AN INVESTIGATION OF SELF-PERCEIVED COMPETENCY: A COMPARISON BETWEEN INDIVIDUAL EVENTS COMPETITORS AND PUBLIC SPEAKING STUDENTS

THESIS

Presented to the Graduate Council of Southwest Texas State University
In Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements

For the Degree

Master of ARTS

By

Leigh-Anne R. Dowdy

San Marcos, Texas
May, 2002

COPYRIGHT

by

Leigh-Anne R. Dowdy

2002

This thesis is dedicated to Mom and Dad. Thank you for teaching me the value of education, and then providing me with one. I love you.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to thank my thesis committee. First, to the chair, Dr. Mary Hoffman, thank you for your direction. Thank you for sticking with me on a surprisingly quantitative thesis and always being so supportive. Second, Dr. Timothy Mottet, thank you for spending so much more time than would be expected for a second reader on this project. I have learned so much by working with you, and I hate to think about what I would have missed if you had not been a part of this. To Wayne Kraemer – I don't think I could pick out just one or two things for which to thank you. You have literally shown me the world and I could never express enough gratitude for all that you have done for me. Thank you doesn't even begin to do the job.

I would also like to thank my family. To Mom and Dad, thank you for always encouraging me. To Trey and David, you are the best big brothers a girl could ask for; thanks for being such great examples. To Steven, thank you for helping me through this and always being so supportive. And more importantly, thank you for always making me laugh. I love you all so much.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

		Page
LIST OF TABLES		vii
Chapter		
I.	INTRODUCTION AND JUSTIFICATION	1
II.	REVIEW OF LITERATURE Forensics Communication Competence	
III.	METHOD Participants Data Collection and Procedures Instrumentation Data Analysis	24
IV.	RESULTS Possible Confounding Variables Results of Research Questions Summary of Results	33
V.	CONCLUSIONS Review of Study Results of Research Questions *Post-hoc* Analyses Summary of Findings Implications of Research Limitations of the Current Study Possible Suggestions for Future Research Summary of Thesis	42
APPENDIX		57
REFERENCES		85

LIST OF TABLES

3.1 *Collegiate Individual Events Experience* 25

3.2 *High School Individual Events Experience* 26

3.3 *Comparison Between Instructional Conditions* 26

4.1 *Means, Standard Deviations, and F-Ratios for Instructional Treatment Conditions* 37

5.1 *Correlations Between Prior Experience and Assessment Variables* 49

CHAPTER ONE:

INTRODUCTION AND JUSTIFICATION

I remember the day my director of forensics received a call from a newspaper reporter asking him to comment on the forensic evidence found at a recent archeological dig. At the time, we laughed about how misunderstood our activities were, but most communication scholars agree that it is sometimes hard to answer the question, "So, what do you do again?" Even our own friends and families have a hard time understanding. Often they believe that the extent of the communication discipline is teaching people how to speak well. In light of our desire to emphasize the cognitive elements of our discipline, it is tempting to trivialize the skills aspect and emphasize the other unique areas such as rhetorical analysis, organizational theory and practice, interpersonal, and instructional developments. But we must not forget the importance of teaching students basic communication skills. If the communication discipline fails to teach students the skills they need to communicate effectively, we may lose our ability to teach anything. The March 26, 1999 edition of the *Chronicle of Higher Education* reports that "Speaking Across the Curriculum" has worked its way into institutions around the country with chemistry, political science, and history departments incorporating oral presentation assignments into their courses. Members of the communication discipline, however, feel that teaching communication skills should be left to those trained in the field. James C. McCroskey of West Virginia University argues, "It's [communication] a professional

field, and not everyone who's trained in biology is trained to teach it. They may do more harm than good" (Schneider, 1999). The fact that educators in all disciplines are beginning to integrate public speaking into their curricula shows that they feel there is a need for an increase in communication skills among college students. We, as communication scholars, must realize the importance of teaching those skills.

