumed that if there is a relationship between connotative meaning and behavior, then there should be a predictable relationship between an individual's overt behavior in a formal speaking situation and his ratings of speech-related concepts on a series of Semantic Differential scales. For this study, two of the many variables associated with speech behavior were chosen as the validating criteria for the Semantic Differential; these behaviors were "stage-fright" and "topic-stand."

The overt behaviors referred to by the generic term "stage-fright" are among the many which have been assumed in the past to be closely associated with past learning experiences, which would presumably determine an individual's

connotations of terms relevant to a speech situation. The term, however, is traditionally vague in its vernacular usage. Clevenger reports that the conventional use of the term signifies the complex "emotional states" normally associated with public speaking.[20] But for the purposes of research, Clevenger writes that a variety of definitions have been employed; each definition has been guided by the common principle of identifying "speech-fright" with specifiable internal or overt subject behavior.[21]

Consistent with the specificity principle cited by Clevenger, the behaviors labeled as "stage-fright" and "topic-stand" in this study were both identified through the use of constructed rating scales. The linguistic stimuli rated on the Semantic Differential scales were either words and phrases related to speech situations or the speech topics which the subjects were later asked to speak on. It might be contended, however, that some types of words and phrases would render the Semantic Differential less a measure of connotation than a self-rating instrument. If this is the case, the type of concepts rated on the Semantic Differential scales might determine the size of the validity coefficients when Semantic Differential scores are correlated with a behavioral criterion. Therefore in this study two categories

---

[20]T. Clevenger, Jr., "A Synthesis of Experimental Research in Stage Fright," A Quarterly Journal of Speech, 45 (1959), p. 135.

[21]Clevenger, pp. 134-135.

of words and phrases, which had been judged a priori to vary in their degree of abstraction, in the sense of "subject-involvement," were rated on Semantic Differential scales. This study is not designed specifically to test the differences, but to explore the possibility that different types of concepts will yield different validity coefficients with the same behavioral criteria.

It is conceivable that a person who rated himself on the Semantic Differential as being "good," "active," and "strong" in a speaking situation would be judged to exhibit few of the behaviors associated with "stage-fright"; that Semantic Differential scores from self-rating phrases would show a greater degree of relation to a person's judged speech tenseness than Semantic Differential scores from phrases of a more abstract nature; that a subject who rated a speech topic as being "good," "active," and "strong" would speak affirmatively for that topic when asked to take a stand on it. Therefore it is hypothesized that there is a positive relationship between subjects' Semantic Differential factor scores with both their judged degree of "stage-fright" and their judged "for" or "against" stand taken with respect to that topic while speaking about it. The following chapter gives a detailed account of the procedures followed to test the above hypothesis.

CHAPTER TWO

PROCEDURE

The purpose of this study was to obtain evidence with respect to the validity of the Semantic Differential in relation to certain restricted overt speech characteristics. As part of the research design, two different sets of concepts were rated by subjects on Semantic Differential scales chosen to represent the three main factors: evaluation, potency, and activity. The first set of concepts named specific speech situations. It was assumed that these phrases referred to situations in which the subjects had either personally participated or in which they had observed others participate. Below are the phrases:

1. you speaking
2. you participating in college debate
3. you introducing a speaker
4. you presenting an oral report before a class
5. you presiding over a meeting
6. you taking the dominant part in a group discussion
7. you lecturing before a large group
8. you giving a political speech

The eight concepts were phrased in such a way as to encourage subjects to regard themselves as personally performing in these situations.

In contrast to the first set of phrases, eight abstract speech concepts were also rated by the subjects on the same Semantic Differential scales. The concepts were chosen to represent some of the fundamentals incorporated in speech

education. Below are the concepts:

1. organization
2. projection
3. pronunciation
4. delivery
5. audience
6. gestures
7. posture
8. speaking performance

Since the data were collected near the end of Spring quarter (1962), the subjects, all members of beginning speech classes, had presumably been formally introduced to the above concepts from class lectures and reading assignments. Rather than responding from the point of view of "self-involvement," as on the first set, it is assumed that on the second set the subjects responded from more of a "conceptual" frame of reference.

Three speech-topic phrases were also rated on the scales. Since the subjects were later assigned to speak on each of the topics, topics were chosen on the basis of their current significance and student interest. The three topics chosen are listed below:

1. varsity sports
2. atom bomb testing
3. federal aid to education

Before considering the specific Semantic Differential scales that were used, it should be emphasized that there is no one "standard" Semantic Differential Form. An experimenter selects the scales to meet his particular experimental conditions. Osgood et. al. state that the ideal set of scales should have the following properties:

> (a) high loading on the factor they represent, (b) high correlation with the other scales representing the same factor, (c) low correlation with scales representing other factors (and hence low loadings on other factors),

and (d) a high degree of stability across the various concepts judged.[22]

No set of scales with these ideal properties has been isolated. Instead, as will be pointed out in more detail below, there seems to be a high degree of concept-scale interaction. The meanings of scales and their factorial loading seem to be dependent upon the specific concepts being judged.[23]

Two recent studies by Smith provide evidence of the concept-scale interaction phenomena. In his first study, Smith chose ten concepts which he felt represented the basic parts of a speech situation. They were: "public speeches," "political speeches," "classroom speeches," "emotional speeches," "reasoning," "persuasion," "audience," "stage-fright," "gestures," and "me as a speaker."[24] The concepts were rated by 100 Indiana University speech students on 29 scales. The data were factor-analyzed, and five factors were identified. Smith labeled the factors as follows: optimism, seriousness, honesty, value, and poise.[25] Smith chose the two scales from each of the five factors which best satisfied the ideal scale criterion of being heavily loaded on the factor the scale measures and minimally loaded on all other factors.

---

[22] Osgood et. al., p. 186.

[23] Osgood et. al., p. 187.

[24] Raymond G. Smith, "Development of A Semantic Differential for Use with Speech Related Concepts," Speech Monographs, 26(1959), p. 266.

[25] Smith, p. 268.

Smith concludes that the resulting ten-scale measuring instrument will be practical in judging a wide variety of speaking performances.[26]

In Smith's second study, ten theatre concepts were rated by 100 speech students on the same 29 scales used in his first study. Once more the data were factor-analyzed, but this time only four factors were identifiable. Smith named the four factors manner (action), seriousness, ethical value, and esthetic value.[27] Smith again chose the purest scales from each factor in an attempt to construct a useful instrument for experimental research in drama.[28] It should be noted that even though the same scales were used in both studies, different factors were isolated in the two factor-analyses. This was presumably because different concepts were rated on the scales.

In an effort to identify scales which would be the most stable across classes of concepts, Osgood conducted a study in which scales were composed from 77 antonyms selected from Roget's Thesaurus.[29] One hundred subjects judged twenty concepts against these scales. In order to sample a wide diversity of concept types, concepts were divided into five categories: Person Concepts, Physical Objects, Abstract

---

[26]Smith, p. 272.

[27]Raymond G. Smith, "A Semantic Differential for Theatre Concepts," Speech Monographs, 28(1961), p. 4.

[28]Smith, p. 8.

[29]Osgood et. al., p. 47.

Concepts, Event Concepts, and Institutions.[30] The three dominant factors of evaluation, potency, and activity were isolated; below are the five scales which had the heaviest loadings on their respective factors.[31]

Evaluative: (1) good-bad (2) harmonious-dissonant (3) successful-unsuccessful (4) beautiful-ugly (5) wise-foolish

Potency: (1) hard-soft (2) masculine-feminine (3) severe-lenient (4) strong-weak (5) tenacious-yielding

Activity: (1) fast-slow (2) active-passive (3) excitable-calm (4) rash-cautious (5) heretical-orthodox

Because the above scales are presently the ones isolated which best satisfy the requirement of having high factor loadings over a variety of concepts, they were selected as being the most appropriate on which to rate the phrases in the present study.

The fact that different factors were isolated in the studies of Osgood and Smith indicates that further research on the varieties of scale-concept interaction is needed to determine specifically the effects it has on subjects' responses. Research of this type is a separate series of experimental studies in itself, but the data from the present study will have indirect bearing on the scale-concept interaction question. If high reliability and validity coefficients result from the data, then evidence is provided that scale-concept interaction is not a determining factor in subject performance.

---

[30] Osgood et. al., p. 49

[31] Osgood et. al., pp. 53-61.

If the data yield low reliability and validity coefficients, then further evidence is provided that the scales representing the three general factors are not applicable to all sets of concepts.

The Semantic Differential form was composed of the 15 scales and 19 concepts discussed above. The test booklet contained 31 pages; on every page there appeared two concepts with five scales beneath each concept. The presentation orders of both the scales and concepts in the test booklet were determined by a table of random numbers. The randomization was done in order to meet Osgood's suggestion to prevent the subjects from acquiring a stable response reference. The most accurate reflection of subjects' connotative meanings are obtained when the scale-concept pairs are presented in an unexpected or unanticipated order. The test booklet, along with the initial instructions, appears in Appendix A.

The subjects were obtained from two Montana State University introductory speech courses. This course is designed to acquaint students with the principles of speech. The classes were composed of twenty-three freshmen, seven sophomores, seven juniors, three seniors, and two students of undetermined class standing. A total of 42 subjects, 8 females and 34 males, participated in the experiment. It was assumed that the varied major fields of study of the students would increase the probability of their associating different connotations with the speech- and topic-concepts. Since the same instructor taught both classes, the course

content and type of instruction were assumed to have been similar for both sets of students.

The Semantic Differential instructions were read aloud to the subjects, who were asked to read the same instructions silently from their own copies of the Semantic Differential booklet. The subjects were then asked to rate the phrases on the scales in their test booklets as they were called out on a tape recorder on which they had previously been recorded. A copy of these instructions follows:

> In order that all of you will mark the scales at the same rate, this tape recorder will call out the sequence and the space at which you are to mark the scales. It is important for you to not work ahead or fall behind. Since there will only be a brief time for each rating, please make your judgments promptly. Remember, mark the scales only as they are called out by the tape recorder. Are there any questions? If not, let's begin.
>
> (Play the tape for 30 seconds; stop the tape and again ask if there are any questions). Then read:
>
> Now that you understand how to mark the scales, there will be no more interruptions. Remember, mark the scales only as they are called out by the tape recorder.

A copy of these instructions appears in Appendix B.

In order to insure that the subjects marked each scale in accordance with their first impressions, the phrases and scales had been taped, with a five-second interval between each phrase and scale. A graduate speech student had served as a reader. The five-second interval was regarded as sufficient time for the subjects to mark the scales, but not enough time for them to "semantically analyze" the phrase-scale combinations. The paced presentation further insured that the subjects would complete their test booklets during the alloted fifty-minute class period.

To obtain an estimate of scale reliability for the Semantic Differential, the scales and concepts on the first page were repeated, but in a different order, as the last page of the booklet. The time interval between the first and last pages represented approximately forty minutes. Since the phrases and scales were called out at the rate of every five seconds, it was assumed that there was small likelihood of the subjects' remembering their scale responses from the first page.

As part of the required course work, each student who had filled out the Semantic Differential booklet scheduled a speaking appointment with the experimenter. When the subject arrived for his time appointment, he was taken into a waiting room and given a data sheet to fill out. A copy of the data sheet appears in Appendix C. The subject was then handed the following instructions, which he was requested to read:

> Your class has been chosen to help assess the effectiveness of a new technique in Speech teaching. The purpose of this session is to provide impromptu speaking experience for you on a variety of topics before an unfamiliar audience. The topics you will speak on are listed below:
>
> 1. Should varsity sports be part of a university system?
> 2. Should the U.S. continue atom bomb testing?
> 3. Should federal aid be provided for college students?
>
> Please talk for one minute expressing your view on each of the topics. At the end of one minute, the chairman will signal you by raising his right hand. At that time please bring your talk to a conclusion. There will be a very brief interval between each of your talks. This procedure will be repeated for each of the three topics.
>
> Since it will be a few minutes before you will speak, you may use this time to think about the topics.

> When you are before the group, the chairman will announce the order in which you are to take up the topics.
>
> Remember, for each topic please talk until the chairman has signaled that a minute has passed, then bring your talk to a conclusion.

A copy of the subjects' instruction sheet appears in Appendix D.

Each speaker gave three one-minute impromptu talks, with a fifteen-second interval between presentations. The experimenter tape-recorded the separate talks of each subject. The only audience for the speakers consisted of the three judges and the experimenter. During the intervals between the speaker's presentations, three judges rated him independently on both a speech-tension and topic-stand scale (explained below). The three judges were graduate teaching assistants in the Speech Department; each had at least two quarters of university speech teaching experience.

The speech-tension scale instructions for the judges stressed the point that there are a variety of overt behaviors usually associated with speech tension; a sample of these behaviors were listed for the judges. Because there are an inordinate number of possible stage-fright behaviors, and because different subjects might more intensely exhibit some of these characteristics than others while speaking, the judges were instructed to regard the listed behaviors as only suggestive. They were told to provide their own "standard" of evaluation from their experience in speech education.

The speech-tension scale was composed of seven intervals, with a descriptive adjectival phrase immediately beneath

each interval. Below is a copy of the speech-tension scale and the instructions for the judges:

> We are assuming that "speech tension" (or "speech fright") may be overtly manifested in a variety of ways. Please rate each speaker for the degree to which speech tension was, in your judgment, characteristic of that speaker for each of his presentations.
>
> A speaker experiencing "speech tension" may be expected to exhibit one or more of the following behaviors: random "non-communicative" activity, such as; trembling, perspiring, hesitancy in speech, awkward postures, restless shifting of feet, nervous hand movements, weak or poor projection, poor eye contact, etc.
>
> These behaviors are to be regarded as only suggestive of some of the observable characteristics that may be associated with "speech tension." We are relying upon you to provide a "standard" or "frame of reference" from your experience in speech education upon which to base your evaluations. Is the speaker exhibiting overt tension all out of proportion to the speaking situation? Or is the speaker markedly calm, cool and nonchalant as he speaks?
>
> After each presentation of the speaker, please rate his <u>overall</u> speech tension by placing a check mark opposite the appropriate description. Please do this for all three topics. The "speech tension" scale is presented below:

Virtually None	A Slight Amount	Less than Average	Average	More than Average	A Marked Amount	An extreme Amount

The judges also rated each subject on a seven-step topic-stand scale immediately after each of the subjects' presentations. The extremes of the scale were defined as "for" or "against," with a descriptive word again beneath each scale interval. Below is a copy of the topic-stand scale and instructions for the judges:

> Speakers may vary as to how strongly they feel "for" or "against" the topic about which they speak. After each presentation of the speaker, please rate the <u>degree</u> to which the speaker expressed a "for" or "against" with respect to the topic by placing a check mark against the

appropriate description. Please do this for each of the three topics. The "topic stand" scale is presented below.

FOR AGAINST

_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
(extremely)	(quite)	(slightly)	(neutral)	(slightly)	(quite)	(extremely)

The combined set of speech-tension and topic-stand instructions for the judges appears in Appendix E. A copy of the judges' rating scale sheet for each speaker appears in Appendix F.

Immediately upon conclusion of each subject's speaking, he was given a self-rating "speech-fright" scale on which he rated himself as to the degree of speech tension he experienced while speaking before the judges. Below is a copy of the scale and instructions for the subjects:

> On the scale below, rate yourself by placing a check mark against the appropriate description indicating the <u>degree</u> of "speech fright" you experienced while speaking <u>before</u> this group:

_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
None	Slight	Mild	Moderate	Considerable	Marked	Extreme

A copy of the subjects' rating scale sheet and instructions appears in Appendix G.

The report of the data analysis is presented in the following chapter.

