



1955

An investigation of the types of speech programs in California high schools

Lawrence William Payne Jr.
University of the Pacific

Follow this and additional works at: https://scholarlycommons.pacific.edu/uop_etds



Part of the [Education Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Payne, Lawrence William Jr.. (1955). *An investigation of the types of speech programs in California high schools*. University of the Pacific, Thesis. https://scholarlycommons.pacific.edu/uop_etds/1290

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Graduate School at Scholarly Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in University of the Pacific Theses and Dissertations by an authorized administrator of Scholarly Commons. For more information, please contact mgibney@pacific.edu.

AN INVESTIGATION OF THE TYPES OF SPEECH PROGRAMS
IN CALIFORNIA HIGH SCHOOLS

A Thesis
Presented to
the Faculty of the Department of Education
College of the Pacific

In Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree
Master of Arts

by
Lawrence William Payne, Jr.
February 1955

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER	PAGE
I. STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM	1
Justification	2
The thesis	3
Methodology	3
Definition of terms	5
II. SIGNIFICANCE OF RELATED AREAS	6
Significant philosophies of teaching as revealed in texts on speech	6
Survey of journals	22
Surveys of a related nature in the state	30
Summary	31
III. CRITERIA FOR THE HIGH SCHOOL SPEECH PROGRAM	33
Introduction	33
Summarization of authorities' views	34
Examples of speech program criteria	37
A minimum set of criteria	46
IV. THE QUESTIONNAIRE	50
Introduction	50
Tabulation and interpretation of questionnaire	53
Significant teacher comments	77
Summary	78

CHAPTER	PAGE
V. SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDED STUDIES .	80
Summary	80
Conclusions	82
Recommended studies	83
BIBLIOGRAPHY	86
APPENDIX	89

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE	PAGE
I. Tabulation of Questionnaires	54
II. Curricular Categories of Speech Classes . . .	58
III. Tabulation of Schools Having Required Speech Courses	61
IV. Tabulation of Schools Having Elective Speech Courses	62
V. Schools Offering Speech in Conjunction with Other Subjects	66
VI. Combined Speech Arts Classes	69

CHAPTER I

STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

Psychologists and leaders in the field of education have pointed out time and again that high school curriculums should be designed not only to teach a group of subjects, but also to meet the needs of a large group of individuals--the students. The boy or girl who spends four years in classes of mathematics, history, English, science, and a lot of other subjects does so not in order to parrot back to a teacher a long list of learned facts, but in order that he may prepare himself to take his place in society as a well adjusted and useful citizen in his chosen community. If this premise be true, then it would appear that one of the basic needs of the high school student is effective oral communication. As a consequence, one of the basic curriculum subjects would be a course in fundamentals of speech.

This thesis is an attempt to find out if that need is being met by the high schools in the State of California. Briefly stated the thesis problem is: "Are the individual student's speech needs being met by the California high school curriculums?"

Justification. Any research or survey problem to be of value to the individual making it or to others who may read it must be undertaken only if a need for the survey exists. Three main factors seemed to show a need for and to justify a survey into the above problem.

First, teachers both in and out of the field of speech have expressed definite opinions to the effect that the average high school student needs more training in speech. These opinions have been expressed to the investigator over a five year period in private conversations and at conferences for teachers.

Most speech teachers seemed to express the opinion that although a course in speech was offered in their schools it did not reach enough of the students. They tended to reflect three main reasons why speech courses were not reaching the majority of the students. These reasons were: (1) it was not a "required" course; (2) program counselors failed to emphasize the need for speech training; and (3) the majority of students seemed to have an inherent "fear" of "public speaking."

The teachers of courses other than those of speech tended to base their opinion that students needed more speech training on two main observations. The average student, according to these teachers, seemed to have no idea how to prepare, organize, and deliver an oral report.

Many students in this category also seemed "afraid" to stand before a class and make an oral report.

A second factor is closely related to the first. Group discussions concerning "speech needs" as have been conducted at various teachers' institutes and speech conferences attended by the investigator followed very closely the opinions of individual teachers as above cited.

The third factor offered strong support to the first two, namely, that a vast majority of the literature in the field of speech, that was read by the investigator, stressed a need for more high school speech training. Chapter II contains a summary of a few of the articles picked at random from preliminary reading in the Quarterly Journal of Speech (issues of 1940 through 1953) which will suffice to illustrate this third factor.

The thesis. The preceding three factors of justification indicated that the problem of meeting the high school students' speech needs existed. Believing this premise to be true, the following thesis was formulated: "An Investigation of the Types of Speech Programs in California High Schools."

Methodology. At the beginning of this work a comprehensive discussion of this problem was conducted

with the Thesis Committee. It was from this discussion that the complete statement of the problem was formulated and the method of investigation agreed upon.

A review of the related literature in the field was the first major step of this study. This review was divided into three basic steps. First, the investigator conducting the investigation was to read a representative number of speech texts. From this reading the investigator was to discern the likenesses and differences by which various authorities approached the problem of meeting the high school speech needs, as indicated in the authors' prefaces and the pattern of development in the texts. This aspect is discussed in Chapter II. Second, the various speech journals and monographs were to be scanned for articles related to this problem. The results of this scanning and reading are also discussed in Chapter II.

As a result of these first two reading categories, the criteria, as outlined in Chapter III, were formulated. The third step in this review of the literature was to check through the available thesis abstracts to determine if other studies of a like nature had been conducted. The results of this search are in evidence throughout this thesis.

The second major step of the study was the formulation of a questionnaire to be sent to the

administrations and speech departments in a cross section of California high schools.¹ The purpose, results, and interpretation of this questionnaire are discussed in Chapter IV.

The final step of the investigation was the formulation of conclusions and recommendations based on the first two major steps. These are developed in Chapter V.

Definition of terms. The term "speech" has many connotations, but as used in this study in reference to the speech needs of the high school student, the investigator uses the word in its generic sense and intends it to include those processes by which the students express and communicate ideas to other individuals and groups.

¹See Appendix, p. 90.

CHAPTER II

SIGNIFICANCE OF RELATED AREAS

I. SIGNIFICANT PHILOSOPHIES OF TEACHING AS REVEALED IN TEXTS ON SPEECH

Each authority or author of a speech text tends to put more emphasis on one phase of the total "speech arts" field than the rest according to his own teaching experience or scholastic background in the field. Although at first glance it would seem that there are almost as many philosophies on how to teach and on what to teach in a high school speech course as there are writers on the subject, one can classify most of the approaches into one of four basic categories.¹

One group takes the point of view that the students of high school age can be helped to more effective speech, a better personality, and a loss of fear in a speaking situation through speech organization and delivery. This

¹The placing of the several speech philosophies into one of four categories is based upon the investigator's own interpretation of the material contained in the texts quoted in this chapter and as listed in the Bibliography. It may well be that some of the readers will place a different interpretation of the authorities' philosophies based on their own training, experiences, or personal acquaintance with the authors.

group will ignore phonetics and interpretive speech almost entirely and start the student with the basic fundamental speech organization and let the student grow through constant speaking assignments. These persons believe that phonetics, sentence structure, and grammar should be taught in the English department, and that the speech teacher need not be burdened with anything other than delivery and organization. Interpretive speech, they point out, belongs to the Drama department.

A second philosophy is that all students should first undergo a diagnostic speech test to determine to what extent and degree speech defects exist. The curriculum is then built around various exercises to improve the student's speech, phonetically speaking. This group believes that only after the student has been corrected for these defects, some of which are: stuttering, nasality, poor tonal qualities, and sound substitutions, are they ready to learn organization and practice full speech delivery.

The third major group are the interpretationists who base their curriculum around speech improvement by reading selections from prose, poetry, and "great" speeches. This group strongly resembles the old "elocutionist" school of thought where public speaking was another form of acting. Their philosophy was that if the

student forgets "himself" in creating an interpretive role, his own speech pattern will improve and his fear of appearing before a group will subside. As one dissenting authority puts it, this is learning to speak by "osmosis."

The fourth group are those who believe that a high school speech curriculum should include all of the other three philosophies. Their opinion is that a speech course should give a student a chance to survey the over-all field of speech and participate mainly in the area where his talents best fit. A curriculum of this type normally starts with diagnostic type exercises and then divides the students into groups of speech correction, platform speakers, debators, actors, and similar types of "speech" classifications.

The following quotations from representative speech texts designed either for high school use or for the guidance of potential speech instructors will point out the basic differences of the various speech philosophies. The sections quoted are the author's objectives or principles as stated in the preface material. Before using the quotations the books were thoroughly examined to determine that the methodology used actually carried out the aims and objectives as stated in the preface.

Sarett and Foster have collaborated on a number of textbooks and are recognized as authorities in the field

of high school speech. Their text, Basic Principles of Speech, is often quoted and used as a reference by other writers. On page 12 of this text will be found the following set of six basic principles:

1. Effective speech is not for exhibition but communication.
2. Effective speech commands attention in order to win response.
3. Technique of effective speech is unobtrusive and therefore disarming.
4. Speech is effective, other things being equal, in proportion to the intrinsic worth of the speaker.
5. Impressions of the speaker are derived largely from signs of which the audience are unaware.
6. Effective speech results in part from free bodily action.²

These principles are carried out by using the philosophy of speech organization and delivery and making corrections of pronunciation, voice, gesture, etc., as the speaker progresses through many classroom and outside speaking assignments.

Friederich and Wilcox have very recently published a text for the guidance of prospective high school teachers that already is gaining rapid adoption in many

²Lew Sarett and Trufant Foster, Basic Principles of Speech (New York: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1936), p. 12.

high schools as a classroom textbook as well. They do not point out a list of basic principles but rather set forth a list of ten goals to be achieved. These are to be found on page 103 of their book, Teaching Speech in High School.

1. Develop a sincere, friendly, enthusiastic direct method of speaking.

2. To give practice in the speaking situations which occur in daily living, so that the student may acquire self-confidence and poise in speech situations.

3. Provide practice in simple vocational situations, such as the interview, telephone conversation, sales talk, etc.

4. To aid in the finding and the selecting of readings and life observations, and in their organization into usable material for speaking situations.

5. To teach instructional speaking in which the student explains, describes, narrates, defines, directs, reports, and uses illustrations, examples and analogy as well as visual aids.

6. To teach basic principles of reasoning from valid evidence so that the persuasion may be both logical and honest.

7. To initiate the pupil into the use of valid and resistance to invalid and persuasive appeals to wants and emotions.

8. To provide opportunity for practice in as many special types of formal public speeches as time will permit.

9. To stimulate creative and artistic achievements in speaking performance as far as the talent of the individual will allow.

10. To increase the effectiveness of the individual in school and community living.³

This text devotes a great deal of space to phonetic training and bodily movement. The speaking assignments are based largely upon what the authors feel the average student will come into contact with in daily school and community living. The sound of the speaker's voice and the sight of his bodily actions become as important, if not more important, than the speech organization. The authors believe that effective communication is more "how you say it" than "what you say."