Once we realize that teaching communication skills is important, the focus becomes; what is the best way to teach presentational speaking skills? Many university and college core curricula include a "Introduction to Public Speaking" course designed to teach students research skills, listening behaviors, organization, delivery, language, audience analysis, and strategies for overcoming apprehension (Johnson and Szczupakiewicz, 1987). Research has questioned whether the course is teaching students skills they will really need (Pearson, Nelson & Sorenson, 1980). A wealth of literature has been devoted to the basic course and how it can be most effective (Gibson, Gruner, Hanna, Smythe & Hayes, 1980, Gibson, Hanna, & Huddleston, 1985, Weaver, 1976).

One of the goals of a communication course is to increase competency, such as knowledge, affect, and performance, of the student (Beebe and Beebe resource manual). Individual events competition has been overlooked as a way to increase competency in students. Students in individual events compete in prepared speaking events such as persuasive speaking, informative speaking, communication analysis, and after-dinner speaking; prepared interpretation events such as prose interpretation, poetry interpretation, dramatic interpretation, program oral interpretation, and duo dramatic interpretation; and limited preparation events such as extemporaneous speaking and impromptu speaking. Research has not compared a public speaking course to

participation in competitive speaking. Students from all disciplines participate in forensics competition for several reasons, but may participate in order to increase their ease and skill in giving presentations. Hill (1982) found that students identified education as the top reason for competing in forensics. Coaches and students believe that competition in these events increases skill and competency (Allen, Berkowitz & Louden, 1995, Colbert & Biggers, 1985, Millsap, 1998, Stenger, 1998,), yet no comparison between the benefits of individual events competition and public speaking classes has been made.

There are four reasons why this comparison needs to be made. First, there is a lack of quantitative research demonstrating how individual events participation affects public speaking skills. McGlone (1974) focuses on the quantitative research, arguing that it is "of poor overall quality". More quantitative research has been published, but it focuses on the impact that debate (exclusively Cross-Examination Debate Association and National Debate Tournament) training has on critical thinking skills (Bellon, 2000; Colbert, 1987; Williams, McGee & Worth, 2001). These studies did provide the debate community with important evidence of the advantages and disadvantages of participating in debate, but most focus primarily on policy debate and critical thinking. There have been few studies comparing participants and non-participants in individual events, and the research that does exist focuses on critical thinking rather than on communication competency on the whole (Allen, Berkowitz & Louden, 1995). The present study hopes to contribute to the research by providing data showing the effects of individual events participation on student perceptions of skill effectiveness.

A second reason for this comparison is to provide data that will increase the options available to educate students about speaking. Communication educators have deemphasized skills based teaching in public speaking order to avoid being perceived as a "service discipline". However, some scholars feel that forensics competition may be an alternative teaching tool for communication skills (Dean & Levasseuer, 1989, Miles, 1972). This study aims to examine this idea by seeing if the educational benefits of participation in forensics is comparable to a course in public speaking.

The third reason is to examine the value in forensics programs. Kenneth Anderson (1974) explains, "In an age of educational accountability the forensics community is and will be increasingly called upon to tell what it seeks to do, how well it accomplishes its goals, and what other effects it has" (p. 155). Many believe this is still true today, and thus far the forensics community has failed to meet his challenge regarding individual events. The comparison this study will make may provide evidence of the contributions individual events makes to the overall education and development of participating students, thereby demonstrating the necessity and worth of the activity.

The fourth reason for this study is to hopefully support individual events programs at colleges and universities. Those who participate in the activity can attest to the number of programs that are under-funded. This lack of funding leads to programs that are student-run, limited in travel, funded in part by the participants paying out of pocket for entry fees or accommodations, or programs that are cut altogether. Many scholars point out the danger forensics is in during times of budgetary cutbacks, or even during financially solvent times (DeLancey, 1984, LaBan, 1980, Spiker, 1980). If administrations fail to see the benefits of the activity, the activity may soon disappear. If

this study is able to exemplify the worth of these programs and the enhancement of skills that they lead to in their participants, it may contribute to the continued funding and support of forensics programs.