CHAPTER THREE

RESULTS

An estimate of the interjudge reliability on the speech-tension scale was calculated to determine whether that data was useful. Siegel suggests that the Kendall coefficient of concordance W is an appropriate statistic to calculate interjudge reliability when more than two sets of ranks are correlated.[32] The interjudge W coefficient on the speech-tension scale for 42 subjects yielded a value of .63. The W value of .63 was judged to be not sufficiently high for useful examination of the hypothesis guiding this research. This data appears in Appendix H. Inspection of the speech-tension scales revealed that two of the judges were consistently using the scales in almost identical ways with respect to the same speakers. The third judge marked the scales in the same direction as the other two judges, but consistently used the lower range of scale values. Because of this fact, speakers were retained for further study only if each of the three judges had been in agreement that the speaker was either above or below each judge's median scale value of speech-tension. Twenty-five speakers met the above judge-agreement criterion, and the W interjudge reliability was calculated for those 25 subjects. The calculation resulted in a W value of .90,

---

[32] Sidney Siegel, Nonparametric Statistics, (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1956), p. 229.

which was judged to be satisfactory for the purposes of this study. Data for these calculations appears in Appendix I.

The judges rated each of the speakers' three presentations on a separate topic-stand scale, and W interjudge reliabilities were also calculated for these ratings. The resulting W values were judged as satisfactory; the results are summarized in Table 1. The data for these calculations are in Appendices J, K, and L.

As a means of obtaining a reliability estimate of the Semantic Differential scales, the phrases and scales of the first page of the test booklet were repeated, but in a different order, as the last page of the booklet. The individual scale values of corresponding scales were correlated to obtain the estimates of scale reliability. The Pearson Product Moment Correlation is commonly used in Semantic Differential work, and Osgood presents some evidence that the Semantic Differential scales provide interval measurement, which would support the use of this statistic. However, since the evidence is far from conclusive,[33] the cosine-pi estimate of the tetrachoric correlation[34] was employed rather than the Pearson correlation. According to Tate and Clelland, the Z value is an appropriate approximation to test the significance

---

[33] Osgood et. al., p. 152.

[34] J.P. Guilford, Fundamental Statistics in Psychology and Education, (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1956), p. 305.

Table 1

The Interjudge "Topic Stand" Scale Reliability of the Three Judges for 42 Speakers

Speech Topic	"W" value	"x^2" value
1. Should varsity sports be part of a university system?	.85	104.55*
2. Should the U.S. continue atom bomb testing?	.79	96.68*
3. Should federal aid be provided for college students?	.70	86.1*

*Indicates significance at the five per cent level. A value of "x^2" = 55.76 with 40 degrees of freedom is required for significance at the five per cent level.

of the cosine-pi tetrachoric estimate.[35] Out of the ten scale test-retest correlations, three were not significantly greater than zero. The mean of the test-retest correlations for the ten scales was .56; the results are summarized in Table 2. These reliability coefficients, as reported in Table 2, are clearly low, and will render marginal any inferences drawn from these data.

The sign test[36] was also applied to each of the test-retest scales to determine whether there had been any systematic change in the subjects' markings of the scales. As shown in Table 3, only the first "active-passive" scale provided any indication of a systematic change.

Five scales comprised each of the Semantic Differential factors employed in this study. Osgood recommends that the experimenter average the scale values in order to calculate factor scores, but because of the questionable assumption of interval scale measurement, the median scale value was considered a more appropriate estimate of each factor score. The original data from the Semantic Differential scales and the resulting factor scores for the 25 subjects who had been retained are in Appendix M.

A speech-tension judgment had been made by each judge for each of the three presentations made by every speaker.

---

[35]Merle W. Tate and Richard C. Clelland, Nonparametric and Shortcut Statistics, (Danville, Illinois: Interstate Printers and Publishers, Inc., 1957), p. 77.

[36]Siegel, p. 68.

Table 2

The Tetrachoric Reliability Test-Retest Coefficients for Ten Semantic Differential Scales

Scale	"r_t" value	"z" value
Yielding - Tenacious	.22	.91
Good - Bad	.75	3.06*
Orthodox - Heretical	.56	2.31*
Active - Passive	.35	1.42
Feminine - Masculine	.74	3.05*
Active - Passive	.60	2.44*
Dissonant - Harmonious	.57	2.32*
Wise - Foolish	.75	3.07*
Orthodox - Heretical	.34	1.37
Rash - Cautious	.74	3.05*

*Indicates significance at the five per cent level. A value of "z" = ±1.96 for a two tailed test is required for significance at the five per cent level.

Table 3

The Sign Test Probabilities for the Ten Test-Retest Semantic Differential Scales

Scale	Probability That No Systematic Change Occurred
Yielding - Tenacious	.62
Good - Bad	.19
Orthodox - Heretical	.57
Active - Passive	.001*
Feminine - Masculine	.82
Active - Passive	.44
Dissonant - Harmonious	.69
Wise - Foolish	.17
Orthodox - Heretical	1.00
Rash - Cautious	1.00

*Indicates significance at the five per cent level.

These three speech-tension ratings for each speaker were averaged to yield a mean judgment for each judge with respect to each speaker. The median value of the resulting three means of the judges was used as an estimate of each subjuct's speech tension. These median values are summarized in Appendix N.

Subjects' factor scores from the 19 concepts were correlated with the subjects' respective median speech-tension values. It was assumed that this data reasonably met the assumptions of the cosine-pi estimate of the tetrachoric correlation. A correction for attenuation was employed to the calculated tetrachoric values to obtain an estimate of what the correlation might have been if both variables had been perfectly reliable.

In the first set of concepts, which were the self-rating phrases, only the evaluative factor scores of the phrase "You presenting an oral report before a class" yielded a correlation greater than zero with the speech-tension ratings. But because of questionable categorization in calculating this tetrachoric value, it is quite unlikely that this value really differs from the correlations for the other phrases. These data are summarized in Table 4. None of the activity or potency factor scores of the phrases from the first set of concepts correlated significantly greater than zero with the speech-tension ratings. The data from these correlations are reported in Table 5 and Table 6.

None of the evaluative or potency factor scores of the

Table 4

The Calculated & Corrected Tetrachoric Correlations of the Evaluative Factor Scores with the Speech Tension Ratings for 25 Ss on the First Set of Phrases

Phrase	Calculated "r_t" value	Corrected "r_t" value	"z" value of Corrected r_t
You giving a political speech	-.26	-.36	1.13
You presenting an oral report before a class	.46	.64	2.00*
You lecturing before a large group	-.17	-.24	.76
You introducing a speaker	.04	.05	.17
You presiding over a meeting	.04	.05	.17
You participating in college debate	-.30	-.42	1.32
You taking the dominant part in a group discussion	-.04	-.05	.17
You speaking	-.16	-.22	.70

*Indicates significance at the five per cent level. A value of "z" = 1.96 for a two tailed test is required for significance at the five per cent level.

Table 5

The Calculated & Corrected Tetrachoric Correlations of the Potency Factor Scores with the Speech Tension Ratings for 25 Ss on the First Set of Phrases

Phrase	Calculated "r_t" value	Corrected "r_t" value	"z" value of Corrected r_t
You giving a political speech	.38	.53	1.66
You presenting an oral report before a class	-.07	-.10	.31
You lecturing before a large group	.01	.01	.04
You introducing a speaker	.44	.62	1.95
You presiding over a meeting	.04	.05	.17
You participating in college debate	-.04	-.05	.17
You taking the dominant part in a group discussion	-.33	-.47	1.46
You speaking	.04	.05	.17

A value of "z" = 1.96 for a two tailed test is required for significance at the five per cent level.

Table 6

The Calculated & Corrected Tetrachoric Correlations of the Activity Factor Scores with the Speech Tension Ratings for 25 Ss on the First Set of Phrases

Phrase	Calculated "r_t" value	Corrected "r_t" value	"z" value of Corrected r_t
You giving a political speech	.18	.26	.81
You presenting an oral report before a class	.01	.01	.05
You lecturing before a large group	.22	.31	.96
You introducing a speaker	.28	.40	1.24
You presiding over a meeting	-.05	-.06	.20
You participating in college debate	-.06	-.09	.27
You taking the dominant part in a group discussion	.11	.16	.50
You speaking	.36	.50	1.56

A value of "z" = 1.96 for a two tailed test is required for significance at the five per cent level.

words and phrases from the second set of concepts, which were the abstract speech principles, correlated significantly greater than zero with the speech-tension ratings. The data from these correlations are reported in Tables 7 and 8. Three of the activity factor scores of the words and phrases from the second set of concepts correlated significantly with the speech-tension ratings. The words or phrases were: Speaking performance, Organization, and Gestures. But again, the categorization which resulted in these tetrachoric values is questionable; it is unlikely that the correlations are really significant. These data are summarized in Table 9.

Table 10 summarizes the correlations of each of the factor scores with the topic-stand ratings on each of the three speech-topic phrases. On the first speech-topic phrase, "Federal aid to education," the evaluative and potency factor scores were significantly correlated with the topic-stand ratings; on the second speech-topic, "Varsity sports," only the potency factor scores were significantly correlated with the topic-stand ratings; on the third speech-topic phrase, "Atom bomb testing," none of the factor scores were significantly correlated with the speech-topic phrases. The categorization which resulted in the significant correlations was again questionable.

A tetrachoric correlation was also calculated between the subjects' judged speech-tension ratings and the subjects' own ratings of their speech tension. The resulting value was .07, which was not significant.

Table 7

The Calculated & Corrected Tetrachoric Correlations of the Evaluative Factor Scores with the Speech Tension Ratings for 25 Ss on the Second Set of Concepts

Phrase	Calculated "r_t" value	Corrected "r_t" value	"z" value of Corrected r_t
Posture	.11	.16	.50
Projection	.09	.12	.38
Speaking Performance	-.01	-.01	.04
Organization	.04	.05	.17
Gestures	.07	.10	.31
Pronunciation	.17	.24	.75
Audience	-.06	-.09	.27
Delivery	-.36	-.51	1.58

A value of "z" = 1.96 for a two tailed test is required for significance at the five per cent level.

Table 8

The Calculated & Corrected Tetrachoric Correlations of the Potency Factor Scores with the Speech Tension Ratings for 25 Ss on the Second Set of Concepts

Phrase	Calculated "r_t" value	Corrected "r_t" value	"z" value of Corrected r_t
Posture	.01	.01	.04
Projection	.17	.24	.76
Speaking Performance	-.27	-.37	1.17
Organization	.11	.16	.50
Gestures	-.05	-.06	.20
Pronunciation	.22	.31	.96
Audience	-.33	-.47	1.46
Delivery	.22	.31	.96

A value of "z" = 1.96 for a two tailed test is required for significance at the five per cent level.

Table 9

The Calculated & Corrected Tetrachoric Correlations of the Activity Factor Scores with the Speech Tension Ratings for 25 Ss on the Second Set of Concepts

Phrase	Calculated "r_t" value	Corrected "r_t" value	"z" value of Corrected r_t
Posture	.03	.04	.14
Projection	.36	.50	1.56
Speaking Performance	.46	.64	2.00*
Organization	-.46	-.65	2.02*
Gestures	.69	.97	3.03*
Pronunciation	.17	.24	.76
Audience	.05	.06	.20
Delivery	.04	.05	.17

*Indicates significance at the five per cent level. A value of "z" = 1.96 for a two tailed test is required for significance at the five per cent level.

Table 10

The Calculated & Corrected Tetrachoric Correlations of the Factor Scores with the Topic Stand Ratings for the 25 Ss on the Three Speech Topic Phrases

Phrase	Factor	Calculated "r_t" value	Corrected "r_t" value	"z" value of Corrected r_t
Federal Aid To Education	Evaluative	.68	.98	3.07*
	Potency	-.45	-.65	2.03*
	Activity	-.05	-.07	.20
Varsity Sports	Evaluative	.30	.45	1.41
	Potency	.60	.90	2.81*
	Activity	.28	.43	1.33
Atom Bomb Testing	Evaluative	.21	.34	1.05
	Potency	.33	.53	1.64
	Activity	-.21	-.33	1.04

*Indicates significance at the five per cent level. A value of "z" = 1.96 for a two tailed test is required for significance at the five per cent level.

The results of the data analysis did not support the hypothesis that a positive relationship exists between subjects' Semantic Differential factor scores and both their judged degree of "stage-fright" and their judged "for" or "against" stand taken with respect to a topic while speaking about it. Interpretations of the above results and their implications for further research will be discussed in the next chapter.

CHAPTER FOUR

DISCUSSION

The purpose of this study was to investigate the predictive validity of three Semantic Differential factors in relation to the overt speech behaviors of subjects. It was hypothesized that there would be a positive relation between subjects' factor scores and their judged speech-tension and topic-stand ratings. After the calculated correlation coefficients were corrected for attenuation, the hypothesis was not confirmed. The remainder of this chapter discusses some of the possible interpretations of these findings and some of the implications for further research.

Semantic Differential Reliability

The low test-retest reliability coefficients of the Semantic Differential scales merit discussion. Even though there was a time period of approximately forty minutes between the two test-retest pages, one might suspect that this procedure would yield spuriously high reliabilities. It is possible that subjects would have remembered seeing those concepts on the first page and would thus tend to rate them the same way on the last page. This did not seem to be the case, for the reliabilities ranged from a high of .75 to a low of .22, with a mean value of .56. Despite the fact that these are relatively low coefficients, however, it still might

be the case that they are spuriously high. These findings are consistent with those of Garrett[37] and those of Alexander and Husek,[38] but are in marked contrast to the reliability evidence presented by both Osgood[39] and Smith.[40]

The low reliabilities might be due to the method employed in administering the Semantic Differential to the subjects. Instead of having subjects mark the scales at their own rate, as Osgood and other investigators report having done, the phrases and scales were tape-recorded at five-second intervals. Subjects were instructed to mark the scales only as they were called out by the tape recorder. Presumably this procedure would decrease the opportunity for subjects to "rationalize" the phrase-scale relations. This procedure would be in accord with Osgood's suggestion that subjects' scale responses should be a function of their first impressions, not reflective analyses. But the five-second paced interval might have had an opposite effect; reliability might be dependent on the subjects' having time to think through the phrase-scale relations. Further research is needed to assess the relationship which varied lengths of scale-concept presentations have on reliability.

---

[37]Garrett, pp. 31-34.

[38]Sheldon Alexander and Theodore R. Husek, "The Anxiety Differential: Initial Steps in the Development of a Measure of Situational Anxiety," Educational and Psychological Measurement, 2(1962), p. 328.

[39]Osgood, pp. 126-140.

"Development of a Semantic Differential for
h Related Concepts," Speech Monographs, 26 (1959).

One other procedural modification was employed in this study in the administration of the Semantic Differential. The numbers "3," "2," "1," and "0," have normally been used to identify the scale intervals, with a positive sign attached to the numbers on one side of the scale and a negative sign to the numbers on the other. Subjects have been instructed previously that the words "extremely," "quite," "slightly," and "neutral," respectively, correspond with the above numbers. It is quite possible, however, that while subjects are in the process of marking a set of scales against a group of concepts, they would forget the discriminatory verbal descriptions of each interval. In this case, the resulting uncertainty of the subjects might tend to lower the reliability of the scales. To avoid this possibility, the above descriptive words, rather than numerical labels, were written beneath each scale interval for all the scales employed in the present investigation.

Garrett reported an apparent uncooperativeness on the part of his subjects, which perhaps reflected a low level of interest in the project. The uncooperativeness of Garrett's subjects might explain the low reliabilities of his study. Osgood paid his subjects for their experimental time, which presumably motivated them to cooperate more fully and could plausibly be a reason for the high reliabilities he has reported. Subject motivation did not seem to be a problem in the present study. The class instructor incorporated the experimental procedure as a regular assignment for both of

his classes, and the subjects seemed perfectly willing to cooperate with the experimenter. The subjects' cooperativeness was probably also partially due to the excellent rapport which the instructor appeared to have with his classes. It seems that low motivation for the subjects in the present study was not a contributory factor to the low reliability coefficients. Something else is needed to explain the findings of this investigation.

It was assumed that a practice page, which preceded the first page in the Semantic Differential booklet, provided a warm-up opportunity for subjects to orient themselves to the process of marking the scales. Following this practice page was the first page of the booklet. The fact that this first page was repeated in order to obtain the reliability estimate might have influenced the resulting reliability values. This page might have come too soon for the subjects to have stabilized their scale responses.