Two persons who often collaborate on books in the field of speech and who are recognized as eminent authorities in this field are Wilhelmina Hedde and William Brigance. In their Speech--A High School Textbook they state, "the text offers a basis for a practical high school course." On pages 10 through 12 of the "Preface" they list the following six objectives:

1. Eradicate undesirable mannerisms--meaningless gestures and poor articulation.
2. To be able to discover, select, and arrange ideas and then express them effectively before an audience.

³Willard Friederich and Ruth Wilcox, Teaching Speech in High School (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1953), p. 103.

3. Development of mental and emotional responses to the meanings of good literature and the ability to read so that these meanings may be communicated to others.

4. Develop a cultural appreciation of good drama and a reasonable mastery of basic principles in the technique of acting.

5. Knowledge of correct social conduct in speech situations.

6. A personal objective above and beyond all others discussed, and one towards which all of the others were in part aiming--namely, the attainment of self-confidence in public and private situations.⁴

Hedde and Brigance continually point towards objective six by using four main speech field media: (1) phonetic voice training, (2) public speaking organization and delivery, (3) oral interpretation, and (4) technique of acting. Their over-all aim is not to develop a student's "speech" as such but through the use of the speech arts to develop the student to a point where he has poise, self-confidence, and a well modulated voice. It is their philosophy that if this is accomplished the student will be successful in any oral communicative endeavor.

Karl F. Robinson of Northwestern University has devoted much of his time and energies toward various

⁴Wilhelmina G. Hedde and William Norwood Brigance, Speech--A High School Textbook (New York: J. B. Lippincott Company, 1937), pp. x-xii.

researches into the needs and aims of speech education as directed towards the secondary level. A study of this nature would be incomplete without some reference to his findings and philosophy. His book, Teaching Speech in the Secondary School, is both a speech teacher's manual and a secondary speech textbook. On page 4 he voices some of his philosophy of speech for the high school student as a result of much research into the after-effects of speech as given or as not given to high school students.

Speech training has become important not only because the human voice can now travel around the world; but also because specialized forms of speech have become the everyday necessity of the man and woman on the street. Speech training is essential for each student if he is to accomplish each of the four objectives of secondary education as set down by the National Educational Policies Commission, namely: (1) Self realization--the personal development of the student; (2) happy social relationships--the ability of the individual to get along with people in our society; (3) economic efficiency--adequate vocational training; (4) good citizenship--provision for willing and competent acceptance of civic responsibility. It is vital to the maximum personal development of the individual. It is the means by which persons exchange ideas and make the social adjustments necessary in human relationships. It is an all-important vocational need. Speech permits the individual citizen to participate in civic affairs, to help solve problems through discussion and conference; it is the medium which allows men to present issues of importance to voters, eliciting their response at the ballot box. It is therefore the responsibility of the secondary school to provide training in the basic elements and the more specialized forms of speech so that all students may have

the opportunity to achieve proficiency in these essential skills. It is the right of every high school student to have speech training as an integral part of a system of free public education. Citizens in a democracy must be competent in speech.⁵

Robinson lists his objectives for a high school speech course.

1. Speech needs and abilities of every student tested and diagnosed.
2. Students with major defects provided opportunity for correction.
3. The large group having 'inadequate' and normal speech should be given the chance to profit from systematic education in such fundamental speech processes as:
 - a. Adjustment to speaking situations of everyday life--to rid one of fear and develop confidence and poise.
 - b. Develop sincere, friendly and communicative speaking personality.
 - c. Skill in developing a subject.
 - d. Analysis of audience which is addressed.
 - e. Organization and arrangement of content.
 - f. Mastery of effective delivery.
 - g. Expressing one's ideas in simple, acceptable and effective spoken language.
 - h. Articulating and pronouncing words intelligibly.

⁵Karl F. Robinson, Teaching Speech in the Secondary School (New York: Longmans, Green and Company, 1951), p. 4.

i. Using voice effectively.

j. Communication of ideas with expressive and coordinated bodily action.

k. Ability to select and arrange content for reading aloud.

l. Effective use of fundamental processes in reading aloud ordinary material from the printed page.

m. Cultivation of good listening habits for purposes of learning, evaluating and criticizing.

4. Students who are superior in basic speech skills should be given opportunities to develop special skills directly associated with their best interests, needs and abilities.

5. Basic speaking skills should be implemented through a balanced program of functional speech experiences.

6. Evaluating the growth and development in basic speech skills.⁶

Robinson's basic philosophy as outlined in this text is diagnosis for all students, then separate them into three classes: (1) those who have serious speech defects and need a correctionist's help, (2) the average speaker who is adequate but can be vastly improved, and (3) the superior speech student who does not need basic speech training, but a chance to become proficient in speech in line with his special needs. Robinson's

⁶Ibid., p. 81.

philosophy of training is one of articulation study combined with speech organization and delivery training and a minimum amount of oral reading training.

The Speech Arts by Alice Craig is a high school text that is still used by many schools, and her philosophy can be found in the "Foreword."

The gifted students must be given the technique and training that will enable them to develop their talents; the mediocre or average need to be given exercises and opportunities, perhaps a little less formal and public, that will encourage and develop their alertness, assurance, initiative, and resourcefulness--the especially weak should be given definite technical exercises together with reassuring and helpful advice that will reveal to them the possibilities of gaining normal expression.⁷

Again we see with Craig the philosophy in action of dividing the students according to innate abilities. She also builds her curriculum of speech around all speech arts giving the students exercises in phonetics, platform speaking, oral interpretation and dramatics, believing that this will develop poise and self-confidence in all forms of oral communication.

Another textbook by Hedde and Brigrance, American Speech, is of more recent publication than their Speech--A High School Textbook, but their philosophy remains the

⁷Alice Craig, The Speech Arts (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1932), p. v.

same as will be noted in the "Preface" where they state that the book is based on the following three tenets:

1. As society becomes more complex, its speech patterns likewise become more complex and speech training, therefore, becomes increasingly important.

2. Speech training in high school should be not merely for the talented few, but for all who in life must face speech situations in any form.

3. This training should aim at making efficient future citizens of the masses now in school, so they will be prepared for living in a democratic way of life.⁸

The methodology used in this text is the same as used in the previous one quoted; namely, develop poise, articulation, and self-confidence through development of the student by a curriculum of all phases of the speech arts.

Another high school text that has seen much service is Dodd and Seabury's Our Speech. They approach the subject by attempting to arouse interest by giving a "colorful" background to "our" words. They believe the curriculum should accomplish three aims and have six public speaking principles.

⁸Wilhelmina G. Hedde and William Norwood Brigance, American Speech (New York: J. E. Lippencott Company, 1946), p. v.

1. Integration of written and oral English
2. Corrective speech
3. Preparation for public speaking principles of:
 - a. Speech as an inherent part of living and should be given a place among fundamentals.
 - b. A child cannot write correct English until he can speak correct English.
 - c. We talk far more than we write.
 - d. It is a universally recognized fact that good speech is an asset of the greatest social importance.
 - e. Speech guides and encourages the development of personality.
 - f. The socialized activities of the speech course aid the child in adapting himself to life situations.⁹

Dodd and Seabury also have the philosophy of student development through the use of the entire speech art field.

Leon K. Whitney in his much used text, Directed Speech, puts forth this philosophy:

. . . that the purpose of speech is to secure some specific response from the mind of the hearer is the basic principle in this book, together with the consequent principle that the material of speech and its delivery must be adjusted to secure the response desired.

This book subscribes to the point of view of those who believe that delivery is better directed from

⁹Celeste V. Dodd and Hugh F. Seabury, Our Speech (Austin, Texas: Stick Company of Austin, Texas, 1940), p. vi.

within than from without; that delivery should be directed by a desire to secure a specific response from a specific person or group. This does not mean that one must always consciously evaluate his ideas and deliberately direct every movement of the body or change of the voice. It does mean that one must consciously learn the principles of directing both the speech and the delivery, and must practice directing them until by force of habit he is able to say the correct thing when required as well as to say it in the correct way.¹⁰

It is Whitney's contention that phonetics belong to the English or correctionist departments and that speech can most successfully be taught by development of organization and delivery under constant oral speech assignments.

Another fundamentalist who bypasses all forms of speech arts other than "platform" speaking in developing her principles of public speaking for high school, is Margaret Painter. She states her philosophy as follows:

Training in speech that will bring immediate returns is the need and the demand of high school youth. Students must be able to recognize the values of such a course in greater ease before the daily audiences that must be faced in school, social, and community associations, and in the increasing assurance that their ideas are being presented clearly and interestingly.

Base in Speech is designed to meet the needs of such students. Its pages constitute a manual for a laboratory course in public speaking. The book is

¹⁰Leon K. Whitney, Directed Speech (New York: Ginn and Company, 1936), p. iii.

based on the theory that effectiveness in speaking can be developed by a knowledge of its principles followed by a testing of that knowledge on the platform in the public speaking, chemistry, history, or English class; before the student club or committee; and in informal social groups. Ease in Speech does not offer a course which is an end in itself; it simply provides the tools which may open new avenues of interest and development that lead to the satisfactions of achievement and service. It is based on the theory that the best pedagogy requires knowledge plus experience. It assumes that certain fundamental principles of speaking are essential for all and that one principle must find expression in actual experience before the next is undertaken.¹¹

The final text to be quoted in support of one of the four basic philosophies of speech education for the high school level is Gladys L. Borchers' Living Speech. This text is designed primarily for the first speech course in the secondary school. It is based on three propositions:

First, that there is a body of principles and techniques--such as effective action, good voice, appropriate language, acceptable pronunciation--fundamental to all types of speech.

Second, that mastering these essentials comes most readily through supervised practice in pantomime, interviews, club meetings, and dozens of similar activities that are of immediate importance to the pupil.

Third, that a pupil will discover his own speech problems and their solution when he is encouraged to analyze everyday experiences.

¹¹Margaret Painter, Ease in Speech (New York: D. C. Heath and Company, 1937), p. 111.

Therefore, this book attempts to place boys and girls in a variety of speech situations. The student is encouraged to participate in a variety of speaking, reading, and acting projects and through them to discover and correct his own difficulties.¹²

This text also uses all forms of the speech arts, but uses the unusual approach that is directly opposite of the usually accepted procedure of going from fundamentals of speech to drama in that the author starts the student with pantomimic exercises then goes to phonetics, interpretation, platform speaking and acting in that order. This theory assumes that through pantomime the student develops a large degree of self-confidence and poise necessary to carry out successfully the other aspects of her speech curriculum.

The significance of the above stated principles, aims, objectives, and philosophies of speech is that all authorities in the field of high school text writing agree that speech training is an essential need of all students, but differ as to what the course should consist of and how it should be taught.

¹²Gladys L. Borchers, Living Speech (New York: Harcourt, Brace and Company, 1939), p. v.