This chapter has outlined four main justifications for this study. The first reason is to contribute to the quantitative data regarding research on forensics and improve upon previous studies, which have been limited in scope. The second reason is to increase strategies of teaching. The third reason is to investigate the value of participation in forensics and its impact on overall education. The fourth reason is to validate the continued support of programs. The following chapters will review literature pertinent to the study, detail the methodology of the study, present the results obtained from the data, and interpret that data by drawing conclusions and suggesting avenues for future research.

CHAPTER TWO:

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

This chapter will review the literature concerning forensics and individual events and the assessment variables. The first section of the literature review summarizes the research that has investigated forensics and individual events. The next section discusses the overall concept of competence and the domains within that concept. Each research question stems from one of the three domains: cognitive, affective, or behavioral/ performance. The discussion of each domain will include a review of the literature regarding that domain, a summary of how that domain has been viewed in forensics, and an explanation of the rationale behind the research question(s) stemming from that domain. The overall goal of all of the research is to compare the effectiveness of two instructional formats (individual events participation and a public speaking course) on student competence.

Forensics

The first section of literature examines forensics as an activity and the benefits students receive from participating in forensics. There are four areas to this research. The section which follows discusses early research regarding tournaments and their advantages to students; the second section reviews research involving specific behaviors; the third examines research involving the benefits of forensics participation to students; and the fourth summarizes findings pertaining to the role of forensics in instruction.

Early research. Much of the research concerning speech as a competitive event began in early editions of *Communication Education* (formerly *Speech Teacher*). Discussions in the 1950s focused on weighing the advantages and disadvantages of tournaments, debating whether or not winners should be determined, and establishing what the behavioral effects of competition were. Fuchs (1954) was a proponent of a non-ranking system at speech tournaments, which would allow students to participate without competing, thereby gaining skills and confidence without risking any negative behavioral effects. Fuchs' basis for this argument was that students would be more motivated to learn if they did not have to deal with embarrassment of losing. She also argues that there are no real standards of evaluation for the judges anyway. Walsh (1957) addressed the arguments of "anti-contest" critics who thought tournament participation would make students anti-social, demoralized, and dishonest. She described one critic who suggested that participation would lead to psychopathic problems in students. Walsh argued that tournaments had improved upon judging and ballots. She also emphasized the education students received at tournaments and the increased numbers of students who were eager to participate.

Specific behaviors. A second large set of research involving forensics dealt with whether or not forensics increased specific behaviors - including argumentativeness and verbal aggressiveness. Debate training has been shown to decrease verbal aggressiveness by improving argument skills. If students can make better arguments, they are less likely to be verbally aggressive, and are also less likely to respond to verbal aggression in kind (Infante, Trebing, Shepard, & Seeds, 1984). It was again determined that policy debate training could increase argumentativeness without increasing verbal aggressiveness. Not

only would the training not increase verbal aggressiveness, but it may decrease it without decreasing argumentativeness (Colbert, 1993). This study was replicated in 1994 with the same conclusions (Colbert, 1994). The 1994 study also added that debate can be good assertiveness training, especially for women.

Forensics researchers have also explored the relationship between critical thinking and debate. Authors who endorse the claim that there is a causal relationship between debate and improved critical thinking typically cite one of three sources to support their claim: Gruner, Huseman, and Luck (1971); Huseman, Ware, and Gruner (1972); or Colbert and Biggers (1985) (Greenstreet 1993). The results of these studies establish that there is a relationship between critical thinking and debate participation. The problem with these studies is that while they explore the relationship between debate and critical thinking ability, they cannot support the idea that participation or training in debate causes the difference in the students' ability.