In past research with the Semantic Differential, concepts have been presented in relative contextual isolation. Yet it seems clear that connotative significance of words may be expected to vary as a function of their contextual occurrence. When the contextual occurrence of concepts remains unspecified, then no frame of reference is provided from which subjects can base their scale responses. For example, one of the concepts employed in the present study was: "You presenting an oral report before a class." If short paragraphs had been provided which explained the type of people

who made up the class, or the subject matter of the report, or the length of the report, etc., one would predict that a subject would mark the same set of scales differently in each instance. It is possible that in this investigation a contextual shift occurred between the first and last pages of the booklet, which would account for the low reliabilities.

Use of the Semantic Differential assumes that subjects have had some prior meanings associated with the terms employed. There is doubt about this assumption with respect to some of the scales employed in this investigation. It is quite probable that scales like "dissonant-harmonious," "yielding-tenacious," and "heretical-orthodox" included words that were not in the recognition vocabulary of some of the subjects. If this is the case, then one would expect subjects to mark scales heterogeneously at different times.

Although the test-retest reliability values were low, it is possible that the changes in the subjects' markings of the scales from first to last page would reflect a consistent shift in one direction. They might have consistently tended to mark either the higher or the lower scale values from the test to the retest page. The results of the sign test, however, showed that for nine out of the ten test-retest scales, there was no systematic change in the subjects' markings of the scales. They were just as likely to mark a higher scale interval on the second page as they were to mark a lower scale interval.

Interjudge Reliability

The initial speech-tension scale interjudge reliability of .63 indicated only fair agreement among the judges. The judges were graduate students in the Speech Department, and had approximately equivalent amounts of speech teaching experience. One often assumes that individuals in the same profession attach similar significances to the terms employed in that field, but the .63 value suggests that these three individuals tended not to use the term "speech-tension" in the same way. This may be regarded as another example of the need for continued research in the measurement of factors which affect the process of communication. The judges also tended to avoid marking the extremes of the scale, which reduced it to something less than a seven-point instrument. The resulting restricted range of the speech-tension scale would contribute to the low interjudge reliability.

Although incidental to the main purpose of the study, the lack of a significant correlation (.07) between subjects' judged degree of speech-tension and their own ratings of their experienced speech tension is of interest. Assuming the validity of the subjects' ratings, the insignificant correlation suggests that speech teachers might employ a different standard in rating students on speech-tension than the students themselves; students might not be as fearful in a speaking situation as instructors sometimes assume them to be. It might be the case, however, that the subjects tended to err

in the direction of under-rating themselves. Perhaps they did not care to admit publicly the tension which they experienced in a speaking situation. Or it might be the case that alternative forms of objectively measuring speech-tension might be in closer agreement with the subjects' own ratings of their speech-tension.

Basic Correlations

As was pointed out in the Results Chapter, the relationship between speech-tension and topic-stand judgments with factor scores was not essentially different from zero.

The questionable procedure of assigning scale polarities might be one of the reasons that would account for the lack of significant relationship. Scale polarities have typically been assigned on the basis of the experimenter's judgment. A factor score is the mean of the scale values which comprise that factor, and the individual scale values are determined by which of the scale extremes is the "plus end" and which is the "minus end." If subjects' polarity judgments failed to correspond with the preassigned scale polarities, then the resulting factor scores would not be based on scales having homogeneity of polarity. It is doubtful that the resulting factor scores would be accurate reflections on subjects' connotative meanings for the concepts judged on those scales. Until an independent operation of assigning polarities is available, the interpretation of the factor scores from any Semantic Differential study would appear to be in

some doubt.

The evidence so far presented by Osgood et. al. for regarding the Semantic Differential scales as equal interval scales was judged not sufficient to justify the use of a parametric correlation in this study.[41] Instead, the non-parametric tetrachoric r was employed to calculate the basic correlations between the judgments and factor scores. According to Guilford,[42] when both variables are continuous, normally distributed, and linearly related, then the cosine-pi estimate of the tetrachoric r may be appropriately applied to the data. It may be reasonably assumed that the Semantic Differential, speech-tension, and topic-stand scales do each lie along a continuum, with one extreme representing a strong positive judgment and the other extreme representing a strong negative judgment. In relation to the normality assumption, Guilford states:

> If a continuum is granted, the general law of unimodal distribution approaching normality in psychological traits may be cited in defense of the other requirement.[43]

No supporting evidence can be cited in defense of the linearity assumption; nor is there any indication of its failure. Another of the requirements of the tetrachoric r is that the two variables are to be dichotomized at the medians, or at least within the limits of the 40th and the 60th per-

---

[41] Osgood et.al., p. 152.

[42] Guilford, p. 305.

[43] Guilford, p. 306.

centiles. If the variables do not fall within these limits, then the tetrachoric r value is over-estimated. The seven out of 57 correlations which were significant did not meet this categorization requirement, but several of these seven coefficients failed to meet it by only a small margin. Interpreting these coefficients as significant, however, would be highly questionable.

A comment concerning an inconsistency in statistical operations is relevant to the nonparametric techniques employed in this study. A mean speech-tension value was calculated for each judge with respect to each speaker, and then the median value of the resulting three means of the judges was used as an estimate of each speaker's speech-tension. To have been consistent with the previous nonparametric operations, a median speech-tension value for each judge with respect to each speaker would have been calculated, and then the median value of the resulting three medians of the judges would have been used as an estimate of each speaker's speech-tension. The rationale which supported the initial use of the mean was the assumption that each judge was making his evaluations from a constant subjective frame of reference, but that the judges' frames of reference were not necessarily similar, nor were the differentiating steps of each judge's ratings equal in size to those of the other judges. But the judges tended to use only the mid-range of the speech-tension scales, and therefore the use of the mean probably resulted in little if any difference to the result-

ing speech-tension scores.

The fact that the speech-tension judgments tended to fall within the mid-range of the scale intervals deserves further comment. According to Guilford, it is often the case that judges use only the middle range of rating scales.[44] It might be the case in this investigation, however, that extremes of speech-tension were not present; none of the subjects displayed high speech-tension, but some speech-tension was observable and thus the judges avoided the low end of the scale. The initial instructions handed to the speakers might be related to this lack in extremes of speech-tension. The instructions informed the subjects of the nature and purpose of the speaking situation, and gave them a few minutes to think about the topics they were to speak on. The subjects' ability to predict the coming events might therefore have made them less tense outwardly while speaking before the judges. If the subjects had been brought into the speaking room without any prior information and abruptly given the topics they were to speak about, their visible speech-tension might have been more apparent.

It was suggested in Chapter One that the wording of concepts which dealt in one way or another with the act of public speaking might be a determining factor in how subjects respond to the Semantic Differential scales. To explore this possibility, two categories of speech concepts were employed

---

[44] J.P. Guilford, Psychometric Methods, (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1954), p. 278.

in the present study. Concepts in the first category were phrased in a manner that described subjects in various speaking situations, and for this reason were regarded as self-rating concepts. Concepts in the second category, because they were comprised of single words which dealt with some of the fundamentals of public speaking, were regarded to be of a relatively abstract nature. Although none of the correlations from either of the two categories of concepts were significant, a distinguishable trend was suggested by the data. Assuming that a more reliable technique could be devised for measuring connotative meaning than was employed in the present investigation, and further assuming that the correlation coefficients were significantly different from zero, there is a suggestion that the self-rating phrases might tend to yield the higher correlation values.

In Chapter Two, mention was made of a possible concept-scale interaction phenomena. According to Osgood, this phenomena refers to the fact that scales do not always maintain the same intercorrelations with other scales when they are judged against different sets of concepts.[45] Osgood et. al. have consistently identified the same three general factors in their research, but these factors have not always been represented by the same scales. In Smith's two factor-analytic studies, he identified essentially the same factors as Osgood had, although in both of Smith's studies, the factors were represented by different sets of scales. Because

---

[45]Osgood et. al., p. 176.

of this fact, Smith concluded that a separate factor-analysis is required to select the scales most suited for a particular class of concepts. It might be the case that if a different set of scales had been employed in the present study, a higher degree of relationship would have been indicated between the judgments and factor scores.

Assuming that the Semantic Differential is an accurate measure of the sense of connotative meaning as developed in Chapter One, then an obvious possible explanation for the insignificant validity coefficients is that the hypothesis derived from the line of speculation in Chapter One is not true. The assertion that there is a predictable relationship between an individual's connotative meanings and his overt behavior may have no factual foundation. It is the opinion of this experimenter, however, that the procedure employed to test the hypothesis is presently inadequate. Only a continuing research effort will provide the evidence to answer this question.

CHAPTER FIVE

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

The recently developed Semantic Differential was reviewed as a possible technique for measuring the connotative meanings which individuals have for various verbal stimuli. It was hypothesized that there is a relationship between individuals' connotative meanings as measured by the Semantic Differential and their nonverbal behavior, specifically, manifest speech-tension. The central problem of this thesis was to test this hypothesis.

Students from two beginning speech classes were administered a Semantic Differential form composed of scales representing the three factors: evaluation, potency, and activity. The concepts rated on these scales were selected to represent three general categories. The first category was regarded to be of a self-rating nature; the second category dealt with some of the principles of public speaking; the third category consisted of speech topics, about which subjects were later required to speak. Subjects' factor scores for the concepts were calculated. The same subjects later gave three one-minute impromptu talks which were judged by three independent judges on both a seven-step speech-tension scale and a seven-step topic-stand scale. A median speech-tension and topic-stand score for each subject was obtained. The cosine-pi estimate of the tetrachoric r was employed to

assess the relationship between subjects' Semantic Differential factor scores and their judged speech-tension and topic-stand ratings. The following tenative conclusions are suggested by the data:

(1) Under the conditions of this study, the hypothesized relation between connotative meanings for speech related concepts and speech-tension was not confirmed.

(2) As employed in this investigation, the Semantic Differential failed to provide suitable scale reliabilities.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Alexander, Sheldon and Husek, Theodore R. "The Anxiety Differential: Initial Steps in the Development of a Measure of Situational Anxiety," Educational and Psychological Measurement, 29 (1962).

Berlo, David K. The Process of Communication. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1960.

Bridgman, P.W. The Way Things Are. Cambridge: Harvard University, 1959.

Clevenger, T., Jr. "A Synthesis of Experimental Research in Stage Fright," Quarterly Journal of Speech, 45 (1959).

Garrett, Merrill F. "Semantic Differential in Measuring Effects of Speeches." Unpublished M.A. thesis, Montana State University, Missoula, 1960.

Gray, G.W. and Wise, C.M. The Bases of Speech. Third edition. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1959.

Guilford, J.P. Psychometric Methods. Second edition. New York: McGraw-Hill, Inc., 1954.

_____. Fundamental Statistics in Psychology and Education. New York: McGraw-Hill, Inc., 1956.

Manis, Melvin. "Assessing Communication with the Semantic Differential," American Journal of Psychology, 72 (1959).

Miller, George A. Language and Communication. New York: McGraw-Hill, Inc., 1951.

Morris, Charles W. Foundations of the Theory of Signs. Chicago: University of Chicago, 1938.

Nebergall, Roger E. "An Experimental Investigation of Rhetorical Clarity," Speech Monographs, 25 (1958).

Ogden, C.K. and Richards, I.A. The Meaning of Meaning. New York: Harcourt, Brace, and Company, 1956.

Osgood, Charles E., Suci, George J., and Tannebaum, Percy H. The Measurement of Meaning. Urbana: University of Illinois, 1957.

Siegel, Sidney. Nonparametric Statistics. New York: McGraw-Hill, Inc., 1956.

Smith, Raymond G. "Development of A Semantic Differential for Use with Speech Related Concepts," Speech Monographs, 26 (1959).

Smith, Raymond G. "A Semantic Differential for Theatre Concepts," Speech Monographs, 28 (1961).

Stevens, S.S. "A Definition of Communication," Journal of the Acoustical Society of America, 22 (1950).

Tate, Merle W. and Clelland, Richard C. Nonparametric and Shortcut Statistics. Danville, Illinois: Interstate Printers and Publishers, Inc., 1957.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

The Initial Semantic Differential

Instructions and Test Booklet

INSTRUCTIONS

The purpose of this study is to investigate the meanings which people have for various words and phrases. We would particularly like to know what meanings you feel these words and phrases have for you; so in marking the following scales, its is important to make your judgments solely on the basis of what these things mean to you.

On each page of this booklet you will find a different word or phrase and beneath it several scales. You are to rate the word or phrase on each of the scales in order. For example, consider the word AUTOMOBILE and the scale WISE-FOOLISH. If you feel the word automobile is EXTREMELY RELATED to the wise end or EXTREMELY RELATED to the foolish end of the scale, place your check mark as follows,

WISE ___X___ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ FOOLISH
(extremely)

or

WISE _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : ___X___ FOOLISH
(extremely)

If you think the word AUTOMOBILE is QUITE RELATED to the wise end or QUITE RELATED to the foolish end of the scale, place your check mark as follows,

WISE _____ : ___X___ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ FOOLISH
(quite)

or

WISE _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : ___X___ : _____ FOOLISH
(quite)

If the word AUTOMOBILE seems only SLIGHTLY RELATED to the wise end or SLIGHTLY RELATED to the foolish end of the scale, place your check mark as follows,

WISE _____ : _____ : ___X___ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ FOOLISH
(slightly)

or

WISE _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : ___X___ : _____ : _____ FOOLISH
(slightly)

Remember, the direction toward which you check depends on which of the two sides of the scale seems most characteristic of the word or phrase you're rating.

If you consider the word AUTOMOBILE to be NEUTRAL on the scale (both sides equally associated with the word or phrases) or if the scale is completely IRRELEVANT (unrelated to your feelings for the word or phrase), then place your check mark in the middle space,

WISE _____ : _____ : _____ : ___X___ : _____ : _____ : _____ FOOLISH
(neutral)

IMPORTANT: (1) Place your check marks in the middle of the spaces, not on the boundaries;

this
X : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____

not this
_____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ X _____ : _____

(2) Be sure to check every scale for each word or phrase.

(3) Never check more than once for each scale.

Here is a short example to work. The phrase to be rate is:

ECONOMIC AID TO FOREIGN COUNTRIES

The first scale is: LARGE - SMALL

LARGE _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ SMALL
(extremely) (quite) (slightly) (neutral) (slightly) (quite) (extremely)

Make your check mark according to the meaning which this phrase has for you; is it EXTREMELY RELATED, QUITE RELATED, SLIGHTLY RELATED or NEUTRAL on this scale?

The second scale for the same phrase is: GOOD - BAD

GOOD _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ BAD
(extremely) (quite) (slightly) (neutral) (slightly) (quite) (extremely)

The third scale for the same phrase is:

STATIC _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ DYNAMIC
(extremely) (quite) (slightly) (neutral) (slightly) (quite) (extremely)

Make your check according to your meaning for this phrase on this scale.

Before you begin there are some additional things you should know.

The purpose of this study is to investigate the meanings which people have for various words and phrases. We would particularly like to know what meanings you feel these words and phrases have for you; so in marking the scales it is important to make your judgments solely on the basis of what these things mean to you.

Do not worry or puzzle over individual items. There are no "right" answers. It is your first impressions, the immediate "feelings" about the items that we want. On the other hand, we ask you to be as careful and as discriminative in your use of the points on each scale as you can, since we want as true and accurate a picture of these meanings as possible.