II. SURVEY OF JOURNALS

The second field of related areas for this study to be explored was the material to be found in speech journals, bulletins, monographs, and national surveys.

There were many surveys revealed that were closely related to the one here being conducted. A summary of a few of the articles picked at random from preliminary reading in related areas will suffice to illustrate the general tenor of the findings.

From 1932 through 1937 Harrison M. Karr¹³ conducted a survey among the Los Angeles high schools to determine what effect the "fusion" or "core" curriculum program was having on speech. The results of this survey revealed that speech was retaining its own identity, but not increasing to an appreciable amount. The enrollment of the schools increased 18 per cent during that period, and the survey revealed a 19 per cent increase of speech teacher employment. A follow-up interview showed that the majority of administrators and teachers felt much more speech education was necessary.

¹³Harrison M. Karr, "Statistical Message of Encouragement to Teachers of Speech," Quarterly Journal of Speech, 26:171, April, 1940.

Another study of speech in relation to the core type curriculum was conducted by Karl F. Robinson, and he found that for the core curriculum to be successful it must have speech as the center of the core. He states:

The growth of personality and ability to make social adjustments grow not from the study of man's relationships alone (social studies) but from the standpoint of the individual, from actually engaging in these activities which man 'uses to make' such growth and adjustment. These are fundamentally activities of communication (speech).¹⁴

Dorothy Behannon conducted a speech survey among 285 ninth grade pupils of Joplin, Missouri, to determine the speech abilities and needs of these students. Each student prepared and gave a two minute speech and was checked against this nine point criteria:

1. Choice of ideas
2. Organization of materials
3. Use of language
4. Projection to the audience
5. Control of bodily activity
6. Rhythm
7. Pronunciation

¹⁴Karl F. Robinson, "The Heart of the Core Curriculum," Quarterly Journal of Speech, 36:367, October, 1940.

8. Voice control

9. General effectiveness

The findings were summarized as follows:

All students need some type of speech improvement. There is no great inability to 'speak,' but lack of one or more of the above criteria makes it desirable for all to have some training based on individual needs as determined each year by a 'diagnostic speech.'¹⁵

Former head of the Federal Department of Agriculture, Carl F. Taeusch, sent out a questionnaire to fifteen hundred top-salaried staff members and eighty-five hundred members of the agriculture extension service to determine what sources helped them the most in their present jobs, and which course they did not take that they felt they should have taken. Among the top four courses mentioned as a "need course" or one which would have helped them the most which they did not take was "some type of course or courses in effective speaking."¹⁶

The following quotations from an article "Education and Speech Education Tomorrow," by Karl R. Wallace, summarizes the need of speech in high school as expressed

¹⁵Dorothy Bohannen, "The Speech Needs and Abilities of 9th Grade Pupils of Joplin, Missouri," The Quarterly Journal of Speech, 27:182, April, 1941.

¹⁶Carl F. Taeusch, "Effective Speaking as an Index of Thought," The Quarterly Journal of Speech, 27:195, April, 1941.

in various ways by many authors and authorities:

. . . 75 per cent of our graduates will write very few letters and reports--except in conjunction with their vocations. Almost none will write interpretive essays or analyses of books and articles. In their world they will look, listen, and talk. As teachers, we'd better act accordingly.¹⁷

. . . the schools know that 75 per cent of their graduates assume the responsibilities of adult life and never go on to college. They have accordingly dethroned college preparatory studies and have enthroned those studies and activities which manifestly help their graduates to pay the grocery bill, to beget and maintain a family, to make wise use of their leisure time, and to participate in civic and political decisions. Only when they lose sight of their social goals can they afford to neglect speech education.¹⁸

. . . if communication and symbolization be regarded as the principal means of individual growth and self-realization, there is a good chance that education in language behavior, especially in the language as spoken, may once again occupy a central position in all education.¹⁹

In 1945 the National Association of Teachers of Speech prepared a survey report for the secondary school principals' publication, and the following quotation from the "Foreword" of this issue summarizes the general feeling of the association towards education and speech:

¹⁷Karl R. Wallace, "Education and Speech Education Tomorrow," The Quarterly Journal of Speech, 36:177, April, 1950.

¹⁸Ibid., p. 182.

¹⁹Ibid., p. 183.

There are certain concepts of postwar public secondary education which seem self-evident. Among them are (1) we must educate all American youth, (2) we must adjust our curriculums to provide a 'general' education which shall include all that every high-school boy or girl should learn in order to fit him to become a good citizen in a free democracy, and (3) we must adapt that instruction to the individual's specific needs and abilities. No such general education for life can properly leave speech instruction out of the picture.²⁰

In 1953 the Speech Association of America were invited to outline their speech program for the same publication.²¹

While this particular publication does not have aims and objectives listed in the "Preface" or a general summary of the contents in the "Conclusion," Franklin Knower, the committee chairman, states:

The titles of the fourteen chapters of this Bulletin state what the committee holds to be essential features of the speech program.²²

These chapter headings are as follows:

Chapter I: "Representative Vocations Call for Speech"

²⁰Pierre Tracy, chairman, "The Role of Speech in the Secondary School," Bulletin of the National Association of Secondary School Principals, XXIX (1945), 6.

²¹Franklin H. Knower, chairman, "A Speech Program for the Secondary School," The Bulletin of the National Association of Secondary School Principals, XXXVIII (January, 1954).

²²Ibid., p. 2.

Authorities from each of the following fields point out the value of speech training to the success of workers in their particular vocations: public service, engineers, men in industry, executives, labor, doctors, military services, and teaching.

Chapter II: "Former High School Pupils Support Speech"

A number of quotations from former high school students across the nation pointing out the values high school speech has for them in their present professions.

Chapter III: "A Sound Speech Program is Based on Fundamentals"

This chapter points out the need of developing these four basic fundamentals through speech:

(1) Personality development, (2) Diction, (3) Visual Symbolism, and (4) Critical Thinking.

Chapter IV: "Functional Speech Activities as Emphasized"

Functional speech activities are listed as conversation, interviewing, story telling, dramatics, general education through speech, discussion, and debate.

Chapter V: "We Teach Speech for Democratic Citizenship"

This chapter outlines the necessity of corrective speech for those handicapped by abnormal or subnormal speech and a program of correction and aid for those who have auditory disabilities.

Chapter VI: "We Teach Speech for Democratic Citizenship"

A discussion of how various methods of discussion, debate, and evaluation help train leadership and individual functioning in a democratic society.

Chapter VII: "We Teach the Use of Knowledge"

The use of speech as a tool for acquiring and using knowledge in general and studying contemporary affairs in particular.

Chapter VIII: "We Develop the Aesthetic Qualities"

The development of poise, self-confidence, and aesthetic appreciation through the use of interpretive reading, choral speaking, and theatrical are discussed.

Chapter IX: "Speech Contributes to Education for Economic Security"

This chapter points out the part speech plays in occupation and social success.

Chapter X: "Education (or Listening) is also Needed"

The value of critical and analytical listening is

discussed in this chapter.

Chapter XI: "We Help Others in Teaching Speech"

Various ways are discussed in which others benefit from an individual's training in speech.

Chapter XII: "The Speech Program can be Adapted to Various Schools and Types of Curricula"

Twelve different approaches to the speech education program as they fit into twelve types of secondary curricula are discussed.

Chapter XIII: "A Speech Program Requires Good Teaching"

The Many facets of speech teaching and "how and why" they must be used are outlined.

Chapter XIV: "The Administrator Has Responsibilities for the Speech Program"

The selecting of a speech teacher, the value of a speech program to the school's public relations program, and the evaluation of the secondary school speech program are discussed.

From the above journalistic quotations and paraphrases it would seem that their significance to this study is the unanimous feeling that speech training is a definite need for all secondary school pupils. What is most significant is the support for speech training given by authorities outside the speech field--men and

women from all vocations tend to support the authorities in the speech field in their emphatic statements that speech training is a must in today's high school curriculums.

III. SURVEYS OF A RELATED NATURE IN THE STATE

The third field of inquiry into related areas to this study was made to determine if any similar surveys had been conducted in this state. This check was made by writing to the libraries of the main universities and colleges in the state.

No state-wide surveys were found to exist, but four related surveys of a local nature were revealed in this inquiry. The University of Southern California has on file the survey of Harrison M. Karr, as previously cited, concerning the core curriculum and its effect on speech in the Los Angeles high schools. The College of the Pacific shows a survey to determine "The Influence of Speech on the Inflection of Employees." This survey was conducted in Stockton to determine value and effect of speech habits of employees who contact the public. The University of California at Los Angeles mentions a survey of Southern California to determine what speech textbooks were being used and San Jose State conducted a follow-up survey of former speech students to evaluate

their speech programs.

Having been unable to find any studies of a like nature to this problem: "Are the individual students speech needs being met by the California high school curriculum," this investigator felt free to proceed with his survey and thesis.

IV. SUMMARY

Three areas related to the problem under consideration were investigated and their significance noted:

The first related area of textual materials revealed that all authorities in this field were in agreement that all high school students should have speech training, but differed in their opinions as to what degree of training the students should receive, how this training should be organized, and which of the speech arts constituted a well rounded high school speech curriculum.

The second related area of journalistic writings had two major points of significance to this study. First, all authorities in the speech field were in complete and undeniable agreement that all high school pupils needed some degree of speech education. Secondly, a large number of authorities in various professions other than speech or education supported the speech authorities' views.

The third area of inquiry revealed that there had not been any other surveys of a similar nature to this one conducted in the State of California.

CHAPTER III

CRITERIA FOR THE HIGH SCHOOL SPEECH PROGRAM

I. INTRODUCTION

Based on the opinions and findings of the authorities in the field of speech education as reflected in Chapter II, it seemed to this investigator that certain criteria were evident that could be used as a basis for setting up a speech program for high schools. The criteria listed and discussed in this chapter are not to be considered the only or the best criteria on which to base a secondary school speech program. They are merely suggested criteria which could be used and which seem to reflect the opinions of the majority of authorities read by this investigator.

Chapter III is divided into three areas: The first, a summarization of the criteria most often mentioned in the readings of this investigator; secondly, a list of two sets of criteria as developed by national speech organizations that could be used to set up a high school speech program. The final phase of this chapter is devoted to the development of a minimum set of criteria that could be used as a starting point to develop a speech program.

II. SUMMARIZATION OF AUTHORITIES' VIEWS

In compiling a set of criteria adaptable to the needs of his school, it is essential that the administrator or speech chairman ascertain by means of a pre-program inventory those criteria of greatest value to his school.

The pre-program inventory as here developed is evolved out of a compilation of suggestions as reflected in the majority of opinions of the authorities read in the field. Most authorities feel it is necessary for the administrator to have an answer for each phase of this compiled inventory in order to have a successful speech program. Those questions most often asked are the following:

1. Is the administration convinced that a speech program is needed by the pupils in the school?
2. Are trained speech personnel available to coordinate and supervise a speech program?
3. Will students in need be able to receive individual speech counseling?
4. Can a diagnostic speech testing program be set up to ascertain the speech needs of each individual student?
5. Are administrators and teachers willing to devote the time and effort necessary to develop a worthwhile speech program?