While the previously mentioned articles concerning critical thinking ability cannot provide a causal link between debate and ability, they do suggest a relationship by measuring critical thinking scores of students who have received debate training and those who have not. Many other authors find the claim apparent, and provide no evidence to support it. Authors have claimed that debate increases critical thinking because it demands questioning and examination of knowledge (Patterson & Zarefsky, 1983). Others assert that debate allows students to see both sides of an issue, opening their mind, and that the activity encourages rational challenging of others' ideas (Sanders, 1983; Sheckels, 1984). There is a wealth of literature that asserts the link between critical thinking and debate, but none of it cites a reference for support (Bartanen &

Frank, 1991, Fryar & Thomas, 1980, Pelham & Watt, 1989, Wilbanks & Church, 1991, Ziegelmueller, Kay & Dause, 1990). These articles simply assert the link. McGlone (1974) explains, "There is a rather large number of investigations which demonstrate that debate improves certain cognitive abilities and a large body of criticism of these studies which points out that people who have these abilities are simply attracted to debate" (p. 140). McGlone illustrates the chicken/egg question that seems inherent with research that attempts to explore the relationships between debate and critical thinking ability.

In recent years authors have tried to correct the errors of previous research in an attempt to quantify the connection between debate and critical thinking. Allen, Berkowitz, & Louden (1995) compared debate training to formalized instruction on critical thinking skills. The study supports the idea that the increase in critical thinking is larger with a semester of debate competition than with a semester of coursework in argumentation. Later studies replicated these findings (Allen, Berkowitz, Hunt, & Louden, 1999). The research on this subject continues with articles that survey and evaluate previous research and synthesize conclusions about critical thinking (Bellon, 2000) and others that create new data. For example, Williams, McGee, & Worth (2001) concluded that debate training had a positive relationship with critical thinking. Again, however, the chicken/egg debate continues as these articles still fail to provide data for a causal relationship between debate and critical thinking. Additionally, all of these articles focus on policy debate training within organizations such as the National Debate Tournament (NDT) and the Cross-Examination Debate Association (CEDA). No research in this area has been entirely devoted to finding a relationship between critical thinking and individual events.

General benefits. A third area of research explores general benefits of forensics participation. This research has combined individual events with debate, or focused primarily on individual events. Many of these studies focused on what students believed were the benefits gained by participating in forensics. Pruett (1972) explored benefits perceived by high school students who had participated in a summer debate institute. The study found that a majority of the students felt the debate training at the institute helped in the overall development of their education, more specifically in their ability to do research, improve their study habits, and increase knowledge. Hill (1982) also focused on policy debate, asking students to list their motivations for participating in debate. Educational needs was found to be the most important category, with students listing improved communication behaviors, increased knowledge, and improved argumentation and organization. These findings were replicated in a later study (Wood & Rowlan-Morin, 1989) which found that students stayed in debate because they felt it met their educational needs.

While these articles focused primarily on motivational reasons, McMillan and Todd-Mancillas (1991) measured student perceptions of advantages and disadvantages by competing in forensics. McMillan and Todd-Mancillas focused on individual events, rather than debate. Not only did participants report twice as many advantages as disadvantages, they overwhelmingly agreed or strongly agreed with statements representing educational advantages that included gaining knowledge for the "real world", individualized instruction, knowledge about subjects, thinking quickly, and developing ethics. The majority of participants also agreed or strongly agreed with the statements representing an improvement of skills such as oral communication skills,

critical thinking, organization, research, and writing. Finally, participants largely agreed or strongly agreed that participation increased their self-esteem. Current research continues to support the idea that students believe their participation in forensics helps them. An additional study that focused on individual events found largely the same results. Dickmeyer and Boerboom (1999) concluded that students improved communication skills, as well as skills in other areas of their life such as time-management skills, networking skills, and social skills. These students again found education to be the primary benefit of forensics participation.