THE UNITED NATIONS

GOOD _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ BAD
(extremely) (quite) (slightly) (neutral) (slightly) (quite) (extremely)

STRONG _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ WEAK
(extremely) (quite) (slightly) (neutral) (slightly) (quite) (extremely)

RASH _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ CAUTIOUS
(extremely) (quite) (slightly) (neutral) (slightly) (quite) (extremely)

HARD _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ SOFT
(extremely) (quite) (slightly) (neutral) (slightly) (quite) (extremely)

WISE _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ FOOLISH
(extremely) (quite) (slightly) (neutral) (slightly) (quite) (extremely)

PSYCHOLOGY

HARMONIOUS _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ DISSONANT
(extremely) (quite) (slightly) (neutral) (slightly) (quite) (extremely)

SEVERE _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ LENIENT
(extremely) (quite) (slightly) (neutral) (slightly) (quite) (extremely)

ACTIVE _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ PASSIVE
(extremely) (quite) (slightly) (neutral) (slightly) (quite) (extremely)

BEAUTIFUL _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ UGLY
(extremely) (quite) (slightly) (neutral) (slightly) (quite) (extremely)

HERETICAL _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ ORTHODOX
(extremely) (quite) (slightly) (neutral) (slightly) (quite) (extremely)

YOU GIVING A POLITICAL SPEECH

RASH _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ CAUTIOUS
(extremely) (quite) (slightly) (neutral) (slightly) (quite) (extremely)

ORTHODOX _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ HERETICAL
(extremely) (quite) (slightly) (neutral) (slightly) (quite) (extremely)

WISE _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ FOOLISH
(extremely) (quite) (slightly) (neutral) (slightly) (quite) (extremely)

DISSONANT _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ HARMONIOUS
(extremely) (quite) (slightly) (neutral) (slightly) (quite) (extremely)

ACTIVE _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ PASSIVE
(extremely) (quite) (slightly) (neutral) (slightly) (quite) (extremely)

YOU PRESENTING AN ORAL REPORT BEFORE A CLASS

FEMININE _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ MASCULINE
(extremely) (quite) (slightly) (neutral) (slightly) (quite) (extremely)

ACTIVE _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ PASSIVE
(extremely) (quite) (slightly) (neutral) (slightly) (quite) (extremely)

ORTHODOX _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ HERETICAL
(extremely) (quite) (slightly) (neutral) (slightly) (quite) (extremely)

GOOD _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ BAD
(extremely) (quite) (slightly) (neutral) (slightly) (quite) (extremely)

YIELDING _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ TENACIOUS
(extremely) (quite) (slightly) (neutral) (slightly) (quite) (extremely)

YOU LECTURING BEFORE A LARGE GROUP

BEAUTIFUL	_____ (extremely)	_____ (quite)	_____ (slightly)	_____ (neutral)	_____ (slightly)	_____ (quite)	_____ (extremely)	UGLY
WEAK	_____ (extremely)	_____ (quite)	_____ (slightly)	_____ (neutral)	_____ (slightly)	_____ (quite)	_____ (extremely)	STRONG
FAST	_____ (extremely)	_____ (quite)	_____ (slightly)	_____ (neutral)	_____ (slightly)	_____ (quite)	_____ (extremely)	SLOW
DISSONANT	_____ (extremely)	_____ (quite)	_____ (slightly)	_____ (neutral)	_____ (slightly)	_____ (quite)	_____ (extremely)	HARMONIOUS
HERETICAL	_____ (extremely)	_____ (quite)	_____ (slightly)	_____ (neutral)	_____ (slightly)	_____ (quite)	_____ (extremely)	ORTHODOX

FEDERAL AID TO EDUCATION

PASSIVE	_____ (extremely)	_____ (quite)	_____ (slightly)	_____ (neutral)	_____ (slightly)	_____ (quite)	_____ (extremely)	ACTIVE
SEVERE	_____ (extremely)	_____ (quite)	_____ (slightly)	_____ (neutral)	_____ (slightly)	_____ (quite)	_____ (extremely)	LENIENT
SLOW	_____ (extremely)	_____ (quite)	_____ (slightly)	_____ (neutral)	_____ (slightly)	_____ (quite)	_____ (extremely)	FAST
BEAUTIFUL	_____ (extremely)	_____ (quite)	_____ (slightly)	_____ (neutral)	_____ (slightly)	_____ (quite)	_____ (extremely)	UGLY
CALM	_____ (extremely)	_____ (quite)	_____ (slightly)	_____ (neutral)	_____ (slightly)	_____ (quite)	_____ (extremely)	EXCITABLE

YOU LECTURING BEFORE A LARGE GROUP

EXCITABLE _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ CALM
(extremely) (quite) (slightly) (neutral) (slightly) (quite) (extremely)

BAD _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ GOOD
(extremely) (quite) (slightly) (neutral) (slightly) (quite) (extremely)

RASH _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ CAUTIOUS
(extremely) (quite) (slightly) (neutral) (slightly) (quite) (extremely)

LENIENT _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ SEVERE
(extremely) (quite) (slightly) (neutral) (slightly) (quite) (extremely)

TENACIOUS _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ YIELDING
(extremely) (quite) (slightly) (neutral) (slightly) (quite) (extremely)

POSTURE

UNSUCCESSFUL _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ SUCCESSFUL
(extremely) (quite) (slightly) (neutral) (slightly) (quite) (extremely)

EXCITABLE _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ CALM
(extremely) (quite) (slightly) (neutral) (slightly) (quite) (extremely)

BAD _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ GOOD
(extremely) (quite) (slightly) (neutral) (slightly) (quite) (extremely)

WISE _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ FOOLISH
(extremely) (quite) (slightly) (neutral) (slightly) (quite) (extremely)

WEAK _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ STRONG
(extremely) (quite) (slightly) (neutral) (slightly) (quite) (extremely)

YOU GIVING A POLITICAL SPEECH

RONG _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ WEAK
(extremely) (quite) (slightly) (neutral) (slightly) (quite) (extremely)

FT _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ HARD
(extremely) (quite) (slightly) (neutral) (slightly) (quite) (extremely)

VERE _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ LENIENT
(extremely) (quite) (slightly) (neutral) (slightly) (quite) (extremely)

LY _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ BEAUTIFUL
(extremely) (quite) (slightly) (neutral) (slightly) (quite) (extremely)

ST _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ SLOW
(extremely) (quite) (slightly) (neutral) (slightly) (quite) (extremely)

:

YOU INTRODUCING A SPEAKER

NIENT _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ SEVERE
(extremely) (quite) (slightly) (neutral) (slightly) (quite) (extremely)

CCESSFUL _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ UNSUCCESSFUL
(extremely) (quite) (slightly) (neutral) (slightly) (quite) (extremely)

LM _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ EXCITABLE
(extremely) (quite) (slightly) (neutral) (slightly) (quite) (extremely)

RONG _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ WEAK
(extremely) (quite) (slightly) (neutal) (slightly) (quite) (extremely)

FT _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ HARD
(extremely) (quite) (slightly) (neutral) (slightly) (quite) (extremely)

VARSITY SPORTS

)D _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ BAD
(extremely) (quite) (slightly) (neutral) (slightly) (quite) (extremely)

SUCCESSFUL _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ SUCCESSFUL
(extremely) (quite) (slightly) (neutral) (slightly) (quite) (extremely)

ERE _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ LENIENT
(extremely) (quite) (slightly) (neutral) (slightly) (quite) (extremely)

SONANT _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ HARMONIOUS
(extremely) (quite) (slightly) (neutral) (slightly) (quite) (extremely)

E _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ FOOLISH
(extremely) (quite) (slightly) (neutral) (slightly) (quite) (extremely)

YOU PRESIDING OVER A MEETING

HODOX _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ HERETICAL
(extremely) (quite) (slightly) (neutral) (slightly) (quite) (extremely)

ACIOUS _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ YIELDING
(extremely) (quite) (slightly) (neutral) (slightly) (quite) (extremely)

SIVE _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ ACTIVE
(extremely) (quite) (slightly) (neutral) (slightly) (quite) (extremely)

ERE _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ LENIENT
(extremely) (quite) (slightly) (neutral) (slightly) (quite) (extremely)

Y _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ BEAUTIFUL
(extremely) (quite) (slightly) (neutral) (slightly) (quite) (extremely)

PROJECTION

AUTIFUL _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ UGLY
(extremely) (quite) (slightly) (neutral) (slightly) (quite) (extremely)

) _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ GOOD
(extremely) (quite) (slightly) (neutral) (slightly) (quite) (extremely)

RD _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ SOFT
(extremely) (quite) (slightly) (neutral) (slightly) (quite) (extremely)

ELDING _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ TENACIOUS
(extremely) (quite) (slightly) (neutral) (slightly) (quite) (extremely)

SE _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ FOOLISH
(extremely) (quite) (slightly) (neutral) (slightly) (quite) (extremely)

YOU PARTICIPATING IN COLLEGE DEBATE

) _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ GOOD
(extremely) (quite) (slightly) (neutral) (slightly) (quite) (extremely)

IACIOUS _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ YIELDING
(extremely) (quite) (slightly) (neutral) (slightly) (quite) (extremely)

IINE _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ MASCULINE
(extremely) (quite) (slightly) (neutral) (slightly) (quite) (extremely)

CESSFUL _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ UNSUCCESSFUL
(extremely) (quite) (slightly) (neutral) (slightly) (quite) (extremely)

Y _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ BEAUTIFUL
(extremely) (quite) (slightly) (neutral) (slightly) (quite) (extremely)

VARSITY SPORTS

ASCULINE _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ FEMININE
(extremely) (quite) (slightly) (neutral) (slightly) (quite) (extremely)

ASSIVE _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ ACTIVE
(extremely) (quite) (slightly) (neutral) (slightly) (quite) (extremely)

NACIOUS _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ YIELDING
(extremely) (quite) (slightly) (neutral) (slightly) (quite) (extremely)

LY _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ BEAUTIFUL
(extremely) (quite) (slightly) (neutral) (slightly) (quite) (extremely)

CITABLE _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ CALM
(extremely) (quite) (slightly) (neutral) (slightly) (quite) (extremely)

SPEAKING PERFORMANCE

AK _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ STRONG
(extremely) (quite) (slightly) (neutral) (slightly) (quite) (extremely)

SE _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ FOOLISH
(extremely) (quite) (slightly) (neutral) (slightly) (quite) (extremely)

MININE _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ MASCULINE
(extremely) (quite) (slightly) (neutral) (slightly) (quite) (extremely)

RMONIOUS _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ DISSONANT
(extremely) (quite) (slightly) (neutral) (slightly) (quite) (extremely)

UTIOUS _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ RASH
(extremely) (quite) (slightly) (neutral) (slightly) (quite) (extremely)

PROJECTION

ERE _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ LENIENT
(extremely) (quite) (slightly) (neutral) (slightly) (quite) (extremely)

SIVE _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ ACTIVE
(extremely) (quite) (slightly) (neutral) (slightly) (quite) (extremely)

T _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ SLOW
(extremely) (quite) (slightly) (neutral) (slightly) (quite) (extremely)

K _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ STRONG
(extremely) (quite) (slightly) (neutral) (slightly) (quite) (extremely)

ETICAL _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ ORTHODOX
(extremely) (quite) (slightly) (neutral) (slightly) (quite) (extremely)

ORGANIZATION

M _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ EXCITABLE
(extremely) (quite) (slightly) (neutral) (slightly) (quite) (extremely)

ERE _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ LENIENT
(extremely) (quite) (slightly) (neutral) (slightly) (quite) (extremely)

T _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ HARD
(extremely) (quite) (slightly) (neutral) (slightly) (quite) (extremely)

MONIOUS _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ DISSONANT
(extremely) (quite) (slightly) (neutral) (slightly) (quite) (extremely)

_____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ BEAUTIFUL
(extremely) (quite) (slightly) (neutral) (slightly) (quite) (extremely)

GESTURES

RETICAL _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ ORTHODOX
(extremely) (quite) (slightly) (neutral) (slightly) (quite) (extremely)

LM _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ EXCITABLE
(extremely) (quite) (slightly) (neutral) (slightly) (quite) (extremely)

RONG _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ WEAK
(extremely) (quite) (slightly) (neutral) (slightly) (quite) (extremely)

NIENT _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ SEVERE
(extremely) (quite) (slightly) (neutral) (slightly) (quite) (extremely)

TIVE _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ PASSIVE
(extremely) (quite) (slightly) (neutral) (slightly) (quite) (extremely)

YOU PRESENTING AN ORAL REPORT BEFORE A CLASS

FT _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ HARD
(extremely) (quite) (slightly) (neutral) (slightly) (quite) (extremely)

AUTIFUL _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ UGLY
(extremely) (quite) (slightly) (neutral) (slightly) (quite) (extremely)

OLISH _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ WISE
(extremely) (quite) (slightly) (neutral) (slightly) (quite) (extremely)

RONG _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ WEAK
(extremely) (quite) (slightly) (neutral) (slightly) (quite) (extremely)

UTIOUS _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ RASH
(extremely) (quite) (slightly) (neutral) (slightly) (quite) (extremely)

YOU PARTICIPATING IN COLLEGE DEBATE

ɔITABLE _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ CALM
(extremely) (quite) (slightly) (neutral) (slightly) (quite) (extremely)

NIENT _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ SEVERE
(extremely) (quite) (slightly) (neutral) (slightly) (quite) (extremely)

RD _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ SOFT
(extremely) (quite) (slightly) (neutral) (slightly) (quite) (extremely)

SSONANT _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ HARMONIOUS
(extremely) (quite) (slightly) (neutral) (slightly) (quite) (extremely)

RONG _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ WEAK
(extremely) (quite) (slightly) (neutral) (slightly) (quite) (extremely)

FEDERAL AID TO EDUCATION

LDING _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ TENACIOUS
(extremely) (quite) (slightly) (neutral) (slightly) (quite) (extremely)

E _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ FOOLISH
(extremely) (quite) (slightly) (neutral) (slightly) (quite) (extremely)

UCCESSFUL _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ SUCCESSFUL
(extremely) (quite) (slightly) (neutral) (slightly) (quite) (extremely)

D _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ BAD
(extremely) (quite) (slightly) (neutral) (slightly) (quite) (extremely)

K _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ STRONG
(extremely) (quite) (slightly) (neutral) (slightly) (quite) (extremely)

YOU TAKING THE DOMINANT PART IN A GROUP DISCUSSION

ASCULINE _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ FEMININE
(extremely) (quite) (slightly) (neutral) (slightly) (quite) (extremely)

ALM _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ EXCITABLE
(extremely) (quite) (slightly) (neutral) (slightly) (quite) (extremely)

ARMONIOUS _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ DISSONANT
(extremely) (quite) (slightly) (neutral) (slightly) (quite) (extremely)

ATHODOX _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ HERETICAL
(extremely) (quite) (slightly) (neutral) (slightly) (quite) (extremely)

TRONG _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ WEAK
(extremely) (quite) (slightly) (neutral) (slightly) (quite) (extremely)

YOU PRESIDING OVER A MEETING

ALM _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ EXCITABLE
(extremely) (quite) (slightly) (neutral) (slightly) (quite) (extremely)

ASCULINE _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ FEMININE
(extremely) (quite) (slightly) (neutral) (slightly) (quite) (extremely)

AFT _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ HARD
(extremely) (quite) (slightly) (neutral) (slightly) (quite) (extremely)

ARMONIOUS _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ DISSONANT
(extremely) (quite) (slightly) (neutral) (slightly) (quite) (extremely)

SLOW _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ FAST
(extremely) (quite) (slightly) (neutral) (slightly) (quite) (extremely)

POSTURE

ACIOUS	(extremely)	(quite)	(slightly)	(neutral)	(slightly)	(quite)	(extremely)	YIELDING
SIVE	(extremely)	(quite)	(slightly)	(neutral)	(slightly)	(quite)	(extremely)	ACTIVE
UTIFUL	(extremely)	(quite)	(slightly)	(neutral)	(slightly)	(quite)	(extremely)	UGLY
SONANT	(extremely)	(quite)	(slightly)	(neutral)	(slightly)	(quite)	(extremely)	HARMONIOUS
CULINE	(extremely)	(quite)	(slightly)	(neutral)	(slightly)	(quite)	(extremely)	FEMININE

YOU PRESENTING AN ORAL REPORT BEFORE A CLASS

IENT	(extremely)	(quite)	(slightly)	(neutral)	(slightly)	(quite)	(extremely)	SEVERE
CESSFUL	(extremely)	(quite)	(slightly)	(neutral)	(slightly)	(quite)	(extremely)	UNSUCCESSFUL
M	(extremely)	(quite)	(slightly)	(neutral)	(slightly)	(quite)	(extremely)	EXCITABLE
T	(extremely)	(quite)	(slightly)	(neutral)	(slightly)	(quite)	(extremely)	SLOW
SONANT	(extremely)	(quite)	(slightly)	(neutral)	(slightly)	(quite)	(extremely)	HARMONIOUS