6. Is the majority of the faculty willing to cooperate with the development of the speech program?

7. Are the administrators willing to defend the need of the program and explain it to the school board and community organizations?

8. Is specialized help available, in the school, community, or other sources, to help in the development of the department?

9. Are there building facilities available for a speech program?

10. Can adequate supplies be obtained to "carry through" such a program?

11. Will the speech program be of benefit to teachers and classes outside the department?

12. Will the community support a speech program in its school?

13. Will the students be able to make use of their training outside the department in the school and community?

14. Can the school financially afford a speech program?

These questions must be answered in the affirmative if the administrators and the staff expect to have a successful speech program.

In formulating a criteria for speech concepts one must have in mind the aims and purposes of speech. From the references to the authorities in the field, as outlined in Chapter II, we can readily see that each authority has evolved his own set of aims and purposes to fit his particular philosophy of speech training. Hence this investigator hesitates to quote any one authority's definition of speech training as a universal guide. It would seem that each administration can evolve a set of aims and purposes of speech training to meet the needs of their particular school situation.

However, there are certain guiding principles that are common to most philosophies of speech education for the high school student. These common aims and purposes as noted by the investigator are summarized in the following list, which would be used as a basis for a speech program criteria.

1. Speech training has a common purpose--to develop more effective communication.
2. Speech consists of two main aspects:
 - a. Visible physical attitudes and activities
 - b. Audible tones, rhythms, modulations, and conventional phonic units constituting spoken language.

3. The above statements being true, the following aims should be common to all speech training programs:
- a. To develop a poised self-confident individual
 - b. To correct articulatory and pronunciation errors
 - c. To teach method in speaking
 - d. To communicate clearly and effectively to the listener
 - e. To meet the individual speech needs and problems of the student.

Keeping these basic aims in mind when setting up a criteria for a speech program, the staff or speech committee will select the best basic principles of speech education from known authorities and evolve a set of principles upon which the success of the speech program for their situation may be predicated.

III. EXAMPLES OF SPEECH PROGRAM CRITERIA

The following two sets of criteria have been evolved out of national speech committee research. Although the first set was published in 1925, it is still valuable and can well be used by any school in developing criteria for its own purposes and needs. The second set

is the one that was published as a result of a nationally conducted investigation into the field of high school speech.

The following criteria are from a report of a special committee of the National Association of Teachers of Speech (now called the Speech Association of America).

1. Courses should be organized for regular class instruction under the 'unit' system. 'Rhetoricals,' 'assemblies,' and 'plays' may legitimately be products of or parts of, the courses, but should be incidental to the regular classroom work. Courses should not be clearing houses for interscholastic contests in which the reputations of the school and of the teacher depend on the decision.

2. Teachers should have sympathy with the work; training in its methodology; fundamental training in phonetics, voice, pronunciation, and principles of expression; personal proficiency in speaking; habits of speech and pronunciation which will be a sound influence on their pupils.

3. Courses should improve the pupil's private speech and conversation quite as much as--or even more than--his speaking in public. They should also do quite as much to suppress bad public speaking as to promote good public speaking.

4. All work in oral expression should build on the natural, conversational speech of the individual--improving and developing, but not artificially standardizing it.

5. Voice, pronunciation, enunciation, phrasing, emphasis, and action should receive proper attention in all courses.

6. Training in expression is apt to be futile or artificial unless an impulse to express or communicate is present. Therefore, subjects discussed, readings for background, in fact the whole plan of the course, and the conduct of the class hour should be such as to stimulate the desire and develop the impulse to communicate.

7. Communication, as an underlying principle of spoken discourse, includes the discovery of ideas, their selection, their arrangement, their verbal expression, and their appropriate presentation through speech and action to secure a desired effect on the hearer.

8. The technical training of the courses should be based on the principles; (1) that the standard of speaking and reading, whether in private or in public, is essentially conversational, communicative speech, and (2) that speaking or reading in public is a quite normal act. A variety of situations, projects, etc., should be arranged to enforce and develop these fundamental principles.

9. The work of the courses should be carefully balanced between theory and practice--between the knowledge of 'how and why' and the acquisition of personal skill.

10. Written work should be required in all courses, particularly written plans, outlines, and analyses as a basis for oral work. Better speaking will mean better writing--better writing will mean better speaking.

11. A suitable text or texts should be used.

12. Appropriate collateral readings should be required: (1) readings on method, problems of technique, etc.; (2) reading of types, models, etc.; (3) readings in the characteristic content of the forms of expression studied--the selections chosen combining interesting and typical subject matter with excellence of form.

13. There should be the usual preliminary and final examinations, either (a) oral, or (b) written and oral, or (c) written, with oral work certified as in modern language.

14. No pupil should receive final credit whose pronunciation of English is unsatisfactory, or whose speech is an ineffective means of communication.

15. Not more than fifteen pupils should be assigned to each section, unless there is individual conference and drill outside the class period.

16. Where individual conferences and drills are a definite part of the course, the time necessary for them should be included in the teacher's regular schedule of teaching hours.

17. A trained teacher should be in charge.

18. The teacher should know what has been done in oral English (as well as other courses), and, wherever possible, should build on that work.¹

The above set of criteria was developed to be all inclusive, and, therefore, to be used only as a guide for any one particular high school. It does not take into consideration the size of the school, available facilities, or area needs.

The following set of criteria is much more elaborate and is intended to be used either as an evaluation checklist for a speech program already in existence or as a criterion guide for a proposed speech program development. The list of criteria is divided into two parts. The entire list may be used for a moderately large to a large high school and those questions starred may be used in evaluating or developing an adequate speech program for the small high school. The criteria were prepared by a special committee of the National Association of Teachers

¹A. M. Drummond, chairman, A Course of Study in Speech Training and Public Speaking for Secondary Schools (New York: The Century Company, 1925), pp. 10-12.

of Speech with the assistance of the American Educational Theatre Association, The American Speech Correction Association, and the Association for Education by Radio under the chairmanship of Franklin H. Knowler of the University of Iowa.

- 1.* Is speech instruction made conveniently available to all students?
- 2.* Is speech instruction adapted to individual needs and abilities in various courses and activities?
3. Does your school have a graduated and continuous program of instruction available to students in all grades?
- 4.* Does your speech program coordinate the work done in high school with the work which has been done in the grades and which may be done by those who go to college?
- 5.* Do you make an effort in speech instruction to give students a clear picture of aims and objectives in speech instruction?
6. Are your objectives validated in terms of the achievements of a good program of speech education?
- 7.* Do you attempt to guide students toward an appreciation of a high standard of speech achievement toward which they should aim by work with phonograph records, sound films, demonstrations, radio, and observational projects?
8. Do you have a speech correction program available for students who stutter, lisp, and are maladjusted, or who speak with a dialect or accent?
9. Do you have sizeable units devoted to the improvement of clearness and acceptability or articulation and pronunciation at various levels of instruction?

10.* Do you have units devoted to the improvement of clearness, of the quality, and of the use of the voice for various types of speaking?

11.* Do you have units devoted to clearness, acceptability, and effectiveness in the use of oral English at various levels of instruction?

12.* Do you have units devoted to the selection and evaluation of subjects and materials to talk about for various levels of learning?

13.* Do you help students enrich their background and knowledge for use in speaking as they mature intellectually?

14.* Do you give instruction in the development of poise, directness, and expressive action in speaking?

15.* Do you have units of instruction on the development of confidence, convictions, social sensitivity, and consideration, and social responsibilities in speech for students of various aptitudes?

16.* Do you give instruction on the development of discrimination in speaking for various purposes?

17.* Do you give instruction on adapting speech to various types of listeners and situations?

18.* Do you give instruction in appreciative and critical listening?

19. Do you give instruction in theatre and movie appreciation?

20.* Is instruction given in informal social and business speaking?

21.* Do you give instruction in interviewing and person-to-person conference speaking?

22.* Is instruction given in instructional speaking and oral reporting?

23.* Do you give instruction in oral and interpretative reading from manuscript?

24.* Do you give instruction in argumentative, persuasive, and inspirational speaking?

25.* Do you give instruction for participation in dramatic productions involving understanding of dramatic literature, staging and lighting?

26.* Do you give instruction in forum speaking, panel discussion, and parliamentary procedure?

27. Do you give instruction in radio speaking, with or without public address equipment?

28. Do you have a well-balanced program of course instruction in speech education beginning with correction and fundamentals, and advancing to more specialized objectives and interests?

29. Do you have a co-curriculum (extracurriculum) activity program in which students are challenged to their best performance in competition with others of their own level of ability?

30. Do you have a program of co-curriculum activities in which a relatively large number of your students participate?

31.* Is your co-curriculum program based directly on courses of instruction with an emphasis on further education rather than winning contests?

32. Do you have a well-balanced co-curriculum program including oral reading (declamation), discussion, debate, dramatics, and radio speaking?

33.* Does your program stress speech training in functional school and community projects and situations such as assemblies, demonstrations, and club and festival programs?

34.* Do you have a program of speech work in dramatics or other clubs?

35. Is your program in speech instruction well-supported by and coordinated with other programs of instruction in your school such as social studies, English, and art?

36.* Is your speech program directed toward making a contribution to education for life in a democratic society?

37. Do you have a speech examination program in your school by which you diagnose needs and abilities and evaluate achievements in speaking of all students?

38.* Do you give diagnostic and achievement tests in speech as a regular part of course instruction?

39. Do you keep an accumulative record of the speech needs and achievements of all students in your school system?

40.* Do you keep an accumulative record of speech achievement in regular instruction?

41. Do you have special services such as health examinations (including hearing and dental examinations), psychological counseling, and visiting teachers in your school system which you make use of in speech instructions?

42.* Do you make use of modern speech texts, reference books, and magazines in your speech instruction?

43.* Do you have extensive course material, such as magazines, pamphlets, and books, for speech making in a school library which you use in your speech instruction?

44.* Do you have appropriate classrooms which can be used effectively for speech instruction?

45. Do you have and use an efficient voice recording and playback instrument in your school system?

46. Do you have and use speech charts, models, phonograph records, educational films, and other laboratory equipment for dramatic productions?

47.* Do you have a stage, with scenery, and lighting equipment for dramatic productions?

48.* Is your program organized with adequate course time to achieve results in course objectives?

49.* Is your instructional work in speech courses given sufficient academic credit and recognition to make it comparable in motivation and dignity with other courses?

50.* Is your instructional program set up with the view of helping students in the reformulation of educational goals and continued growth in speech achievement in post-school years?

51.* Have your teachers been educated and certificated to conduct the kind of speech teaching programs for which they are responsible in your school?