Researchers have also identified additional benefits of forensics. Colbert and Biggers (1985) argued that there are three main advantages students gain from debate. They cite these advantages as reasons to support debate programs. Their article argues that debaters benefit by improved communication skills, gaining a "unique educational experience", and experiencing pre-professional preparation. More specifically, Pollock (1972) explored the relationship between scholastic forensics and success in legislation. Examining the Florida House of Representatives, the study concluded that "the very top debaters and floor speakers in the Florida House of Representatives were also those who had previous experience in scholastic debate or public speaking-type forensic activity" (p. 17). Stenger (1998) examined whether forensics participation helps in making public presentations specifically within the academic world at professional conferences. Stenger found that forensics participation did provide better preparation for paper presentations than non-forensics training or study.

Instructional benefits. There is a small amount of research dedicated to offering forensics as an alternative form of instruction for communication. Bartanen (1998)

argued that forensics "could serve as a model of proven effectiveness for learner-centered pedagogies" (p. 1). She reviews learning goals outlined by authors and scholars of liberal arts programs then systematically and effectively argued that instructional practices in forensics fulfill those goals. Millsap (1998) demonstrated that forensics teaches skills that are used in all academic areas and classes all over campus. Research about how forensics can help diverse groups of students has also been discussed. Competitive forensics has been suggested as an alternative program for disadvantaged students (Miles, 1972). Miles argued that forensics provides highly effective techniques to deal with insufficiently skilled students by acquainting them with indices and sources and forcing the students to extract, organize, and present information. On the flip side of that philosophy, Dean and Levasseur (1989) argued that forensics provides an environment able to meet the needs of academically talented students. They argued that basic communication courses are sometimes not challenging enough for students who have already acquired the skills and knowledge presented in these courses, and that forensics can be a challenging environment that would meet appropriate educational objectives.

Research in forensics has covered a wide breadth of topics. Many areas of academic development from skill development to pedagogy have been explored. However, there is still no clear answer to what benefits participation can bring. Perhaps Greenstreet (1993) is correct in the argument that the chicken/egg question will always plague forensics research. Does forensics provide these benefits, or do the people who choose to participate already have these skills? This study compares students in their first semester of collegiate forensics competition to students enrolled in a one semester public speaking course in order to compare their perceptions of their own skill effectiveness.

Past findings in this area have exhibited two weaknesses. First, past research has been based on policy debate training, or has merely focused on asking forensics students only what they believe to be their benefits, not taking into account their prior forensics experience. Second, no previous research has quantified students' perceptions of their skill and compared that perception to non-participant students. Research has indicated that individual events students and scholars in forensics believe that students are gaining and improving their communication skills by participating in forensics. It is obvious that people involved in the activity believe individual events competition is beneficial, yet no research has substantiated this belief. Because of these weaknesses in past research, the idea of skills development in forensics will be explored with a research question rather than a hypothesis. The basis for this question will be explained within the discussion of the behavioral domain of competence.

Communication Competence

This section will review the prominent interpretations of communication competence and discuss how competence relates to forensics. It will also review the domains of competence and explain how the research questions measure these domains and thus the competence of the students in the instructional conditions. Much of the debate over communication competence centers on performance and whether performance should be an aspect of communication competence.

McCroskey (1982) argued that equating performance with competence is a mistake. He contended that a person often can perform correct behaviors and not be aware that they are correct, likewise, a person can be competent and just not able to perform. McCroskey also took issue with definitions that equate competence with

effectiveness. He discussed the possibility that achieving one's goals does not always make that person competent and that, "one may be effective without being competent and one may be competent without being effective (p.3). He also discussed skills as an ability to do something, and made a clear distinction between having skill, or ability, and performing that skill. McCroskey identified three domains of learning: cognitive communication learning, psychomotor communication learning, and affective communication learning. Cognitive learning is concerned with knowledge or understanding of concepts, principles, facts, synthesis of information and evaluation. According to McCroskey, this is the domain of communication competence. Psychomotor learning is concerned with behavioral skills, and a person's ability concerning that skill, but not their performance of it. The final domain is affective learning, which concerns the attitudes and feelings of the learner about the communication knowledge and behaviors.