YOU PRESIDING OVER A MEETING

OD _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ BAD
(extremely) (quite) (slightly) (neutral) (slightly) (quite) (extremely)

UTIOUS _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ RASH
(extremely) (quite) (slightly) (neutral) (slightly) (quite) (extremely)

CCESSFUL _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ UNSUCCESSFUL
(extremely) (quite) (slightly) (neutral) (slightly) (quite) (extremely)

OLISH _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ WISE
(extremely) (quite) (slightly) (neutral) (slightly) (quite) (extremely)

RONG _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ WEAK
(extremely) (quite) (slightly) (neutral) (slightly) (quite) (extremely)

PRONUNCIATION

FT _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ HARD
(extremely) (quite) (slightly) (neutral) (slightly) (quite) (extremely)

MONIOUS _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ DISSONANT
(extremely) (quite) (slightly) (neutral) (slightly) (quite) (extremely)

AK _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ STRONG
(extremely) (quite) (slightly) (neutral) (slightly) (quite) (extremely)

ITABLE _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ CALM
(extremely) (quite) (slightly) (neutral) (slightly) (quite) (extremely)

THODOX _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ HERETICAL
(extremely) (quite) (slightly) (neutral) (slightly) (quite) (extremely)

AUDIENCE

FEMININE ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ MASCULINE
(extremely) (quite) (slightly) (neutral) (slightly) (quite) (extremely)

EXCITABLE ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ CALM
(extremely) (quite) (slightly) (neutral) (slightly) (quite) (extremely)

DISSONANT ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ HARMONIOUS
(extremely) (quite) (slightly) (neutral) (slightly) (quite) (extremely)

FAST ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ SLOW
(extremely) (quite) (slightly) (neutral) (slightly) (quite) (extremely)

CAUTIOUS ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ RASH
(extremely) (quite) (slightly) (neutral) (slightly) (quite) (extremely)

DELIVERY

HARD ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ SOFT
(extremely) (quite) (slightly) (neutral) (slightly) (quite) (extremely)

CALM ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ EXCITABLE
(extremely) (quite) (slightly) (neutral) (slightly) (quite) (extremely)

HERETICAL ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ ORTHODOX
(extremely) (quite) (slightly) (neutral) (slightly) (quite) (extremely)

FEMININE ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ MASCULINE
(extremely) (quite) (slightly) (neutral) (slightly) (quite) (extremely)

ACTIVE ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ PASSIVE
(extremely) (quite) (slightly) (neutral) (slightly) (quite) (extremely)

YOU SPEAKING

SLOW _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ FAST
(extremely) (quite) (slightly) (neutral) (slightly) (quite) (extremely)

MASCULINE _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ FEMININE
(extremely) (quite) (slightly) (neutral) (slightly) (quite) (extremely)

DISSONANT _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ HARMONIOUS
(extremely) (quite) (slightly) (neutral) (slightly) (quite) (extremely)

ACTIVE _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ PASSIVE
(extremely) (quite) (slightly) (neutral) (slightly) (quite) (extremely)

WEAK _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ STRONG
(extremely) (quite) (slightly) (neutral) (slightly) (quite) (extremely)

PRONUNCIATION

RASH _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ CAUTIOUS
(extremely) (quite) (slightly) (neutral) (slightly) (quite) (extremely)

PASSIVE _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ ACTIVE
(extremely) (quite) (slightly) (neutral) (slightly) (quite) (extremely)

SEVERE _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ LENIENT
(extremely) (quite) (slightly) (neutral) (slightly) (quite) (extremely)

FOOLISH _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ WISE
(extremely) (quite) (slightly) (neutral) (slightly) (quite) (extremely)

BEAUTIFUL _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ UGLY
(extremely) (quite) (slightly) (neutral) (slightly) (quite) (extremely)

SPEAKING PERFORMANCE

SUCCESSFUL _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ SUCCESSFUL
(extremely) (quite) (slightly) (neutral) (slightly) (quite) (extremely)

RETICAL _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ ORTHODOX
(extremely) (quite) (slightly) (neutral) (slightly) (quite) (extremely)

ELDING _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ TENACIOUS
(extremely) (quite) (slightly) (neutral) (slightly) (quite) (extremely)

ST _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ SLOW
(extremely) (quite) (slightly) (neutral) (slightly) (quite) (extremely)

LM _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ EXCITABLE
(extremely) (quite) (slightly) (neutral) (slightly) (quite) (extremely)

YOU INTRODUCING A SPEAKER

SCULINE _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ FEMININE
(extremely) (quite) (slightly) (neutral) (slightly) (quite) (extremely)

OLISH _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ WISE
(extremely) (quite) (slightly) (neutral) (slightly) (quite) (extremely)

RETICAL _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ ORTHODOX
(extremely) (quite) (slightly) (neutral) (slightly) (quite) (extremely)

D _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ GOOD
(extremely) (quite) (slightly) (neutral) (slightly) (quite) (extremely)

NACIOUS _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ YIELDING
(extremely) (quite) (slightly) (neutral) (slightly) (quite) (extremely)

YOU TAKING THE DOMINANT PART IN A GROUP DISCUSSION

)LISH _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ WISE
(extremely) (quite) (slightly) (neutral) (slightly) (quite) (extremely)

)D _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ BAD
(extremely) (quite) (slightly) (neutral) (slightly) (quite) (extremely)

LDING _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ TENACIOUS
(extremely) (quite) (slightly) (neutral) (slightly) (quite) (extremely)

CESSFUL _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ UNSUCCESSFUL
(extremely) (quite) (slightly) (neutral) (slightly) (quite) (extremely)

IENT _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ SEVERE
(extremely) (quite) (slightly) (neutral) (slightly) (quite) (extremely)

ORGANIZATION

ST _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ SLOW
(extremely) (quite) (slightly) (neutral) (slightly) (quite) (extremely)

ITIOUS _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ RASH
(extremely) (quite) (slightly) (neutral) (slightly) (quite) (extremely)

ETICAL _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ ORTHODOX
(extremely) (quite) (slightly) (neutral) (slightly) (quite) (extremely)

UCCESSFUL _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ SUCCESSFUL
(extremely) (quite) (slightly) (neutral) (slightly) (quite) (extremely)

ONG _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ WEAK
(extremely) (quite) (slightly) (neutral) (slightly) (quite) (extremely)

DELIVERY

SUCCESSFUL _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ SUCCESSFUL
(extremely) (quite) (slightly) (neutral) (slightly) (quite) (extremely)

ST _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ SLOW
(extremely) (quite) (slightly) (neutral) (slightly) (quite) (extremely)

D' _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ GOOD
(extremely) (quite) (slightly) (neutral) (slightly) (quite) (extremely)

SE _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ FOOLISH
(extremely) (quite) (slightly) (neutral) (slightly) (quite) (extremely)

ELDING _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ TENACIOUS
(extremely) (quite) (slightly) (neutral) (slightly) (quite) (extremely)

ATOM BOMB TESTING

SH _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ CAUTIOUS
(extremely) (quite) (slightly) (neutral) (slightly) (quite) (extremely)

AK _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ STRONG
(extremely) (quite) (slightly) (neutral) (slightly) (quite) (extremely)

VERE _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ LENIENT
(extremely) (quite) (slightly) (neutral) (slightly) (quite) (extremely)

MININE _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ MASCULINE
(extremely) (quite) (slightly) (neutral) (slightly) (quite) (extremely)

ST _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ SLOW
(extremely) (quite) (slightly) (neutral) (slightly) (quite) (extremely)

GESTURES

SUCCESSFUL _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ SUCCESSFU
(extremely) (quite) (slightly) (neutral) (slightly) (quite) (extremely)

MONIOUS _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ DISSONANT
(extremely) (quite) (slightly) (neutral) (slightly) (quite) (extremely)

Y _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ BEAUTIFUL
(extremely) (quite) (slightly) (neutral) (slightly) (quite) (extremely)

D _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ SOFT
(extremely) (quite) (slightly) (neutral) (slightly) (quite) (extremely)

W _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ FAST
(extremely) (quite) (slightly) (neutral) (slightly) (quite) (extremely)

YOU SPEAKING

ERE _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ LENIENT
(extremely) (quite) (slightly) (neutral) (slightly) (quite) (extremely)

UCCESSFUL _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ SUCCESSFU
(extremely) (quite) (slightly) (neutral) (slightly) (quite) (extremely)

H _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ CAUTIOUS
(extremely) (quite) (slightly) (neutral) (slightly) (quite) (extremely)

HODOX _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ HERETICAL
(extremely) (quite) (slightly) (neutral) (slightly) (quite) (extremely)

E _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ FOOLISH
(extremely) (quite) (slightly) (neutral) (slightly) (quite) (extremely)

YOU PARTICIPATING IN COLLEGE DEBATE

CAUTIOUS _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ RASH
(extremely) (quite) (slightly) (neutral) (slightly) (quite) (extremely)

WISE _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ FOOLISH
(extremely) (quite) (slightly) (neutral) (slightly) (quite) (extremely)

SLOW _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ FAST
(extremely) (quite) (slightly) (neutral) (slightly) (quite) (extremely)

HERETICAL _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ ORTHODOX
(extremely) (quite) (slightly) (neutral) (slightly) (quite) (extremely)

PASSIVE _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ ACTIVE
(extremely) (quite) (slightly) (neutral) (slightly) (quite) (extremely)

VARSITY SPORTS

HARD _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ SOFT
(extremely) (quite) (slightly) (neutral) (slightly) (quite) (extremely)

WEAK _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ STRONG
(extremely) (quite) (slightly) (neutral) (slightly) (quite) (extremely)

FAST _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ SLOW
(extremely) (quite) (slightly) (neutral) (slightly) (quite) (extremely)

CAUTIOUS _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ RASH
(extremely) (quite) (slightly) (neutral) (slightly) (quite) (extremely)

HERETICAL _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ ORTHODOX
(extremely) (quite) (slightly) (neutral) (slightly) (quite) (extremely)

AUDIENCE

'ASSIVE _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ ACTIVE
(extremely) (quite) (slightly) (neutral) (slightly) (quite) (extremely)

STRONG _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ WEAK
(extremely) (quite) (slightly) (neutral) (slightly) (quite) (extremely)

TIELDING _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ TENACIOUS
(extremely) (quite) (slightly) (neutral) (slightly) (quite) (extremely)

IARD _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ SOFT
(extremely) (quite) (slightly) (neutral) (slightly) (quite) (extremely)

AD _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ GOOD
(extremely) (quite) (slightly) (neutral) (slightly) (quite) (extremely)

SPEAKING PERFORMANCE

EVERE _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ LENIENT
(extremely) (quite) (slightly) (neutral) (slightly) (quite) (extremely)

GLY _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ BEAUTIFUL
(extremely) (quite) (slightly) (neutral) (slightly) (quite) (extremely)

ARD _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ SOFT
(extremely) (quite) (slightly) (neutral) (slightly) (quite) (extremely)

ASSIVE _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ ACTIVE
(extremely) (quite) (slightly) (neutral) (slightly) (quite) (extremely)

OOD _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ BAD
(extremely) (quite) (slightly) (neutral) (slightly) (quite) (extremely)

ATOM BOMB TESTING

LY _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ BEAUTIFUL
(extremely) (quite) (slightly) (neutral) (slightly) (quite) (extremely)

NACIOUS _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ YIELDING
(extremely) (quite) (slightly) (neutral) (slightly) (quite) (extremely)

)LISH _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ WISE
(extremely) (quite) (slightly) (neutral) (slightly) (quite) (extremely)

RD _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ SOFT
(extremely) (quite) (slightly) (neutral) (slightly) (quite) (extremely)

LM _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ EXCITABLE
(extremely) (quite) (slightly) (neutral) (slightly) (quite) (extremely)

PRONUNCIATION

3CULINE _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ FEMININE
(extremely) (quite) (slightly) (neutral) (slightly) (quite) (extremely)

ELDING _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ TENACIOUS
(extremely) (quite) (slightly) (neutral) (slightly) (quite) (extremely)

3T _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ SLOW
(extremely) (quite) (slightly) (neutral) (slightly) (quite) (extremely)

) _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ GOOD
(extremely) (quite) (slightly) (neutral) (slightly) (quite) (extremely)

CESSFUL _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ UNSUCCESSFU
(extremely) (quite) (slightly) (neutral) (slightly) (quite) (extremely)

FEDERAL AID TO EDUCATION

THODOX	(extremely)	(quite)	(slightly)	(neutral)	(slightly)	(quite)	(extremely)	HERETICAL
CULINE	(extremely)	(quite)	(slightly)	(neutral)	(slightly)	(quite)	(extremely)	FEMININE
TIOUS	(extremely)	(quite)	(slightly)	(neutral)	(slightly)	(quite)	(extremely)	RASH
D	(extremely)	(quite)	(slightly)	(neutral)	(slightly)	(quite)	(extremely)	SOFT
SONANT	(extremely)	(quite)	(slightly)	(neutral)	(slightly)	(quite)	(extremely)	HARMONIOUS

YOU TAKING THE DOMINANT PART IN A GROUP DISCUSSION

UTIFUL	(extremely)	(quite)	(slightly)	(neutral)	(slightly)	(quite)	(extremely)	UGLY
TIOUS	(extremely)	(quite)	(slightly)	(neutral)	(slightly)	(quite)	(extremely)	RASH
T	(extremely)	(quite)	(slightly)	(neutral)	(slightly)	(quite)	(extremely)	SLOW
T	(extremely)	(quite)	(slightlh)	(neutral)	(slightly)	(quite)	(extremely)	HARD
IVE	(extremely)	(quite)	(slightly)	(neutral)	(slightly)	(quite)	(extremely)	PASSIVE

PROJECTION

SONANT _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ HARMONIOUS
(extremely) (quite) (slightly) (neutral) (slightly) (quite) (extremely)

CULINE _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ FEMININE
(extremely) (quite) (slightly) (neutral) (slightly) (quite) (extremely)

TIOUS _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ RASH
(extremely) (quite) (slightly) (neutral) (slightly) (quite) (extremely)

CESSFUL _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ UNSUCCESSFUL
(extremely) (quite) (slightly) (neutral) (slightly) (quite) (extremely)

M _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ EXCITABLE
(extremely) (quite) (slightly) (neutral) (slightly) (quite) (extremely)

AUDIENCE

E _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ FOOLISH
(extremely) (quite) (slightly) (neutral) (slightly) (quite) (extremely)

Y _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ BEAUTIFUL
(extremely) (quite) (slightly) (neutral) (slightly) (quite) (extremely)

ERE _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ LENIENT
(extremely) (quite) (slightly) (neutral) (slightly) (quite) (extremely)

HODOX _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ HERETICAL
(extremely) (quite) (slightly) (neutral) (slightly) (quite) (extremely)

CESSFUL _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ UNSUCCESSFUL
(extremely) (quite) (slightly) (neutral) (slightly) (quite) (extremely)

YOU SPEAKING

) _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ GOOD
(extremely) (quite) (slightly) (neutral) (slightly) (quite) (extremely)

UTIFUL _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ UGLY
(extremely) (quite) (slightly) (neutral) (slightly) (quite) (extremely)

M _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ EXCITABLE
(extremely) (quite) (slightly) (neutral) (slightly) (quite) (extremely)

ACIOUS _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ YIELDING
(extremely) (quite) (slightly) (neutral) (slightly) (quite) (extremely)

T _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ HARD
(extremely) (quite) (slightly) (neutral) (slightly) (quite) (extremely)

YOU GIVING A POLITICAL SPEECH

M _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ EXCITABLE
(extremely) (quite) (slightly) (neutral) (slightly) (quite) (extremely)

D _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ BAD
(extremely) (quite) (slightly) (neutral) (slightly) (quite) (extremely)

LDING _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ TENACIOUS
(extremely) (quite) (slightly) (neutral) (slightly) (quite) (extremely)

CULINE _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ FEMININE
(extremely) (quite) (slightly) (neutral) (slightly) (quite) (extremely)

CCESSFUL _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ SUCCESSFUI
(extremely) (quite) (slightly) (neutral) (slightly) (quite) (extremely)