52.* Do your teachers have adequate speech education to achieve results in a well-developed program?

53. Do your teachers keep up to date in speech education by participating in professional speech conferences, reading and writing for a speech journal, going to summer schools for further work, etc.?

54.* Are your teachers enthusiastic about the type of service in speech education which they are giving?

55. Are your teachers given relief in class instructional load when they carry late afternoon and evening curriculum instructional programs in order that they may function reasonably free from undue strain and fatigue?

56.* Are your teachers physically healthy and energetic in their work?

57.* Do you have an equipment and instructional budget adequate for getting results?

58.* Do teachers and administrative staff work together in a spirit of harmony and cooperative inspiration?²

²Franklin H. Klower, chairman, "The Role of Speech in the Secondary School," Bulletin of the National Association of Secondary School Principals, 29:165-68, November, 1945.

Since the administrator must, in the first and last analysis, assume the major responsibility for the success or failure of the speech program, he must select the best objectives for his program only after he has exhausted the study of his resources which are available. The foregoing criteria make it plain that leadership and cooperation of the speech staff is essential to the success of the program. Authorities are in agreement that enthusiastic leadership is the keynote to the success or failure of a speech program, and it is imperative that administrators do not attempt to set up an elaborate program when it is proposed, but rather select only those concepts which will be workable in their school in the beginning. From this beginning let the program grow as the needs arise and as the staff is able to assimilate a more elaborate speech curriculum.

IV. A MINIMUM SET OF CRITERIA

Since there are inevitably going to be a number of unknown factors affecting each individual high school, it would be impossible for administrators or speech staffs to accept either of the foregoing lists of criteria or any other all-inclusive list of criteria in its entirety. Such factors as finances, trained personnel, adequate facilities, speech needs peculiar to an area, willingness

of the entire school staff to cooperative, community resources, size of enrollment, and others will in some degree affect the successful functioning of the program. However, leadership in the person of the administrator must be evident. In the selections from the authorities quoted on the foregoing pages are criteria which will provide a guide for setting up a specific list of criteria for any one high school. Due to local needs, other concepts of speech may be added to this list; but as a minimum standard these criteria should suffice.

1. Basic speech training must develop effective and natural communication.³
2. Give practice in the speaking situations which occur in daily living, so that the student may acquire self-confidence and poise in speech situations.⁴
3. Teach basic principles of listening, reasoning, and analyzing so that persuasion may be both logical and honest.⁵

³Lew Sarett and Trufant Foster, Basic Principles of Speech (New York: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1936), p. 12.

⁴Willard Friederich and Ruth Wilcox, Teaching Speech in High School (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1953), p. 103.

⁵Loc. cit.

4. Provide essential speech training for all students.⁶
5. Speech needs of every student tested and diagnosed.⁷
6. Provide a correction program for all students who have badly defective speech.⁸
7. Suitable texts should be used.⁹
8. Speech instruction must be adapted to individual needs.¹⁰
9. Provide instruction in all phases of the speech arts--platform speaking, oral communication and interpretation, and theater appreciation.¹¹
10. Have the program staffed with trained personnel.¹²
11. Recognize the need and importance of a speech program.¹³

⁶Karl F. Robinson, Teaching Speech in the Secondary School (New York: Longmans, Green and Company, 1951), p. 4.

⁷Ibid., p. 81.

⁸Ibid., p. 82.

⁹Drummond, op. cit., p. 11.

¹⁰Knower, op. cit., p. 165.

¹¹Ibid., p. 166. ¹²Ibid., p. 167.

¹³Ibid., p. 165.

12. Arrange the schedule so that the speech staff have adequate time to properly carry out all phases of speech instruction.¹⁴

13. Build the speech curriculum as a complement to other school curricula and not as an isolated unit.¹⁵

Should local situations warrant a change in or additions to the above list, such changes may be easily made and the program improved. However, it is felt that if proper leadership is available a good start in building a speech program to meet the needs of the students will result by following the above listed criteria.

¹⁴Ibid., p. 168.

¹⁵Ibid., p. 166.

CHAPTER IV

THE QUESTIONNAIRE

I. INTRODUCTION

This study is concerned with a survey made to determine the current practices in speech programs in California high schools as far as amount of training available is concerned. It is not a study of what specifically is taught in courses or methods used in various speech programs. The results of this particular study should reveal whether the latter mentioned studies are needed.

The method of survey has utilized the following outline:

1. Resolution of the topic into component items.
2. Organization of such items into a questionnaire (see Appendix, page 90) since it was not feasible personally to gain the required information by interview.
3. Development of a cover letter of explanation to the recipients of the questionnaire. Self-addressed, stamped envelopes were included to facilitate receipt of returns.
4. Selection of schools to which questionnaires were mailed. These were selected more or less at random

from the California School Directory. The purpose of the selection was to cover a wide geographical range as well as large and small, rural and city high schools. Two hundred and fifty high schools were contacted by questionnaires. This list of high schools (see Appendix, page 94) covered, as far as the investigator could determine, all areas of the state and all sizes of high schools represented in the state.

5. Addressing of envelopes and mailing of questionnaires.

6. Tabulation of answers upon return of questionnaires.

7. Compilation of these answers as far as possible into a statistical account.

8. Summary of findings and implications.

The question, again, is: To what extent are the California high schools meeting the individual speech needs of their students?

To answer this question the following specific inquiries require answers:

1. What percentage of students are getting speech training?
2. Is the speech class required, elective, or extracurricular in nature?
3. What is the average size of the speech class?

4. Is speech taught only as part of another subject?

5. Is speech taught by personnel trained to teach speech?

6. What is the average length of the speech course?

7. Is the administration "speech conscious"?

To obtain answers to the above inquiries, a questionnaire was prepared which required a minimum of writing by those answering it.

The three-page questionnaire was mailed on May 4, 1954, to each of the two hundred and fifty schools selected. This late date was purposely chosen so that the individuals answering would have the advantage of a year just ending to help in formulating their replies. It is recognized that the end of the school year is a busy time for teachers and in all probability affected the number of returns. However, it was felt that accurate data was more pertinent than a few more returns that may have been gained by a questionnaire sent out earlier in the year. By June 28, 1954, 156 copies of the questionnaire were returned. This return of 62.4 per cent of the schools contacted comprise the source of data included herein.

II. TABULATION AND INTERPRETATION OF QUESTIONNAIRE

Table I shows the actual percentage of the schools' total enrollment that are taking speech training. It is further broken down by school population to show the effect that enrollment may have on the total number, in percentage taking speech courses.

From this basic table of the percentage of students having the benefit of formal speech training, many factors become evident. Of these, five seem to be most significant. The first and most glaring fact is that 37 of the 156 schools, or 23.7 per cent, answering the questionnaire, show that no formal speech training of any kind is offered. Four of these schools report having a trained speech teacher on the staff, but feel with the "teacher shortage" their services are more valuable in other fields--three in English and one in History. Part of these schools mention that all students receive "some degree" of speech education in their English classes, but do not mention to what extent or of what type. The fact remains that nearly one-fourth of the schools admit to having no speech classes as part of their curriculum. This fact is most significant in light of the strong support for speech training that leading professional and business men have given in written testimonials. It is further significant that

TABLE I
TABULATION OF QUESTIONNAIRES

Total school Enroll- ment	Percentage of students taking speech																			To- tals				
	0	5	10	15	20	25	30	35	40	45	50	55	60	65	70	75	80	85	90		95	100		
C-																								
100	4				1	1																1	7	
101-																								
200	9	1		1		2																1	14	
201-																								
300	5	5	2		1						1													14
301-																								
400	6	1	4	1					1		1						1							15
401-																								
500	2	2	1								1													6
501-																								
600	1	4	2	1	2						1													11
601-																								
700	1	3	1		1	1	1																	8
701-																								
800	2	3	3	1					1											1				11
801-																								
900	1				1																			2
901-																								
1000	2	3	1			1	1																	8
1001-																								
1500	3	7	6	4	1	3	2															2		28
1501-																								
2000		6	9		2																			17

TABLE I (continued)
TABULATION OF QUESTIONNAIRES

Total school Enroll- ment	Percentage of students taking speech																			To- tals				
	0	5	10	15	20	25	30	35	40	45	50	55	60	65	70	75	80	85	90		95	100		
2001-																								
2500	1	5	1																				1	8
2501-																								
3000		2	2																				1	5
3001-																								
4000				1	1																			2
<hr/>																								
Total Schools	37	42	32	9	10	8	4	1	1		4						1		1		6		156	
<hr/>																								
Per cent of Total Schools Represented in each Category	23.71	20.51	6.41	2.55	.64																			
	26.92	5.76	5.12	.64						2.56							.64		.64		3.84			

twenty-five schools volunteered the information that they have no plans for a future speech program, while only one said that they had plans for a program in the future. Six of the schools, one of these having an enrollment of 1,237 students, stated they had a speech program in the past but discontinued it for "lack of interest"! Eleven schools felt that their students received sufficient oral communication training in other classes, and, therefore, felt a formal speech class unnecessary and merely an "extra" if put into the curriculum.

In view of strong support for speech training at the secondary level, as revealed in published reports and reported in Chapter II, the second significant fact that stands out is that 111 of the 156 reporting schools, 71.14 per cent, offer speech training to 10 per cent or less of their students. Nearly three-quarters of the schools reach less than 10 per cent of their enrollment in a field that all students must use in their daily life as students and will need as an important part of their social and vocational existence for the rest of their lives!

The third and fourth factors that should be pointed out are that only twelve schools, or 7.68 per cent, reach 50 per cent or more of their students, and only six, or 3.84 per cent, give speech training to 100 per cent of their students.

The fifth point that is significant to this study and perhaps even more important to potential future studies, is that the size of the school has little to do with the amount of speech training that is offered. Table I, page 53, indicates this to be sure, with the possible exception of those schools having a total enrollment of two hundred or less. This category reveals a slightly higher percentage of schools in the "no speech offered" class; however, it must be pointed out that two of the six schools that enroll 100 per cent of their students in speech classes fall in this category. The important factor here would seem that it is not the size of the school that affects the amount of speech offered. Since school size is not the predominant factor affecting the amount of speech offered in high schools, it indicates a need for further surveys and studies by either or both the education and speech departments of colleges to try and determine the cause for the small amount of training offered.

Table I, page 53, is indicative that the California high schools are lax in meeting the speech needs of its students. Table II supports this fact and can be interpreted to show that not only are the needs not being met as far as numbers of students getting formal speech training is concerned, but also that the type of students

TABLE II
CURRICULAR CATEGORIES OF SPEECH CLASSES

	Number of Schools	Per cent of Schools
Required	8	5.12
Elective	118	75.64
Extra-curricular	28	17.94

taking speech are not, for the most part, the ones who need speech training the most. It is an accepted fact by most of the educators in the field of speech that in elective speech classes the majority of the students are the "extrovert" type and have generally good normal speech habits. These classes can be of a great help to those students, but it means the students with speech defects, shy attitudes, bad speech habits, etc., in other words, the students with the greatest need, are usually missed. This is particularly true when the school offers only one or two classes of elective speech. Approximately three-quarters (72.7 per cent) of the elective category falls into this latter classification, as shown in Table IV, page 62.