Spitzberg (1983) disagreed with McCroskey's perspective and advanced his own definition of competence as knowledge, skill, and impression. First, Spitzberg disagreed with the distinction between ability to perform a behavior and the actual performance of that behavior. He argued that this distinction should not lead to abandonment of performance as a component of a larger competence. Spitzberg explained that competence is relational and should be judged on a continuum of appropriateness and effectiveness. Appropriateness concerns whether actions are consistent with rules and norms, while effectiveness concerns the end result of the interaction. Also, he argued that communication is functional and that a functional approach emphasizes performance, effectiveness, and skill. In short, knowledge and motivation alone are not enough to

confirm competence. Spitzberg ends with the argument that effectiveness requires performance. For Spitzberg, knowledge, motivation and skill are all necessary and related components of competence.

For the purpose of this study competence is viewed much like the umbrella described by McCroskey (1982) and Spitzberg (1983). It shelters the domains of cognitive learning, affect, and behavior. Behavior is comprised of effectiveness and skills. The remainder of this chapter will discuss these domains and build the argument for each research question. Each domain is investigated with at least one research question to create a comprehensive view of the students' self-reported competence.

Cognitive domain of competence. It seems necessary to evaluate the cognitive understanding of public speaking principles for each instructional group. Again, cognitive learning is concerned with knowledge or understanding of concepts, principles, facts, synthesis of information and evaluation. A small amount of forensics research has touted the activity as an effective instructional tool for cognitive learning (Bartanen, 1998, Dean & Levasseur, 1989, Miles, 1972, Millsap, 1998). Students certainly feel that their level of knowledge is being increased (Hill, 1982, Wood & Rowlan-Morin, 1989). Yet, there has been no research examining the differences in cognitive knowledge acquisition between forensics participants and students participating in more traditional coursework. This seems to be a hole in forensics research that supporters of forensics as an instructional method would be eager to pursue. Unfortunately this has not occurred. Thus, the first research question this study will examined was:

> RQ1: Is there a difference, taking into account students' prior experience, in the level of knowledge acquisition resulting from instructional

treatments of individual events participation and student enrollment in a public speaking course?

Affective domain of competence. Affect encompasses the attitudes and feelings of the learner about what they are learning. Affect includes feeling about the content, the instructor, and the behaviors. McCroskey (1994) built the argument for the importance of affect for teachers and students. He claimed that affect is essential to the achievement of goals and that "it is very difficult to learn (cognitively) or do (perform) what one does not like (affectively)" (p. 62). This domain of competence has not been examined in the limited forensics research. The forensics community probably hopes that students who participate are gaining an appreciation for communication, recognizing the value of the behaviors taught, and are appreciative of their coaches. This is most likely the same hope that faculty members and instructors of public speaking have for their students. The closest forensics research has come to evaluating the affect of forensics participants is the work of Hill (1982) and Wood & Rowlan-Morin (1989). These articles examined some of the motivations students have for participating in policy debate, but did not address individual events students, and did not get at students' attitudes about the content, behaviors, or coaches. Because affect is an integral component of competence, it seems necessary to evaluate how well the activity of forensics creates an appreciation of communication for participants as compared to public speaking classes. The second research question this study examined was:

RQ2: Is there a difference, taking into account students' prior experience, in the affective learning resulting from the instructional treatments of

individual events participation and student enrollment in a public speaking class?