ORGANIZATION

SCULINE ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ FEMININE
(extremely) (quite) (slightly) (neutral) (slightly) (quite) (extremely)

OLISH ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ WISE
(extremely) (quite) (slightly) (neutral) (slightly) (quite) (extremely)

TIVE ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ PASSIVE
(extremely) (quite) (slightly) (neutral) (slightly) (quite) (extremely)

D ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ GOOD
(extremely) (quite) (slightly) (neutral) (slightly) (quite) (extremely)

NACIOUS ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ YIELDING
(extremely) (quite) (slightly) (neutral) (slightly) (quite) (extremely)

YOU INTRODUCTING A SPEAKER

LY ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ BEAUTIFUL
(extremely) (quite) (slightly) (neutral) (slightly) (quite) (extremely)

RMONIOUS ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ DISSONANT
(extremely) (quite) (slightly) (neutral) (slightly) (quite) (extremely)

SSIVE ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ ACTIVE
(extremely) (quite) (slightly) (neutral) (slightly) (quite) (extremely)

ST ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ SLOW
(extremely) (quite) (slightly) (neutral) (slightly) (quite) (extremely)

TIOUS ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ RASH
(extremely) (quite) (slightly) (neutral) (slightly) (quite) (extremely)

POSTURE

H _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ CAUTIOUS
(extremely) (quite) (slightly) (neutral) (slightly) (quite) (extremely)

W _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ FAST
(extremely) (quite) (slightly) (neutral) (slightly) (quite) (extremely)

ERE _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ LENIENT
(extremely) (quite) (slightly) (neutral) (slightly) (quite) (extremely)

T _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ HARD
(extremely) (quite) (slightly) (neutral) (slightly) (quite) (extremely)

ETICAL _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ ORTHODOX
(extremely) (quite) (slightly) (neutral) (slightly) (quite) (extremely)

DELIVERY

IENT _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ SEVERE
(extremely) (quite) (slightly) (neutral) (slightly) (quite) (extremely)

ONG _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ WEAK
(extremely) (quite) (slightly) (neutral) (slightly) (quite) (extremely)

Y _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ BEAUTIFUL
(extremely) (quite) (slightly) (neutral) (slightly) (quite) (extremely)

MONIOUS _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ DISSONANT
(extremely) (quite) (slightly) (neutral) (slightly) (quite) (extremely)

TIOUS _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ RASH
(extremely) (quite) (slightly) (neutral) (slightly) (quite) (extremely)

ATOM BOMB TESTING

RMONIOUS _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ DISSONANT
(extremely) (quite) (slightly) (neutral) (slightly) (quite) (extremely)

THODOX _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ HERETICAL
(extremely) (quite) (slightly) (neutral) (slightly) (quite) (extremely)

CCESSFUL _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ UNSUCCESSFU
(extremely) (quite) (slightly) (neutral) (slightly) (quite) (extremely)

SSIVE _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ ACTIVE
(extremely) (quite) (slightly) (neutral) (slightly) (quite) (extremely)

)D _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ BAD
(extremely) (quite) (slightly) (neutral) (slightly) (quite) (extremely)

YOU LECTURING BEFORE A LARGE GROUP

SUCCESSFUL _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ SUCCESSFU
(extremely) (quite) (slightly) (neutral) (slightly) (quite) (extremely)

D _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ SOFT
(extremely) (quite) (slightly) (neutral) (slightly) (quite) (extremely)

LISH _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ WISE
(extremely) (quite) (slightly) (neutral) (slightly) (quite) (extremely)

CULINE _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ FEMININE
(extremely) (quite) (slightly) (neutral) (slightly) (quite) (extremely)

SIVE _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ ACTIVE
(extremely) (quite) (slightly((neutral) (slightly) (quite) (extremely)

GESTURES

MASCULINE _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ FEMININE
(extremely) (quite) (slightly) (neutral) (slightly) (quite) (extremely)

CAUTIOUS _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ RASH
(extremely) (quite) (slightly) (neutral) (slightly) (quite) (extremely)

TENACIOUS _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ YIELDING
(extremely) (quite) (slightly) (neutral) (slightly) (quite) (extemely)

FOOLISH _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ WISE
(extremely) (quite) (slightly) (neutral) (slightly) (quite) (extremely)

GOOD _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ BAD
(extremely) (quite) (slightly) (neutral) (slightly) (quite) (extremely)

YOU PRESENTING AN ORAL REPORT BEFORE A CLASS

YIELDING _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ TENACIOUS
(extremely) (quite) (slightly) (neutral) (slightly) (quite) (extremely)

GOOD _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ BAD
(extremely) (quite) (slightly) (neutral) (slightly) (quite) (extremely)

ACTIVE _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ PASSIVE
(extremely) (quite) (slightly) (neutral) (slightly) (quite) (extremely)

ORTHODOX _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ HERETICAL
(extremely) (quite) (slightly) (neutral) (slightly) (quite) (extremely)

FEMININE _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ MASCULINE
(extremely) (quite) (slightly) (neutral) (slightly) (quite) (extremely)

YOU GIVING A POLITICAL SPEECH

DISSONANT _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ HARMONIOUS
(extremely) (quite) (slightly) (neutral) (slightly) (quite) (extremely)

WISE _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ FOOLISH
(extremely) (quite) (slightly) (neutral) (slightly) (quite) (extremely)

RASH _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ CAUTIOUS
(extremely) (quite) (slightly) (neutral) (slightly) (quite) (extremely)

ORTHODOX _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ HERETICAL
(extremely) (quite) (slightly) (neutral) (slightly) (quite) (extremely)

ACTIVE _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ PASSIVE
(extremely) (quite) (slightly) (neutral) (slightly) (quite) (extremely)

APPENDIX B

The Second Semantic Differential

Instructions (Tape-Recorder)

Read by the Experimenter

(To be Read By the Experimenter)

In order that all of you will mark the scales at the same rate, this tape recorder will call out the sequence and the pace at which you are to mark the scales. It is important for you to not work ahead or fall behind. Since there will only be a brief time for each rating, please make your judgments promptly. Remember, mark the scales only as they are called out by the tape recorder. Are there any questions? If not, let's begin.

(Play the tape for 30 seconds; stop the tape and again ask if there are any questions). Then read:

Now that you understand how to mark the scales, there will be no more interruptions. Remember, mark the scales only as they are called out by the tape recorder.

APPENDIX C

Subjects' Data Sheet

DATA SHEET

Name _____

University Telephone (and Room Number If Living in a Residence Hall)_____

University Address _____

Age _____

Check one. Male ___ Female ___

Do you have any problems with your Speech? If so describe. _____

_____

_____

_____

Do you have any problems with Hearing? If so describe. _____

_____

_____

_____

Year and Major in College _____

Check one: U. S. citizen ___ Canadian citizen ___ Foreign student ___

Comments _____

_____

_____

_____

APPENDIX D

Speaking Instructions Handed to Speakers

Instructions To Speakers

Your class has been chosen to help assess the effectiveness of a new technique in Speech teaching. The purpose of this session is to provide impromptu speaking experience for you on a variety of topics before an unfamilar audience. The topics you will speak on are listed below:

1. Should varsity sports be part of a university system?
2. Should the U. S. continue atom bomb testing?
3. Should federal aid be provided for college students?

Please talk for one minute expressing your view on each of the topics. At the end of one minute, the chairman will signal you by raising his right hand. At that time please bring your talk to a conclusion. There will be a very brief interval between each of your talks. This procedure will be repeated for each of the three topics.

Since it will be a few minutes before you will speak, you may use this time to think about the topics. When you are before the group, the chairman will announce the order in which you are to take up the topics.

Remember, for each topic please talk until the chairman has signaled that a minute has passed, then bring your talk to a conclusion.

APPENDIX E

Speech-Tension and Topic-Stand Scale Instructions for the Judges

INSTRUCTIONS FOR JUDGES

We are asking you as judges to rate each speaker on two separate scales. The first is a "speech tension" rating and the second is a "topic stand" rating (both explained below). Each speaker will give three one minute impromptu talks, with a fifteen second interval between presentations. At the conclusion of each of the speaker's presentations you will have fifteen seconds to rate him on both the "speech tension" and "topic stand" scales. When making your judgments, please do not consult with the other judges. Rate the speakers only on the basis of your own observations.

"Speech Tension" Scale Instructions.

We are assuming that "speech tension" (or "speech fright") may be overtly manisfested in a variety of ways. Please rate each speaker for the degree to which speech tension was, in your judment, characteristic of that speaker for each of his presentations.

A speaker experiencing "speech tension" may be expected to exhibit one or more of the following behaviors: random "non-communicative" activity, such as; trembling, perspiring, hesitancy in speech, awkward postures, restless shifting of feet, nervous hand movements, weak or poor projection, poor eye contact, etc.

These behaviors are to be regarded as only suggestive of some of the observable characteristics that may be associated with "speech tension." We are relying upon you to provide a "standard" or "frame of reference" from your experience in speech education upon which to base your evaluations. Is the speaker exhibiting overt tension all out of proportion to the speaking situation? Or is the speaker markedly calm, cool and nonchalant as he speaks?

After each presentation of the speaker, please rate his overall speech tension by placing a check mark opposite the appropriate description. Please do this for all three topics. The "speech tension" scale is presented below:

Virtually None	A Slight Amount	Less than Average	Average (Moderate)	More than Average	A Marked Amount	An Extreme Amount
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____

"Topic Stand" Scale Instructions.

Speakers may vary as to how strongly they feel "for" or "against" the topic about which they speak. After each presentation of the speaker, please rate the degree to which the speaker expressed a "for" or an "against" with respect to the topic by placing a check mark opposite the appropriate description. Please do this for each of the three topics. The "topic stand" scale is presented below.

FOR	(extremely)	(quite)	(slightly)	(neutral)	(slightly)	(quite)	(extremely)	AGAINST
	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	

There are a few other things you should know. Print each speaker's name and number at the top of the rating sheet along with your name and the number which has been assigned you as a judge. Rate the speaker only after he has completed each presentation. Remember, please make your judments independent of the other judges.

APPENDIX F

Speech-Tension and Topic-Stand Scales Employed by the Judges

Speaker's Name _____ Judge's Name _____

Speaker No. _____ Judge No. _____

Speech One

SPEECH TENSION SCALE

LOW _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ HIGH
Virtually None : A Slight Amount : Less than Average : Average (Moderate) : More than Average : A Marked Amount : An Extreme Amount

TOPIC STAND SCALE

FOR _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ AGAINST
(extremely) : (quite) : (slightly) : (neutral) : (slightly) : (quite) : (extremely)

Speech Two

SPEACH TENSION SCALE

LOW _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ HIGH
Virtually None : A Slight Amount : Less than Average : Average (Moderate) : More than Average : A Marked Amount : An Extreme Amount

TOPIC STAND SCALE

FOR _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ AGAINST
(extremely) : (quite) : (slightly) : (neutral) : (slightly) : (quite) : (extremely)

Speech Three

SPEECH TENSION SCALE

LOW _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ HIGH
Virtually None : A Slight Amount : Less than Average : Average (Moderate) : More than Average : A Marked Amount : An Extreme Amount

TOPIC STAND SCALE

LOW _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ AGAIN
(extremely) : (quite) : (slightly) : (neutral) : (slightly) : (quite) : (extremely)

APPENDIX G

Speakers' Self-Rating Speech-Fright Scales

Speaker's Name _____

Speaker No. ___

On the scale below, rate yourself by placing a check mark against the appropriate description indicating the degree of "speech fright" you experienced while speaking before this group:

None	Slight	Mild	Moderate	Considerable	Marked	Extreme

APPENDIX H

Judged Speech Tension for 42 Speakers

Ranks Assigned by Three Judges

Speaker	Judge			Speaker	Judge		
	X	Y	Z		X	Y	Z
1	24	1	4	22	39.5	41	41.5
2	9.5	10	11	23	9.5	36	5.5
3	28.5	2.5	7.5	24	2	5	1.5
4	14	11.5	20	25	32.5	18	20
5	39.5	32.5	25	26	9.5	25	5.5
6	24	18	40	27	18.5	11.5	29
7	18.5	2.5	1.5	28	32.5	36	25
8	39.5	41	33	29	28.5	11.5	11
9	9.5	32.5	37.5	30	28.5	29.5	29
10	5	32.5	11	31	2	18	29
11	2	18	20	32	18.5	25	37.5
12	5	4	15	33	24	18	11
13	39.5	38.5	37.5	34	39.5	36	37.5
14	18.5	11.5	3	35	39.5	41	41.5
15	14	11.5	20	36	32.5	25	33
16	18.5	18	20	37	28.5	25	7.5
17	36	25	20	38	24	32.5	29.
18	9.5	11.5	25	39	5	7	15
19	24	29.5	35	40	32.5	25	33
20	35	38.5	29	41	18.5	25	15
21	9.5	7	20	42	14	7	11

APPENDIX I

Judged Speech Tension for 25 Speakers

Ranks Assigned by Three Judges

Speaker	Judge			Speaker	Judge		
	X	Y	Z		X	Y	Z
2	5.5	11	4.5	38	13.5	17.5	16
4	8	8	10	39	3.5	5	6.5
5	22.5	17.5	13.5	40	17	13.5	19
7	11	1	1.5	42	8	5	4.5
8	22.5	24	19				
11	1.5	11	10				
12	3.5	2	6.5				
13	22.5	21.5	22.5				
14	11	8	3				
15	8	8	10				
16	11	11	10				
19	13.5	15.5	21				
20	19	21.5	16				
21	5.5	5	10				
22	22.5	24	24.5				
24	1.5	3	1.5				
28	17	19.5	13.5				
30	15	15.5	16				
34	22.5	19.5	22.5				
35	22.5	24	24.5				
36	17	13.5	19				

APPENDIX J

Judged Topic Stand (Topic I) For 42 Speakers

Ranks Assigned by Three Judges

Speaker	Judge			Speaker	Judge		
	X	Y	Z		X	Y	Z
1	41	40.5	42	22	14	15.5	19
2	29.5	36	38	23	29.5	15.5	19
3	29.5	40.5	38	24	29.5	15.5	19
4	41	40.5	40.5	25	14	15.5	5.5
5	14	15.5	5.5	26	35.5	15.5	31.5
6	38	40.5	31.5	27	14	15.5	31.5
7	35.5	29	19	28	29.5	29	36
8	14	29	19	29	2	15.5	19
9	14	29	19	30	14	15.5	.31.5
10	38	37.5	40.5	31	14	4.5	19
11	14	29	19	32	14	4.5	5.5
12	14	29	19	33	14	29	31.5
13	14	15.5	5.5	34	14	15.5	19
14	14	29	5.5	35	14	4.5	5.5
15	29.5	29	31.5	36	14	4.5	19
16	29.5	29	19	37	14	4.5	5.5
17	14	15.5	19	38	29.5	29	31.5
18	29.5	29	31.5	39	2	4.5	5.5
19	2	15.5	19	40	14	4.5	5.5
20	14	15.5	19	41	14	4.5	38
21	29.5	29.	19	42	38	37.5	

APPENDIX K

Judged Topic Stand (Topic II) For 42 Speakers

Ranks Assigned by Three Judges

Speaker	Judge			Speaker	Judge		
	X	Y	Z		X	Y	Z
1	10	12	11.5	22	24	12	11.5
2	24	27.5	25	23	10	2	11.5
3	32.5	12	11.5	24	39.5	38.5	39.5
4	32.5	12	11.5	25	39.5	38.5	36
5	24	27.5	11.5	26	24	27.5	11.5
6	24	27.5	11.5	27	24	2	25
7	37	27.5	32.5	28	39.5	38.5	39.5
8	24	27.5	25	29	1.5	12	1.5
9	37	38.5	39.5	30	24	27.5	32.5
10	37	35	39.5	31	24	38.5	36
11	10	27.5	25	32	24	12	11.5
12	10	12	11.5	33	10	12	1.5
13	10	27.5	11.5	34	10	12	25
14	32.5	27.5	11.5	35	10	12	11.5
15	10	27.5	11.5	36	10	12	11.5
16	24	12	25	37	42	42	42
17	10	12	25	38	24	27.5	25
18	24	27.5	25	39	10	12	11.5
19	1.5	2	1.5	40	10	12	25
20	10	12	32.5	41	39.5	38.5	36
21	10	12	25	42	32.5	27.5	32.5