Even those schools having required speech classes do not reach 100 per cent of the student enrollment. It will be noted that Table I, pages 54 and 55, shows six schools requiring 100 per cent speech enrollment, but Table II, page 58, lists eight schools having required speech training as part of their curriculum. The reason for this seeming incongruity of the two tables is that two of the schools requiring speech allow certain substitutions. One school has 80 per cent of its students enrolled in regular speech classes and 20 per cent in either an extra-curricular class devoted to contest speaking or in the

drama class. A second school enrolls 90 per cent in the required speech class and permits 10 per cent of the students to substitute with the instructor's approval a class in dramatic arts. Six of the eight schools having required speech classes require only the minimum training of one semester of speech. In conjunction with the required classes, the curriculum has one or more elective classes where a student may take further speech training if he desires it. The two schools that require a full year of speech training do not have any elective speech classes. The breakdown of the eight schools requiring speech into size, number of classes, and number of semesters of speech required is shown in Table III.

The six schools that require one semester of speech training substitute it for one semester of English--usually during the sophomore year.

It should be stressed that only eight schools, 5.12 per cent of those reporting, feel a need for speech training for all students, and that of these eight, six--3.84 per cent--only meet the minimum needs that can be covered in one semester.

The elective program of speech education reaches into almost fifteen times as many schools as does the required program, but only reaches a small percentage of the total school population. Table IV shows the class and

TABLE III
TABULATION OF SCHOOLS HAVING
REQUIRED SPEECH COURSES.

School Enrollment	Number of Classes	Number of Semesters
125	2	2
760	4	1
780	5	1
1000	5	1
1100	6	1
1200	9	1
2200	15	1
3000	20	2

TABLE IV

TABULATION OF SCHOOLS HAVING ELECTIVE SPEECH COURSES*

Number of classes	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
Number of schools in each classification	55	33	14	7	4	2	1	1	0	0	0	1
Per cent of total schools in survey	35.25	21.16	8.97	4.48	2.56	1.28	.64	.64	0	0	0	.64
Per cent of schools having program	45.45	27.27	11.57	5.78	3.31	1.65	.82	.82	0	0	0	.82

*Figures are based on 118 schools reporting they have classes in speech on an elective basis. This represents 75.64 per cent of the total schools represented in the survey.

percentage distribution of the elective program.

As pointed out earlier, the less the number of classes that are offered, the less the number of students with speech needs that are reached. Table IV, page 62, shows that 35.25 per cent of the schools answering the questionnaire offer only one elective class in speech. This figure must be adjusted by subtracting the six schools (3.84 per cent) that also have required speech classes. This means that 31.41 per cent of the schools offer only one class of speech training for their students. The questionnaire revealed that the average speech class enrolled approximately twenty students; the minimum reported being five, the maximum being thirty-one. Lest one be misled into the belief that the other 68.6 per cent of the school offer two or more classes, it must be recalled that 23.71 per cent of the schools reported they had no speech program whatsoever. This obvious fact then stands out, namely, that 55 per cent of the total schools reporting offer speech training either not at all or offer only one class, and that this one class has only twenty students on the average. It would seem that the California high schools are meeting the speech needs of an exceedingly small minority of its students.

The third classification shown in Table II, page 56, is the extra-curricular speech program. Twenty-eight

schools--17.94 per cent--reported this type of speech activity. This is the only speech training offered in one of the schools. All of the schools having this activity confine it to one class. Again this reaches a very few students and because of the activity is devoted almost exclusively to the highly speech talented student. Of the twenty-eight schools, twenty-five schools devote this class exclusively to training students for speech contests and the other three add debate to the program. This type of program is recognized as exceptionally fine speech training, and a valuable part of the over-all speech picture, but is of value almost exclusively to the superior student. Consequently, this classification can be said to add little or nothing to the basic inquiry of whether or not the California high schools are meeting the speech needs of its students. It can be said that these twenty-eight schools are furnishing an opportunity for a few superior students to acquire advanced speech training over what they may be able to receive in the regular curriculum.

The tabulated data to this point would tend to indicate that a relatively small percentage of the high school students are receiving speech training. As far as formal speech classes are concerned, this is undoubtedly true. But are there sources other than the speech class

itself where the student may be given some degree of training in oral communication? Section II D of the Questionnaire was designed to answer this inquiry. Table V is the tabulated result of this portion of the Questionnaire.

The total of column two includes forty schools that checked either drama or social studies in addition to English as being classes where part of the curriculum course of study included speech instruction. Four schools checked social studies, and three schools checked drama and not English.

The information revealed in Table V somewhat brightens the picture. It shows that over half of the schools reporting, 51.28 per cent, teach some degree of speech to all of their students enrolled in English classes. The survey also reveals that ninety-three separate schools, or 59.68 per cent, teach speech as part of one of the above-listed classes.

This tends to indicate that the schools are doing a better job of meeting the speech needs of its students than a survey confined strictly to speech classes would indicate. However, the one all-important factor of what degree of speech is offered in these classes is not revealed in this survey. A further study is essential to obtain a more complete picture of how well the individual

TABLE V
SCHOOLS OFFERING SPEECH IN CONJUNCTION
WITH OTHER SUBJECTS*

Subject	Number of Schools	Per cent of Total Returns
English	80	51.28
Drama	30	19.23
Social Studies	17	10.89
Civics	2	1.28
Guidance	1	.64
Journalism	1	.64
Speech Arts	1	.64
Agriculture	1	.64
Not a part of any non-speech class	63	40.38

*This table indicates the number of schools reporting that speech is taught as part of another curricular subject.

speech needs of the students are being met.

The basic fact that the classes listed in Table V, page 66, are primarily courses other than speech leads us to the assumption that speech is merely incidental to the teaching of the primary subject of these classes. Remarks accompanying the questionnaires state in the majority of the cases speech is taught to a "slight degree" or "incidental" or "confined to oral reports" in most of the returns that are reflected in Table V. It is indicated then that for the most part very little formal speech education is taught in these classes, and that only the minor speech needs of the students are reached.

It is a known fact that drama and certain phases of speech education are very highly correlated, but it is also a known fact that these speech skills are of the advanced class of speech training for high school students and normally attract only the superior speech student. This fact would lead to the assumption that the thirty schools reporting drama as a class where speech is part of the course of study is helping some of the students, but is of little value to the majority of students who have real basic fundamental speech needs.

A most significant fact revealed in Table V is that sixty-three of the returns, or 40.38 per cent, state that speech is not taught as part of any other class in

their curriculum other than their speech classes. Two assumptions can be made from this. Either the schools do not recognize the value of speech education as part of such courses as English and Social Studies, or they do not realize that part of the normal course of study in these classes is oral communication.

The main implication of Table V, page 66, is that the majority of the returns indicate that speech is taught as part of other courses, but further inquiry is needed to determine the extent and value of these courses as speech education.

The questionnaire was headed with the following statement:

The term Speech as used in this questionnaire is meant to be interpreted as fundamentals of public speaking as opposed to oral interpretation, drama, oratory, or debate.

Section II E was designed to determine if any of the above speech arts were taught as part of the fundamentals class. Of the 119 schools reporting one or more classes in speech, only nineteen had classes confined strictly to the teaching of fundamentals. One hundred schools stated their classes combined fundamentals with one or more of the above-listed speech arts. Table VI is a summary of the one hundred combination classes.

TABLE VI
COMBINED SPEECH ARTS CLASSES*

Subjects	Number of schools reporting
Public speaking plus Drama	20
Public speaking plus Oral Interpretation	11
Public speaking plus debate	9
Public speaking plus Drama, Oral Interpretation and Radio	36
Public speaking plus all four	24
Total returns reported	100

*This table indicates speech arts taught in the fundamentals of speech classes in addition to basic public speaking.

In light of the fact that 75 per cent of the schools reporting speech classes have the elective program, it is not surprising that the majority of the speech programs are courses combining two or more of the speech arts. The instructors filling out the questionnaires reported that this type of program is more appealing to students than one of strictly public speaking and fundamentals, and that to maintain enrollment in an elective class there must be strong appeal for the student. This fact brings to mind the obvious question of how much of the fundamentals program is sacrificed for the other speech arts in order to maintain student interest and enrollment. This points out another field worthy of research and study. It might be well worth-while to determine how many of these combination classes are meeting real speech needs and how many of them are mainly exploiting the talents of those students having abilities in one or more of the speech arts.

Section III of the Questionnaire was designed to determine to a degree what basic qualifications the teachers of speech in the schools had and if their talents were being utilized to the best extent. It is realized that this small amount of information is merely indicative and certainly not conclusive, but as this is a basic survey, it was felt that Section III was needed

for two reasons: first, it would indicate to some extent the qualifications of those teaching speech to meet the needs of the students; and secondly, would indicate a possible area for further study.

The returns showed that in the 156 schools reporting there were 263 teachers teaching one or more classes in speech. Of these, only ninety-eight were teaching speech classes exclusively--all others were teaching one or more courses other than speech. The returns indicated that at least 116 of the teachers taught more courses outside the field of speech.

The number of teachers involved and the courses taught are as follows: English, 170; Dramatics, 48; Social Studies, 22; Music, 15; History, 8; and one teacher was also the school librarian.

Of the 263 teachers of speech, 102 of them were speech majors, forty-eight speech minors, and 113 had majors and minors in fields other than speech. Of this latter group it is significant that ninety of them were either majors or minors in the field of English, which seems indicative that the philosophy that the English teacher is qualified to teach speech is still quite prevalent.

From the fact that 113 teachers are involved in teaching speech without the benefit of a speech major or

minor, it is revealed that one of two basic administration situations must exist in many high schools. Either the trained speech teacher is not available, or the administration feels that the speech needs that exist in their schools can be adequately met by teachers not primarily trained to teach speech. In the comments section of the questionnaire, one teacher stated that she had only taken six units of undergraduate speech in college, but was teaching two classes of public speaking because the administration wanted to make classes available to those students who had "talent" in speaking, but did not feel there were enough students involved to justify hiring a full-time trained speech teacher. This is only one isolated case, but combined with the fact that 113 teachers of speech are evidently untrained for their jobs except in an incidental way, it becomes an alarming situation. A definite need of a study to determine the qualifications of teachers who are teaching speech is indicated. Colleges and universities must be cognizant of the fact that the trained speech teacher is running into competition from those outside the field, and at the same time is forced to take a job where his talents are not used to a maximum degree.

A vast majority of the teachers answering the questionnaire indicated that they were asked to carry a

heavy extra-curricular load. The four areas most often listed were: (1) speech contests--which were listed by ninety teachers; (2) school plays--listed by 101 teachers; (3) school assemblies--listed by ninety-seven teachers; and (4) physical education--listed by twenty teachers. Of the 156 returns, 127 listed at least two areas of extra-curricular activities. Of the 156 returns, ninety-four indicated that they taught a full class load in addition to their extra-curricular activities.

From the above it would seem that speech teachers, because of their talents, are required to carry an excessive "extra" load as part of their teaching duties. Whether their load is greater than those of teachers in other specialized fields such as music or sports, or of teachers in the more academic courses who must also carry extra clerical, ticket taking, counseling, chaperoning duties, etc. is not discernable by this survey. An investigation of extra-curricular duties of teachers to discern the equability of various loads could be of great value to teacher training and placement institutions.

Section IV of the Questionnaire was designed to obtain the personal opinion and information of the person answering the questionnaire and to get an indication of the attitude of the speech teachers toward the speech

program.

Of the 156 returns, 127 indicated they felt all students should have speech training. Two of them placed the excessively slow students or mentally retarded on the exception list. Ten of those filling out the questionnaire did not feel all students should take speech. Two felt that there were already too many "required" courses, and all ten felt that speech would be of no benefit to those students of below average abilities. Nineteen of the questionnaires were returned with this question left unanswered.

The important implication of this question is that 127 of the returns reflected the information contained in the field of reading reported in Chapter II, namely, that all students have a need for speech training.

Twenty-eight of the teachers answering indicated they received extra compensation for their extra-curricular duties, and sixteen carried a lighter class load to compensate for time spent in extra-curricular assignments. Of the 112 that did not fall into either category, ninety-two indicated that they felt teachers who must put in a great deal of time in extra-curricular work, such as play production or speaker contents, should have some compensation. Eighty-five of these indicated a preference for a lighter class load rather than monetary compensation.

It seems that less than one-third (28 per cent) of the teachers receive any extra consideration for their extra-curricular duties. This can easily be reflected in their ability to meet the needs of the students in their charge as a teacher who is burdened by heavy after-hours details and expected to carry a full class load and can not possibly do the maximum teaching job he is capable of doing. The teachers' thinking reflects this situation in the large number who desire a lighter load rather than monetary compensation.

As to the question concerning the lack of excess of speech positions available to trained speech personnel, seventy-five felt there was a lack; eleven felt that there was an excess of positions, and seventy either did not know or did not answer the question.

The final question was asked to try and determine the administrator's views on the need of speech education. Fifty of the returns indicated that the administration felt there was a definite need, but twenty of this fifty pointed out that because of other requirements--budget difficulties or lack of trained personnel--it was not possible to include speech as part of the required curriculum. Thirty-five returns indicated that the speech field was a "frill" course. Fifty administrators felt that the speech needs were being met in the English department.

Ten felt that the speech needs were adequately met in the social studies classes. Thirty-one of the returns left this question blank.

One of the most important revelations of the entire questionnaire comes to light in the results of the above data. Less than one-third of the administrators (fifty) stated that speech was a definite need, and twenty of them qualified their statements by pointing out indirectly that the need was not great enough to afford it a place on the regular curriculum. The other two-thirds did not know or did not feel speech as a need, or felt the need only to a slight degree so that it could adequately be taken care of in other courses. The information derived from the final question of the questionnaire needs careful consideration and a definite specialized study, for it is obvious that if administrators are not sold on the need of speech training, it is not going to find a place on an already crowded curriculum. It is indicative that if speech training is to be increased in high schools, administrators and potential administrators must be convinced that the speech need is a real one and that speech education is vital enough to find its place in the normal high school curriculum alongside of mathematics, social studies, English, history, and other regularly offered courses.

III. SIGNIFICANT TEACHER COMMENTS

The final page of the questionnaire was left blank for comments of those filling out the survey. Most of the returns had comments, but only two were repeated often enough to be significant to the basic problem of the survey. Seventy-eight returns were rather emphatic in their opinions that speech should be taken out of the course of study of English classes and made a separate course. They felt in general that speech as taught in English gives the student little more speech training than how to give an oral report and more often than not this report is read. They stated that the students need good speech education by trained personnel, but that they are not getting it in the English classes that purport to teach a unit of speech.

The second main comment concerned again the administration. Sixty-nine returns reflected strong feelings about the curtailment of the speech program by administrators. The sixty-nine returns were unanimous in their agreement that speech training for high school students was necessary, but in their schools for various reasons of "budget, no need, adequate training in other classes, etc.," the administration failed to provide for speech training for all students.

The implication here is that a large number of the teachers in the field, who by their very training are qualified to recognize the speech needs of the students in their schools, find that these needs are not being provided for by existing programs or are being thwarted by administrators who fail to see the speech needs that exist.

IV. SUMMARY

This chapter was devoted to explanation, tabulation, and interpretation of the survey questionnaire.

The first portion of this chapter pointed out that the need for the survey existed and how the questionnaire was formed. The questionnaire was constructed so as to require the minimum amount of writing in filling it out and yet establish an over-all picture of the percentage of students receiving speech training, the classification of speech courses, the duties of speech teachers, the administrators' view of the importance of speech education, and the personal comments of the instructors filling out the questionnaire. The questionnaire was sent to 250 high schools, and the schools were selected to represent the entire state by area and sizes of schools. One hundred and fifty-six returns were received.

Six tables were included to show the percentage of students receiving speech training and the type by curricular classifications. These tables were set up to also show percentages by school population. The results of these tabulations are summarized in Chapter V.

The findings as revealed in each of the tables were interpreted in the light of the question to be determined; namely, are the California schools meeting the speech needs of its students.

Finally a summarization of the most significant comments made by the instructors was made in so far as the comments applied to the basic question of this thesis.

The survey, in general, revealed that a relatively small number of the students in our high school receive formal speech training.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDED STUDIES

I. SUMMARY

The purpose of this study was to try and determine if the California high schools are meeting the speech needs of its students.

To answer this question a questionnaire was sent to two hundred and fifty schools throughout the state, and the following main points of data were obtained from the 156 returns:

The amount of speech training offered in the high schools is not dependent on the size of the school enrollment.

Of the high schools, 23.71 per cent do not offer any type of formal speech education.

Approximately three-quarters, or 71.14 per cent, of the high schools have less than 10 per cent of the students enrolled in speech classes.

Only 7.68 per cent of the schools reach 50 per cent or more of the students with their speech programs.

Only 3.84 per cent of the high schools have some type of speech training for 100 per cent of their students.

Of the 121 schools offering a speech program, only eight schools give a required course in speech education.

Of the 118 schools that have elective speech programs, fifty-five of them only offer one class, and only thirty offer more than two classes.

Ninety-three schools teach speech as part of another course, but only incidental to the main course function.

Eighty schools teach speech as part of the English program, but most of those reporting state that speech taught in English classes is only to a slight degree.

Sixty-three schools indicate that speech is not taught as part of any other course in their curriculum.

One hundred of the reporting schools state that the fundamentals of speech class also combine the other speech arts of drama, oral interpretation, radio, and debate with it.

Of the 263 teachers of speech reached in the questionnaire, ninety-eight taught speech exclusively.

English was taught by 170 of the speech teachers.

Of the 263 teachers, 102 of them were speech majors, forty-eight speech minors, and 113 had neither a major nor a minor in speech.

Speech teachers, because of their special talents, are required normally to carry a heavy extra-curricular load.

Ninety-four of 156 returns indicate that the speech teacher carries a full class load even though they have many extra-curricular assignments.

One hundred twenty-seven returns indicate that the teachers in the field felt a need for speech training for all high school students.

A large majority of the teachers expressing an opinion felt there exists a lack of positions for trained speech teachers.

Three-quarters of the administrations of the schools represented by the returns, either feel that there is not any need for speech in the curriculum or that the speech needs are adequately met by other courses--usually English.

Finally, teachers in the field indicate that speech needs are not being met because of two factors: (1) it is relegated to the English department, which is not prepared to teach speech; or (2) because the program is thwarted by administrators who fail to admit to the need of speech training.

II. CONCLUSIONS

In answer to the basic question of whether the high schools of California are meeting the individual speech needs of its students, the obvious answer is that they are not, and three basic conclusions result:

First, that individual speech needs are not being met because of the small percentage of students offered speech education, the lack of interest of many administrators, the type of programs being offered, the use of untrained teachers to teach speech, and the belief that speech needs can be adequately met in other courses.

The second conclusion is that further research is necessary in this field. Recommendations for this will be outlined in the next section.

The third conclusion is that this survey points out that the speech needs of the individual students are not going to be adequately taken care of until the need for the speech program is recognized by the secondary school administrators.

III. RECOMMENDED STUDIES

During the preparation of this paper certain implications have become apparent. Since they are a part of this survey, they are presented here to point out certain areas in which, in the investigator's opinion, further study is needed and would be of value in both appraising and developing the cause of speech education in the state.

1. A state-wide survey by a college or university, that has the staff and facilities, should reach every high school to determine exactly what percentage of the high

school students are receiving speech training. This would be a basic study similar to this survey only more accurate in that all high schools could be contacted.

2. A survey to determine the extent to which speech correction or a remedial speech program is offered in high schools. A correlation to this survey would be the determining of the number of high school students who need corrective speech because of physical or psychological defects that are unable to receive aid.

3. A survey to determine the courses of study now being offered in the high schools having a speech program. This survey should determine methodology as well as type of courses.

4. A survey to determine the type and amount of speech training that is given in other courses purporting to teach speech as part of another basic course. This survey is particularly needed in the field of English.

5. A study to determine the qualifications of teachers who are teaching speech classes. This is especially necessary since this present survey shows a large number of teachers teaching speech who seem not to have any speech training.

6. An extensive questionnaire should be sent to all head administrators of high schools to determine why so many fail to recognize the need and value of speech

education.

7. A survey to determine if the usual heavy extra-curricular assignments to speech personnel is equitable to the loads of teachers in other departments.

There are undoubtedly many other studies that could be advanced to help the cause of speech education on the high school level, but the above seven recommendations are the most apparent as a result of this survey.

Results of the survey indicate that administrators generally are not conversant with the problems in the field of speech education, and consequently do not realize or feel that there is a real need for speech training as part of the school's curriculum; therefore, this investigator offers the suggestion that the education departments of colleges and universities offer at least one course in speech appreciation to all potential administrators.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

A. BOOKS

- Barnes, Harry Grinnel, and Joseph F. Smith. Speech Fundamentals. New York: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1953.
- Becker, Mortimer. Speaking for All Occasions. New York: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1949.
- Borchers, Gladys Louise. Living Speech. New York: Harcourt, Brace and Company, 1949.
- Craig, Alice E. The Junior Speech Arts. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1940.
- _____. The Speech Arts. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1941.
- Dodd, Celeste Varnell, and Hugh F. Seabury. Our Speech. Austin, Texas: Stick Company, 1940.
- Elson, E. F., and Alberta Peck. The Art of Speaking. New York: Ginn Company, 1952.
- Friederich, Willard, and Ruth Wilcox. Teaching Speech in High School. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1953.
- Gough, Harry, and others. Effective Speech. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1937.
- Hedde, Wilhelmina Genevava, and William Norwood Brigance. American Speech. New York: J. B. Lippencott Company, 1951.
- _____, and William Norwood Brigance. Speech, A High School Textbook. New York: J. B. Lippencott Company, 1937.
- Lockwood, Francis Commins, and Clarence DeWitt Thorpe. Public Speaking Today. Chicago: Benjamin H. Sanborn and Company, 1931.
- McBurney, James H., and Ernest J. Wrage. The Art of Good Speech. New York: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1953.