APPENDIX L

Judged Topic Stand (Topic III) For 42 Speakers

Ranks Assigned by Three Judges

Speaker	Judge			Speaker	Judge		
	X	Y	Z		X	Y	Z
1	25.5	12.5	14.5	22	25.5	30	29
2	25.5	12.5	29	23	25.5	12.5	14.5
3	9.5	12.5	14.5	24	37.5	40	41
4	25.5	30	14.5	25	9.5	1.5	14.5
5	9.5	30	29	26	35	12.5	36
6	35	30	29	27	25.5	12.5	14.5
7	25.5	30	29	28	25.5	12.5	29
8	9.5	30	14.5	29	9.5	12.5	3
9	25.5	30	14.5	30	25.5	12.5	29
10	9.5	30	14.5	31	9.5	12.5	14.5
11	9.5	12.5	14.5	32	9.5	12.5	14.5
12	37.5	30	38.5	33	40	40	41
13	1	12.5	3	34	9.5	12.5	14.5
14	25.5	30	14.5	35	9.5	12.5	14.5
15	25.5	30	3	36	40	40	38.5
16	25.5	12.5	29	37	42	42	41
17	9.5	30	14.5	38	25.5	30	3
18	9.5	30	3	39	9.5	1.5	14.5
19	25.5	12.5	29	40	9.5	12.5	14.5
20	9.5	12.5	29	41	35	38	36
21	25.5	12.5	29	42	40	30	36

APPENDIX M

Scale Values And Factor Scores (Medians Rounded To Nearest Whole Values)

Key For Appendix M

The "Self Rating" Phrases

1. You giving a political speech
2. You presenting an oral report before a class
3. You lecturing before a large group
4. You introducing a speaker
5. You presiding over a meeting
6. You participating in college debate
7. You taking the dominant part in a group discussion
8. You speaking

The "Abstract Speech" Phrases

1. Posture
2. Projection
3. Speaking Performance
4. Organization
5. Gestures
6. Pronunciation
7. Audience
8. Delivery

The "Speech Topic" Phrases

1. Federal aid to education
2. Varsity sports
3. Atom bomb testing

SPEAKER 2

Scale Values and Factor Scores* (Medians, Rounded to Nearest Whole Values)

Self-Rating Phrases**

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)
Evaluative	45422 4	34323 3	44432 4	33243 3	44433 4	12442 2	44234 4	33334 3
Potency	22432 2	22324 2	35343 3	53531 3	21333 3	21334 3	43333 3	33424 3
Activity	43242 3	24434 4	54241 4	45234 4	62535 5	33551 3	35321 3	42352 3

Abstract-Speech Phrases **

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)
Evaluative	22332 2	22232 2	22432 2	54654 5	22111 1	31462 3	64544 4	32243 3
Potency	22333 3	21623 2	52245 4	47656 6	14321 2	32231 2	32122 2	43342 3
Activity	53437 4	23355 3	45432 4	26655 5	42153 3	46522 4	34323 3	34145 4

Speech-Topic Phrases **

	(1)	(2)	(3)
Evaluative	32222 2	35544 4	52533 3
Potency	32243 3	42433 3	21211 1
Activity	36466 6	21333 3	53261 3

* Factor Scores Underlined.

**Key at beginning of Appendix M identifies the phrases which correspond with the numbers in parentheses on the chart.

SPEAKER 4

Scale Values and Factor Scores* (Medians, Rounded to Nearest Whole Values)

Self-Rating Phrases**	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)
Evaluative	23233 3	13334 3	23333 3	32224 2	35322 3	66647 6	42223 2	33433 3
Potency	22234 2	46353 4	24434 4	45346 4	44433 4	24535 4	43663 4	4235 3
Activity	65443 4	34533 3	64265 5	36236 3	56335 5	37617 6	54553 5	22555 5

Abstract-Speech Phrases**	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)
Evaluative	11123 1	22333 3	23333 3	11711 1	33222 2	23232 2	33333 3	33333 3
Potency	12411 1	26334 3	54553 5	77747 7	54342 4	22343 3	46635 5	34533 3
Activity	43333 3	65555 5	55432 4	22561 2	46545 5	53523 3	34523 3	24543 4

Speech-Topic Phrases**	(1)	(2)	(3)
Evaluative	11514 1	45467 5	11111 1
Potency	17141 1	74277 7	12471 2
Activity	11176 1	64711 4	57111 1

* Factor Scores Underlined.

**Key at beginning of Appendix M identifies the phrases which correspond with the numbers in parentheses on the chart.

SPEAKER 5

Scale Values and Factor Scores* (Medians, Rounded to Nearest Whole Values)

Self-Rating Phrases**

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)
Evaluative	12423 2	24223 2	43222 2	23243 3	43232 3	45423 4	33224 3	22224 2
Potency	53332 3	22324 2	25343 3	62533 3	24353 3	32334 3	22244 2	32433 3
Activity	65233 3	26635 5	55362 5	64355 5	55555 5	35662 5	65552 5	52453 4

Abstract-Speech Phrases**

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)
Evaluative	11445 4	22232 2	22232 2	13222 2	31232 2	22232 2	22533 2	32242 2
Potency	14433 3	54424 4	22245 2	43242 3	54323 3	32345 3	53223 3	24332 3
Activity	42555 5	23344 3	55562 5	44521 4	52265 5	36533 3	33643 3	63256 5

Speech-Topic Phrases**

	(1)	(2)	(3)
Evaluative	22222 2	22224 2	35224 3
Potency	52245 4	32222 2	23421 2
Activity	25455 5	21236 2	32162 2

* Factor Scores Underlined.

**Key at beginning of Appendix M identifies the phrases which correspond with the numbers in parentheses on the chart.

SPEAKER 7

Scale Values and Factor Scores* (Medians, Rounded to Nearest Whole Values)

Self-Rating Phrases**

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)
Evaluative	36232 3	22222 2	12323 2	12232 2	31112 1	22222 2	11142 1	22222 2
Potency	23331 3	11624 2	23341 3	62313 3	33171 3	21362 2	11335 3	12535 3
Activity	46133 3	26363 3	35332 3	77335 5	72735 5	14462 4	77542 5	42576 5

Abstract-Speech Phrases**

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)
Evaluative	11111 1	11111 1	23242 2	11111 1	11132 1	11111 1	22324 2	44422 4
Potency	11443 3	42414 4	14454 4	43143 3	22413 2	41442 4	45335 4	54244 4
Activity	71427 4	11764 4	46443 4	71571 5	71123 2	17623 3	24536 4	47145 4

Speech-Topic Phrases**

	(1)	(2)	(3)
Evaluative	65667 6	23233 3	65535 5
Potency	31653 3	51122 2	32112 2
Activity	53413 3	11336 3	12233 2

* Factor Scores Underlined.

**Key at beginning of Appendix M identifies the phrases which correspondent with the numbers in parentheses on the chart.

SPEAKER 8

Scale Values and Factor Scores* (Medians, Rounded to Nearest Whole Values)

Self-Rating Phrases**

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)
Evaluative	56555 5	45445 4	66555 5	54444 4	65555 5	45546 5	56555 5	45454 4
Potency	53344 4	32445 4	53434 4	45444 4	44445 4	43445 4	45544 4	44344 4
Activity	64543 4	34544 4	44344 4	34444 4	43344 4	43444 4	34344 4	44444 4

Abstract-Speech Phrases**

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)
Evaluative	35522 3	75362 5	12231 2	32113 2	23432 3	21112 1	53333 3	32233 3
Potency	54234 4	11111 1	24534 4	44143 4	53344 4	33433 3	42343 3	44423 4
Activity	64444 4	11742 2	43345 4	23333 3	12133 2	54533 4	22224 2	34344 4

Speech-Topic Phrases**

	(1)	(2)	(3)
Evaluative	34543 4	44454 4	74717 7
Potency	56556 5	41224 2	11111 1
Activity	43443 4	11224 2	11171 1

* Factor Scores Underlined.

**Key at beginning of Appendix M identifies the phrases which correspond with the numbers in parentheses on the chart.

SPEAKER 11

Scale Values and Factor Scores* (Medians, Rounded to Nearest Whole Values)

Self-Rating Phrases**

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)
Evaluative	55233 3	33333 3	33333 3	33323 3	33333 3	53225 3	23335 3	33533 3
Potency	53542 4	25334 3	34332 3	62233 3	53253 3	52524 4	34333 3	23553 3
Activity	55325 5	26623 3	26663 6	66336 6	63335 3	35365 5	36552 5	33562 3

Abstract-Speech Phrases**

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)
Evaluative	52233 3	22233 2	33343 3	23332 3	33333 3	33322 3	33353 3	33333 3
Potency	23233 3	55332 3	32353 3	54345 4	55324 4	32345 3	22232 2	32433 3
Activity	23535 3	33653 3	55323 3	53553 5	63325 3	36532 3	24335 3	36326 3

Speech-Topic Phrases**

	(1)	(2)	(3)
Evaluative	32323 3	22222 2	52525 5
Potency	23223 2	22432 2	26452 4
Activity	22235 2	23255 3	66232 3

* Factor Scores Underlined.

**Key at beginning of Appendix M identifies the phrases which correspond with the numbers in parentheses on the chart.

SPEAKER 12

Scale Values and Factor Scores* (Medians, Rounded to Nearest Whole Values)

Self-Rating Phrases**

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)
Evaluative	26362 3	23223 2	24522 2	23543 3	35222 2	32342 3	53323 3	32222 2
Potency	22221 2	12222 2	22221 2	22225 2	22222 2	21226 2	22222 2	22222 2
Activity	66235 5	26535 5	66552 5	65555 5	62525 5	35622 3	52362 3	52545 5

Abstract-Speech Phrases**

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)
Evaluative	52235 3	43362 3	24232 2	35553 5	63233 3	35445 4	35555 5	22222 2
Potency	36266 6	33222 2	21222 2	55555 5	23322 2	35523 3	23332 3	22222 2
Activity	45366 5	23726 3	55352 5	26556 5	35253 3	53455 5	23526 3	63255 5

Speech-Topic Phrases**

	(1)	(2)	(3)
Evaluative	42363 3	12423 2	64256 5
Potency	34355 4	31222 2	25222 2
Activity	22546 4	22235 2	62262 2

* Factor Scores Underlined.

**Key at beginning of Appendix M identifies the phrases which correspond with the numbers in parentheses on the chart.

SPEAKER 13

Scale Values and Factor Scores* (Medians, Rounded to Nearest Whole Values)

Self-Rating Phrases**

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)
Evaluative	34533 3	45334 4	44532 4	33334 3	35543 4	52343 3	53333 3	43333 3
Potency	55433 4	45444 4	54343 4	44543 4	36343 3	34343 3	33334 3	34444 4
Activity	65524 5	36524 4	25254 4	34445 4	33236 3	26444 4	13544 4	33642 3

Abstract-Speech Phrases**

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)
Evaluative	32224 2	55544 5	34332 3	43211 2	54553 5	42222 2	44544 4	21234 2
Potency	13234 3	63354 4	34244 4	22223 2	64434 4	43333 3	33344 3	44441 4
Activity	24543 4	42453 4	64544 4	64542 4	52344 4	64534 4	23224 2	54345 4

Speech-Topic Phrases**

	(1)	(2)	(3)
Evaluative	31315 3	32433 3	72526 5
Potency	55544 5	31422 2	33234 3
Activity	25345 4	21453 3	64233 3

* Factor Scores Underlined.

**Key at beginning of Appendix M identifies the phrases which correspond with the numbers in parentheses on the chart.

SPEAKER 14

Scale Values and Factor Scores* (Medians, Rounded to Nearest Whole Values)

Self-Rating Phrases**

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)
Evaluative	22333 3	23333 3	33433 3	33333 3	35333 3	33333 3	53333 3	33333 3
Potency	23352 3	23235 3	36522 3	63225 3	53223 3	52323 3	22332 2	22353 3
Activity	66232 3	26523 3	36263 3	45235 4	53336 3	35363 3	26622 2	23353 3

Abstract-Speech Phrases**

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)
Evaluative	22323 2	33232 3	33333 3	53222 2	22333 3	33423 3	22333 3	33333 3
Potency	23232 2	33222 2	32533 3	33223 3	22223 2	54325 4	22223 2	22533 3
Activity	22535 3	32452 3	55224 4	32532 3	62225 2	53532 3	33323 3	53325 3

Speech-Topic Phrases**

	(1)	(2)	(3)
Evaluative	23325 3	11112 1	52522 2
Potency	62333 3	11222 2	22132 2
Activity	22255 2	11126 1	62262 2

* Factor Scores Underlined.

**Key at beginning of Appendix M identifies the phrases which correspond with the numbers in parentheses on the chart.

SPEAKER 15

Scale Values and Factor Scores* (Medians, Rounded to Nearest Whole Values)

Self-Rating Phrases**

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)
Evaluative	67666 6	55555 5	55756 5	35554 5	56655 5	25353 3	55535 5	54555 5
Potency	65653 5	33355 3	66553 5	64335 4	55556 5	32535 3	46332 3	35553 5
Activity	65523 5	55523 5	24265 4	36535 5	56255 5	35355 5	25533 3	25532 3

Abstract-Speech Phrases**

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)
Evaluative	34565 5	32253 3	45555 5	23224 2	55654 5	32222 2	65555 5	55555 5
Potency	35453 4	53332 3	34652 4	22333 3	62225 2	32352 3	33222 2	35555 5
Activity	35553 5	22522 2	65225 5	36722 3	33535 3	43325 3	35253 3	36226 3

Speech-Topic Phrases**

	(1)	(2)	(3)
Evaluative	44354 4	12312 2	62622 2
Potency	33333 3	62322 2	23132 2
Activity	36253 3	11121 1	52152 2

* Factor Scores Underlined.

**Key at beginning of Appendix M identifies the phrases which correspond with the numbers in parentheses on the chart.

SPEAKER 16

Scale Values and Factor Scores* (Medians, Rounded to Nearest Whole Values)

Self-Rating Phrases**

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)
Evaluative	34455 4	36464 4	74667 6	54554 5	42534 4	77246 6	24335 3	33435 3
Potency	23421 2	15564 5	66561 6	45414 4	22152 2	61466 6	12343 3	12424 2
Activity	56222 2	26622 2	27166 6	14624 4	45355 5	26446 4	34322 3	23623 3

Abstract-Speech Phrases**

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)
Evaluative	22114 2	44443 4	44334 4	11111 1	12242 2	42232 2	66754 6	33444 4
Potency	14144 4	44441 4	31244 3	12112 1	14414 4	51414 4	42242 2	31443 3
Activity	44433 4	44445 4	52332 3	25661 5	42242 2	46423 4	44646 4	32335 3

Speech-Topic Prases**

	(1)	(2)	(3)
Evaluative	21215 2	13221 2	73726 6
Potency	41544 4	21115 1	24414 4
Activity	11447 4	11134 1	66141 4

* Factor Scores Underlined.

**Key at beginning of Appendix M identifies the phrases which correspond with the numbers in parentheses on the chart.

SPEAKER 19

Scale Values and Factor Scores* (Medians, Rounded to Nearest Whole Values)

Self-Rating Phrases**

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)
Evaluative	24222 2	22224 2	24222 2	22234 2	34222 2	72242 2	42222 1	42222 1
Potency	22621 2	21213 2	12231 2	62622 2	66132 3	12332 2	12233 2	12223 2
Activity	55266 5	14565 5	66262 6	66256 6	62656 6	26562 5	63652 5	52356 5

Abstract-Speech Phrases**

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)
Evaluative	22224 1	22242 1	24222 1	43222 2	24222 1	42222 1	43232 3	22224 1
Potency	12133 2	21221 2	11233 2	52212 2	23312 2	32312 2	13532 3	31222 2
Activity	22556 5	26656 6	62462 4	65562 5	66256 6	66625 6	65556 5	66256 6

Speech-Topic Phrases**

	(1)	(2)	(3)
Evaluative	22224 1	22422 1	31422 2
Potency	66213 3	62222 1	33133 3
Activity	12266 2	22266 2	65662 6

* Factor Scores Underlined.

**Key at beginning of Appendix M identifies the phrases which correspond with the numbers in parentheses on the chart.

SPEAKER 20

Scale Values and Factor Scores* (Medians, Rounded to Nearest Whole Values)

Self-Rating Phrases**

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)
Evaluative	23323 3	22222 2	42222 2	22232 2	35322 3	22222 2	52323 3	52223 2
Potency	23334 3	22522 2	35234 3	72545 5	55322 3	13332 3	32222 2	32535 3
Activity	65252 5	16535 5	65352 5	35255 5	62355 5	25532 3	25321 2	51552 5

Abstract-Speech Phrases**

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)
Evaluative	72111 1	21116 1	12222 2	25211 2	22221 2	21221 2	32553 3	22132 2
Potency	12323 2	31214 2	23353 3	55242 4	15343 3	31242 2	43522 3	21231 2
Activity	51325 3	15532 3	53532 3	35552 5	65135 5	26215 2	35332 3	23155 3

Speech-Topic Phrases**

	(1)	(2)	(3)
Evaluative	32365 3	25212 2	76765 6
Potency	53643 4	27225 2	12221 2
Activity	36363 3	11325 2	67232 3

* Factor Scores Underlined.

**Key at beginning of Appendix M identifies the phrases which correspond with the numbers in parentheses on the chart.

SPEAKER 21

Scale Values and Factor Scores* (Medians, Rounded to Nearest Whole Values)

Self-Rating Phrases**

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)
Evaluative	23344 3	24233 3	42243 3	34444 4	44442 4	44445 4	24444 4	34444 4
Potency	23331 3	12333 3	24542 4	53325 3	55244 4	32344 3	25554 5	24344 4
Activity	65233 3	25553 5	45354 4	36435 4	35435 4	25424 4	66545 5	34455 4

Abstract-Speech Phrases**

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)
Evaluative	11122 1	34432 3	22222 2	13222 2	22433 3	22322 2	41544 4	23233 3
Potency	24434 4	43223 3	24535 4	43243 3	23444 4	42343 3	42333 3	54553 5
Activity	33446 4	22532 2	56433 4	52464 4	63245 4	35533 3	34456 4	33345 3

Speech-Topic Phrases**

	(1)	(2)	(3)
Evaluative	45455 5	22334 3	74664 6
Potency	34444 4	52232 2	21423 2
Activity	66335 5	12346 3	72112 2

* Factor Scores Underlined.

**Key at beginning of Appendix M identifies the phrases which correspond with the numbers in parentheses on the chart.

SPEAKER 22

Scale Values and Factor Scores* (Medians, Rounded to Nearest Whole Values)

Self-Rating Phrases**

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)
Evaluative	64333 3	33333 3	24233 3	54434 4	24332 3	23553 3	43333 3	23325 3
Potency	62652 5	26343 3	26644 4	33523 3	45353 4	62443 4	23553 3	23563 3
Activity	45545 5	36653 5	43665 5	54544 4	43545 4	55344 4	44533 4	56542 5

Abstract-Speech Phrases**

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)
Evaluative	32223 2	22242 2	33322 3	33334 3	35234 3	4434 4	24444 4	52332 3
Potency	64445 4	46224 4	33534 3	43344 4	26244 4	43444 4	44444 4	44553 4
Activity	23544 4	26456 5	54364 4	53543 4	35225 3	54444 4	44354 4	44434 4

Speech-Topic Phrases**

	(1)	(2)	(3)
Evaluative	22325 2	11112 1	22222 2
Potency	26642 4	22222 2	26262 2
Activity	27266 6	26226 3	62262 2

* Factor Scores Underlined.

**Key at beginning of Appendix M identifies the phrases which correspond with the numbers in parentheses on the chart.

SPEAKER 24

Scale Values and Factor Scores* (Medians, Rounded to Nearest Whole Values)

Self-Rating Phrases**

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)
Evaluative	34444 4	44433 4	43444 4	44443 4	43334 3	24434 4	34444 4	44444 4
Potency	33434 3	43434 4	35444 4	44444 4	34443 4	34444 4	43444 4	24434 4
Activity	34333 3	25544 4	34544 4	54345 4	42444 4	34442 4	34542 4	43445 4

Abstract-Speech Phrases**

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)
Evaluative	11443 3	42444 4	44444 4	33443 4	34344 4	43444 4	44444 4	44444 4
Potency	14444 4	43334 3	44444 4	44442 4	33544 4	44444 4	44444 4	44444 4
Activity	43444 4	34444 4	44444 4	44544 4	42333 3	54445 4	44444 4	44444 4

Speech-Topic Phrases**

	(1)	(2)	(3)
Evaluative	77677 7	22334 3	54533 4
Potency	13461 3	22222 2	44622 4
Activity	74241 4	24244 4	62242 2

* Factor Scores Underlined.

**Key at beginning of Appendix M identifies the phrases which correspond with the numbers in parentheses on the chart.

SPEAKER 28

Scale Values and Factor Scores* (Medians, Rounded to Nearest Whole Values)

Self-Rating Phrases**

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)
Evaluative	16122 2	12225 2	45223 3	12223 2	16223 2	22152 2	22222 2	62322 2
Potency	12221 2	11222 2	13221 2	41212 2	22221 2	21322 2	22252 2	72222 2
Activity	63236 3	17664 6	55352 5	26256 5	72234 3	26352 3	56532 5	31565 5

Abstract-Speech Phrases**

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)
Evaluative	21222 2	42563 4	32232 2	22222 2	25322 2	22422 2	44444 4	22222 2
Potency	22422 2	25355 5	21333 3	32222 2	53432 3	11222 2	44444 4	21222 2
Activity	62347 4	33555 5	66362 6	35662 5	62245 4	57623 5	44444 4	65136 5

Speech-Topic Phrases**

	(1)	(2)	(3)
Evaluative	76666 6	11112 1	77777 7
Potency	22646 4	62112 2	22415 2
Activity	23722 2	22266 2	17111 1

* Factor Scores Underlined.

**Key at beginning of Appendix M identifies the phrases which correspond with the numbers in parentheses on the chart.

SPEAKER 30

Scale Values and Factor Scores* (Medians, Rounded to Nearest Whole Values)

Self-Rating Phrases**

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)
Evaluative	35131 3	67623 6	64253 4	12243 2	23625 3	52362 3	36475 5	35556 5
Potency	52224 2	16334 3	66444 4	24264 4	43443 4	45654 5	43574 4	73555 5
Activity	34523 3	44535 4	14633 3	24346 4	33636 3	36444 4	34443 4	23343 3

Abstract-Speech Phrases**

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)
Evaluative	25633 3	63544 4	34443 4	41322 2	33433 3	44631 4	44344 4	34443 4
Potency	55644 5	33455 4	54333 3	32343 3	52433 3	74544 4	44333 3	34533 3
Activity	43444 4	45455 5	64563 5	24642 4	46455 5	34333 3	44454 4	34655 5

Speech-Topic Phrases**

	(1)	(2)	(3)
Evaluative	63563 5	56542 5	53526 5
Potency	24234 3	14353 3	22443 3
Activity	35235 3	42264 4	64445 4

* Factor Scores Underlined.

**Key at beginning of Appendix M identifies the phrases which correspond with the numbers in parentheses on the chart.

SPEAKER 34

Scale Values and Factor Scores* (Medians, Rounded to Nearest Whole Values)

Self-Rating Phrases**

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)
Evaluative	24433 3	34234 3	44232 3	23344 3	43223 3	34443 4	42344 4	43234 3
Potency	43333 3	34434 4	35343 3	44444 4	33242 3	33343 3	35334 3	33334 3
Activity	36255 5	24554 4	44553 4	54345 4	62745 5	55345 5	64545 5	54545 5

Abstract-Speech Phrases**

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)
Evaluative	22124 2	42242 2	34243 3	24332 3	33423 3	41223 2	44544 4	33244 3
Potency	22424 2	44433 4	33434 3	44244 4	54523 4	54422 4	45444 4	43433 3
Activity	42644 4	24444 4	55453 5	34542 4	66345 5	54453 4	54464 4	55345 5

Speech-Topic Phrases**

	(1)	(2)	(3)
Evaluative	42222 2	24224 2	63645 5
Potency	44344 4	41243 3	44444 4
Activity	24664 4	22444 4	64544 4

* Factor Scores Underlined.

**Key at beginning of Appendix M identifies the phrases which correspond with the numbers in parentheses on the chart.

SPEAKER 35

Scale Values and Factor Scores* (Medians, Rounded to Nearest Whole Values)

Self-Rating Phrases**

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)
Evaluative	33353 3	45526 5	53334 3	33445 4	55453 5	44435 4	23233 3	62343 3
Potency	33342 3	23553 3	33231 3	65723 5	55223 3	45445 4	22332 2	22333 3
Activity	34232 3	25332 3	25233 3	25255 5	42335 3	32542 3	66353 5	23333 3

Abstract-Speech Phrases**

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)
Evaluative	22333 3	34352 3	44323 3	25253 3	33554 4	44433 4	64554 5	44433 4
Potency	43344 4	23222 2	43365 4	22232 2	55545 5	43344 4	45223 3	54355 5
Activity	43554 4	34434 4	54333 3	32353 3	52333 3	34434 4	25244 4	53645 5

Speech-Topic Phrases**

	(1)	(2)	(3)
Evaluative	32223 2	11741 1	62761 6
Potency	64365 5	11221 1	22121 2
Activity	63245 4	21122 2	24221 2

* Factor Scores Underlined.

**Key at beginning of Appendix M identifies the phrases which correspond with the numbers in parentheses on the chart.

SPEAKER 36

Scale Values and Factor Scores* (Medians, Rounded to Nearest Whole Values)

Self-Rating Phrases**

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)
Evaluative	14332 3	24336 3	36333 3	23436 3	26222 2	33363 3	65433 4	33343 3
Potency	22111 1	12244 2	23331 3	62412 2	32122 2	31133 3	13331 3	24352 3
Activity	16225 2	26622 2	14262 2	24233 3	62622 2	25343 3	15633 3	32343 3

Abstract-Speech Phrases**

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)
Evaluative	11113 1	22141 2	35333 3	72111 1	35322 3	45655 5	32222 2	33333 3
Potency	11117 1	13321 2	41332 3	11212 1	34413 3	56213 3	13346 3	21272 2
Activity	72114 2	22542 2	54323 3	22542 2	63333 3	44754 4	33334 3	24235 3

Speech-Topic Phrases**

	(1)	(2)	(3)
Evaluative	77774 7	43463 4	31711 1
Potency	71717 7	41312 2	11121 1
Activity	77447 7	31214 2	62741 4

* Factor Scores Underlined.

**Key at beginning of Appendix M identifies the phrases which correspond with the numbers in parentheses on the chart.

SPEAKER 38

Scale Values and Factor Scores* (Medians, Rounded to Nearest Whole Values)

Self-Rating Phrases**

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)
Evaluative	33433 3	34324 3	46333 4	43344 4	44533 4	33463 3	54334 4	43344 4
Potency	55543 5	35354 4	54643 4	44434 4	35343 3	42543 4	34444 4	23444 4
Activity	65552 5	24524 4	34172 3	34335 3	42344 4	34433 3	22543 3	22543 3

Abstract-Speech Phrases**

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)
Evaluative	32233 3	32452 3	23233 3	12222 2	25333 3	22335 3	62644 4	42433 3
Potency	24244 4	44424 4	52544 4	12233 2	33234 3	32224 2	43642 4	23443 3
Activity	43444 4	53444 4	64453 4	76652 6	41122 2	54566 5	24466 4	55235 5

Speech-Topic Phrases**

	(1)	(2)	(3)
Evaluative	56666 6	66664 6	67766 6
Potency	24644 4	42335 3	42424 4
Activity	24121 2	22336 3	24132 2

* Factor Scores Underlined.

**Key at beginning of Appendix M identifies the phrases which correspond with the numbers in parentheses on the chart.

SPEAKER 39

Scale Values and Factor Scores* (Medians, Rounded to Nearest Whole Values)

Self-Rating Phrases**

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)
Evaluative	54333 3	33434 3	35534 4	23234 3	44234 4	33444 4	43233 3	43533 3
Potency	35551 5	15535 5	35331 3	13514 3	55173 5	52323 3	23565 5	13556 5
Activity	54452 4	24565 5	34354 4	54455 5	44656 5	32142 2	55654 5	52545 5

Abstract-Speech Phrases**

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)
Evaluative	51114 1	21222 2	34632 3	54222 2	23332 3	23513 3	43534 4	33334 3
Potency	13222 2	22322 2	23556 5	33113 3	54625 5	62434 4	45555 5	54553 5
Activity	33223 3	32422 2	54554 5	42352 3	33543 3	54544 4	34544 4	54456 5

Speech-Topic Phrases**

	(1)	(2)	(3)
Evaluative	33634 3	11422 2	66626 6
Potency	35425 4	21211 1	31122 2
Activity	33345 3	21124 2	12243 2

* Factor Scores Underlined.

**Key at beginning of Appendix M identifies the phrases which correspond with the numbers in parentheses on the chart.

SPEAKER 40

Scale Values and Factor Scores* (Medians, Rounded to Nearest Whole Values)

Self-Rating Phrases**

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)
Evaluative	11111 1	13111 1	11211 1	12122 2	14111 1	22361 2	22212 2	21112 1
Potency	12221 2	11324 2	23131 2	42313 3	33241 3	11111 1	12123 2	12323 2
Activity	11132 1	21674 4	31752 3	34333 3	17647 6	23341 3	13532 3	32242 2

Abstract-Speech Phrases**

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)
Evaluative	11111 1	44444 4	11121 1	24444 4	11211 1	22222 2	44444 4	11111 1
Potency	14444 4	44444 4	11133 1	44244 4	33313 3	32443 3	44444 4	21232 3
Activity	71544 4	44444 4	64462 4	16643 4	43235 3	24624 4	44234 4	22133 2

Speech-Topic Phrases**

	(1)	(2)	(3)
Evaluative	33333 3	21313 2	53423 3
Potency	21124 2	21122 2	41131 1
Activity	11153 1	11244 2	74141 4

* Factor Scores Underlined.

**Key at beginning of Appendix M identifies the phrases which correspond with the numbers in parentheses on the chart.

SPEAKER 42

Scale Values and Factor Scores* (Medians, Rounded to Nearest Whole Values)

Self-Rating Phrases**

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)
Evaluative	66455 5	33356 3	43555 5	22242 2	23332 3	66563 6	25214 2	65554 5
Potency	55226 5	25545 5	55626 5	62652 5	32323 3	55355 5	62233 3	56323 3
Activity	22331 2	25616 5	62273 3	15326 3	31266 3	26662 6	14632 3	23321 2

Abstract-Speech Phrases**

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)
Evaluative	61715 5	21232 2	22252 2	13112 1	25653 5	62665 6	22562 2	33552 3
Potency	22622 2	22236 2	26222 2	23262 2	23252 2	62362 3	24655 5	65232 3
Activity	43664 4	22352 2	65223 3	73662 6	11122 1	66223 3	14262 2	35225 3

Speech-Topic Phrases**

	(1)	(2)	(3)
Evaluative	67676 6	25533 3	76656 6
Potency	22662 2	46223 3	12712 2
Activity	26231 2	11265 2	22231 2

* Factor Scores Underlined.

**Key at beginning of Appendix M identifies the phrases which correspond with the numbers in parentheses on the chart.

APPENDIX N

Median Values For Each Speaker Resulting From The Means Of The Three Judges' Speech-Tension Scales

MEDIAN VALUES FOR EACH SPEAKER RESULTING FROM THE MEANS OF THE THREE JUDGES' SPEECH TENSION-SCALES

Speaker	Median	Speaker	Median
2	4	21	4
4	5	22	7
5	6	24	3
7	3	28	6
8	7	30	6
11	4	34	6
12	4	35	7
13	7	36	5
14	5	38	5
15	5	39	4
16	5	40	5
19	5	42	4
20	6		