- Monroe, Alan Houston. Principles and Types of Speech. New York: Scott, Foresman and Company, 1949.
- Mouat, Lawrence Henry. A Guide to Effective Public Speaking. Boston: D. C. Heath, 1953.
- Painter, Margaret. Ease in Speech. Boston: D. C. Heath, 1943.
- Raubicheck, Letitia. Improving Your Speech. New York: Nobb and Noble Publishers, Inc., 1939.
- _____. Your Voice and Speech. New York: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1953.
- Robinson, Karl F. Teaching Speech in the Secondary School. New York: Longmans, Green and Company, 1951.
- Sarett, Lew R., William Trufant Foster, and James H. McBurney. Speech: A High School Course. New York: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1951.
- Seehy, Howard Francis, and William Arthur Hackett. Experiences in Speech. New York: Scott, Foresman and Company, 1940.
- Thomssen, Lester, and Howard Gilkinson. Basic Training in Speech. Boston: D. C. Heath and Company, 1953.
- Weaver, Andrew Thomas, and Gladys Louise Borchers. Speech. New York: Harcourt, Brace and Company, 1946.
- Whitney, Leon K. Directed Speech. New York: Ginn and Company, 1936.

B. PERIODICALS

- "The Role of Speech in the Secondary School," The Bulletin of the National Association of Secondary School Principals, XXIX (1945).
- "A Speech Program for the Secondary School," The Bulletin of the National Association of Secondary School Principals, XXXVIII (1954).
- The Quarterly Journal of Speech, All volumes from January of 1940 through December, 1950.

APPENDIX

QUESTIONNAIRE

The term speech as used in this questionnaire is meant to be interpreted as fundamentals of public speaking as opposed to oral interpretation, drama, oratory or debate.

I. Percentage of students taking speech.

A. How many students are enrolled in school?___

B. How many students are enrolled in speech classes? _____

C. Is this a representative yearly percentage? _____

(1) If not, explain _____

D. What grade levels are offered speech? ___ 9

___ 10 ___ 11 ___ 12

E. What percentage of students will receive formal speech training during their high school career? _____

II. Type of speech classes.

A. Is speech a required course? _____

(1) How many classes offered? _____

(2) Average size of classes? _____

(3) Length of course? ___ 1 semester

___ 2 semesters

B. Is speech an elective course? _____

(1) How many classes are offered? _____

- (2) Average size of classes? _____
- (3) Length of course? _____ 1 semester
 _____ 2 semesters
- C. Is speech an extra-curricular subject? _____
- (1) What is taught in this activity? _____

- (2) What is the average enrollment? _____
- (3) Activities offered on what basis _____ 1
 semester _____ 2 semesters
- D. Is speech taught as part of another
 course? _____
- (1) If yes, what? _____ English
 _____ Social Studies
 _____ Drama
 _____ Other
- E. Does your speech class combine the other
 "speech arts" of Drama, Radio, Debate, oral
 interpretation, etc. into one over-all
 class? _____. Which ones? _____

III. Instructional Load.

- A. How many speech teachers in your
 school? _____
- B. How many speech majors? _____ Minors? _____
- C. Do they teach classes other than
 speech? _____

- (1) If so, what? _____
- (2) How many speech classes? _____
- (3) Number of students in each class? _____

D. List extra-curricular duties _____

IV. Personal Data

A. Do you feel all high school students should have speech training? _____

(1) One semester? _____ Two semesters? _____
More? _____

(2) If answer is "No" to "A", explain _____

B. Do you have: _____ a speech major
_____ a speech minor
_____ a major & minor
other than speech? _____ What?

C. Do you receive extra monetary compensation? _____
_____ or a lighter class load? _____ to
compensate for extra-curricular activities?

D. Do you feel there is a lack of positions
for a speech major? _____
Or an excess of positions? _____

E. Does your Administration feel there is a need for a required speech class? _____

(1) If not, because: _____ speech is taught as part of English?

_____ speech is taught as part of Social Studies?

_____ speech is a "frill" course.

V. Comments on Questionnaire:

Do you wish a summary of this questionnaire? _____

TWO HUNDRED FIFTY HIGH SCHOOLS CONTACTED IN THE
SURVEY

Alameda High School	Brentwood Liberty Union High School
Albany High School	Burbank High School
Alhambra City High School	John Burroughs High School
Alpaugh High School	Calexico Union High School
South Tahoe High School	Calipatria High School
Anaheim Union High School	Calistoga Union High School
Antioch High School	Coast Union High School
Pierce Union High School	Campebell Union High School
Arcadia High School	Mountain Empire
Arcata Union High School	Carmel High School
Arroyo Grande Union High School	Carpinteria Union High School
Atascadero Union High School	Caruthers Union High School
Placer Union High School	Surprise Valley Union High School
Citrus Union High School and Junior College	Washington Union High School
Arvin High School	Ceres Union High School
Bakersfield High School	Chico Union High School
Sherman E. Burroughs High School	Chino Union High School
East Bakersfield High School	Chow Chilla Union High School
McFarland High School	Claremont High School
Shafter High School	Clarksburg High School
Banning Union High School	Cloverdale Union High School
Barstow Union High School	Clovis Union High School
Beaumont Union High School	Coachella Valley Union High School
Benicia High School	Colton Union High School
Berkeley High School	Coalinga Union High School
Beverly Hills High School	Colua High School
Biggs Union High School	Compton Union High School
Big Pine High School	Mt. Diablo High School
Bishop Union High School	Corcoran Union High School
Palo Verde Valley Union High School	Los Molinos
Anderson Valley	Corning Union High School
San Lorezo Valley	Corona Union High School
Brawley Union High School	Coronado High School
Breau-Olinder Union High School	Courtland Union High School
	Covina High School
	Del Norte High School
	John Swett Union High School
	Culver City Sr. High School
	Jefferson Union High School

San Ramon Valley Union High School
 Davis Union High School
 Delano Union High School
 Grant Union High School
 Denair Union High School
 Dinuba
 Dixon Union High School
 Dos Palos Union High School
 Downey Sr. High School
 Dunsmuir
 Durham High School
 East Nicolaus Union High School
 Central Union High School
 Elk Grove Union High School
 El Monte High School
 Rosemead High School
 El Segundo High School
 Elsinore Union High School
 Emery Joint Sr. High School
 San Dieguito Union High School
 Escalon Union High School
 Escondido Union High School
 Esparto Union High School
 Etna Union High School
 Eureka Sr. High School
 Exeter
 Armiijo Union High School
 El Camino High School
 San Juan Union High School
 Fallbrook Union High School
 Ferndale Union High School
 Fillmore Union High School
 Folsom Joint Sr. High School
 Fort Bragg Joint Sr. High School
 Fortuna Union High School
 Fowler High School
 Central Union High School
 Edison Joint Sr. High School
 Fresno High School
 Washington Union High School
 Roseville High School
 Rullerton Union High School
 Galt High School
 Garden Grove High School
 Gilroy Union High School
 Glendale High School
 Herbert Hoover High School
 Gonzales Union High School
 Grass Valley Union High School
 Gridley Union High School
 Grossmont High School
 Gustine High School
 Half Moon Bay Union High School
 Hamilton City High School
 Handford High School
 Hayward High School
 San Lorezo High School
 Healdsburg High School
 Hemet Union Joint Sr. High School
 Hilmar High School
 San Benito County High School
 Holtville Union High School
 Hopland Union High School
 Hughson Union High School
 Huntington Beach Union High School
 Hawthorne High School
 Inglewood High School
 Leuzinger High School
 Iosene Union High School
 Waterman High School
 Jackson Union High School
 Juban Union High School
 Kelseyville Union High School
 Kerman Union High School
 King City Joint Union High School
 Kingsburgh Joint Union High School

Acalanes High School
 Laguna Beach High School
 Clearlake Union High
 School
 Antelope Valley Joint
 Union High School
 Randoburg High School
 Layton Joint Union High
 School
 Le Grand Union High
 School
 Avenal High School
 Le Moore High School
 Lincoln Union High
 School
 Lindon Union High School
 Lindsay High School
 Live Oak Union High School
 Livermore Joint Union
 High School
 Lodi Union High School
 Lompoc Union High School
 Lone Pine Union High
 School
 David Starr Jordan High
 School
 Long Beach Polytechnic
 High School
 Woodrow Wilson High
 School
 Phineas Banning High
 School
 Bell High School
 Belmont High School
 Canoga Park High School
 Susan Miller Dorsey High
 School
 Eagle Rock High School
 Fairfax High School
 John H. Francis Poly-
 technic High School
 Benjamin Franklin High
 School
 John C. Fremont High
 School
 Gardena High School
 James A. Garfield High
 School
 Alexander Hamilton High
 School

Hollywood High School
 Huntington Park High
 School
 Los Angeles High School
 Manual Arts High School
 Narbonne High School
 North Hollywood High
 School
 Theodore Roosevelt High
 School
 San Fernando High School
 San Pedro High School
 Santa Fe High School
 South Gate High School
 Van Nuys High School
 Venice High School
 Verbugo High School
 Geo. Washington High
 School
 Dr. Joseph Pomeroy Widney
 High School
 Los Gatos Union High School
 Lower Lake Union High
 School
 Lynwood High School
 Madera Union High School
 Manteca Union High School
 Maricopa High School
 Mariposa High School
 Alhambra Union High School
 Marysville Union High
 School
 Merced High School
 Modesto High School
 Monrovia-Duarte High School
 Monterey Union High School
 Moorpark Union High School
 Chula Vista
 Newport Harbor Union High
 School
 Castlemont High School
 Merritt School of Business
 Oakland High School
 Carlsbad Union High School
 Chaffey Union High School
 Fontana High School
 Orosi Union High School
 Porterville Union High
 School

Red Bluff
Roseville
C. K. McClatchy
Sacramento Sr. High School
Salinas
San Diego
Balboa
Galileo
Lowell
Polytechnic High School
George Washington
Sanger Union High School
San Jose High School
San Luis Obispo
San Mateo
San Rafael
Santa Ana
Santa Rosa
Sonoma High School
Yuba City
Taft
Stockton
Tracy
Tranquility
Ventura
Visalia
Venice
Wasco