Communication apprehension. Communication Apprehension (CA) has been defined as "an individual's level of fear or anxiety associated with either real or anticipated communication with another person or persons" (McCroskey & Beatty, 1998 p. 215). Over the years, there has been a wealth of literature published about communication apprehension. Scholars have studied CA in many situations, as a state or trait, and debated different options for treatment. CA is problematic because it hampers one's social and presentational skills, which are highly valued in a culture where talk is rewarded. People with high levels of CA experience communication avoidance, communication withdrawal, communication disfluency, and over communication. Options for treatment would be the applicable area of discussion to this study. One of the options available for treatment is skills training. Kelly (1997) defined skills training (ST) as "treatment designed specifically to target and improve communication behaviors for interpersonal interaction or public performance" (p. 332). Kelly argued that ST would be effective for communication instructors because it involves instruction in skills with which they have experience and it is less like psychological therapy than other methods. Glaser (1981) described skills training programs for public speaking as having one or more of the following components: direct instruction and coaching, modeling, goal-setting, covert rehearsal, and self-monitoring. Several studies have reported the effectiveness of ST for speech anxiety. Fremouw and Zitter (1978) compared ST to cognitive modification relaxation. Both treatments were effective in reducing behavioral manifestations of anxiety, and ST was more effective in reducing self-report speech

anxiety. Neer and Kircher (1989) studied ST by testing effectiveness of two ST programs, specific delivery instruction and general delivery instruction. Individuals with high CA benefited most from specific delivery instruction. Overall, ST has shown to be effective in reducing self-report and behavioral manifestations of communication apprehension (Kelly, 1997).

Rubin, Rubin, and Jordan (1997) focused on classroom instruction as a method of treating CA. Their study tested whether participation in a basic speech course would affect a student's level of apprehension. Their results showed that students' communication apprehension did significantly decrease from the beginning to the end of the course. The study also suggests that experience may lead to reduced levels of CA.

In light of CA being explored as a biological predisposition, Kelly and Keaten (2000) discussed the biological model of CA and the implications for treatment. McCroskey and Beatty (1998) explained that therapies for CA cannot change the individual's basic temperament, but that therapy could help control some negative aspects of their temperament. Kelly and Keaten (2000) determined that:

> All of the major treatment approaches may have some utility in alleviating communication anxiety, even if the communobiological theory is adopted. Cognitive modification should decrease perceptions of threat of punishment, and systematic desensitization should reduce the novelty associated with public speaking. Skills training, depending on the form it takes, should address both of the core aspects of CA as neurotic introversion. (pp. 52-53)

This conclusion suggests that even if the communobiological paradigm is adopted, cognitive modification, systematic desensitization, and skills training all have utility in treating communication apprehension.

Communication apprehension as it relates to forensics participation has not been fully explored by researchers. Littlefield, Sellnow, and Meister (1994) questioned what information forensic competitors receive concerning speech anxiety. They argued that because many participants of forensics are not communication majors, the only information they receive is from their coaches, or from introductory courses. In order to answer their question, Littlefield, Sellnow, and Meister (1994) examined published texts and studies within speech communication and forensics. They found that most textbooks addressed CA, but did not address all of the concerns of individual events competitors. Research within forensics did not discuss strategies for coping with anxiety; rather it focused on coaching strategies and was event-specific.

Obviously, little research exploring the relationship between CA and forensics has been published, and the research about skills training as treatment is somewhat inconclusive. The third research question this study examined was:

> RQ3: Is there a difference, taking into account students' experience, in self-reported public speaking communication apprehension resulting from the instructional treatments of individual events participation and student enrollment in a public speaking course?

Self-Perceived Behavioral Skills

This is the domain of competence that has triggered the most controversy. As discussed earlier in this chapter, scholars debate whether performance should be included

as a criterion for competence (McCroskey, 1982, Spitzberg, 1983). This was discussed earlier in the chapter under the competence section. Spitzberg (1983) persuasively argues for performance as a criterion by pointing out the functionality of communication, and that achieving function necessitates skill. This study examines skills on two levels: speaking skills and interpersonal skills.

Speaking skills. As previously mentioned in this chapter, individual events students seem to believe that participation in forensics increases their skills. Hill (1982) found that students listed improved communication behaviors as top motivation for participation in forensics. Wood and Rowlan-Morin (1989) replicated this finding. McMillan and Todd-Mancillas (1991) found that participants believed skill improvement for oral communication skills was a major advantage of forensics participation. Colbert and Biggers (1985) also argued that debate improves communication skill. These studies established that students and coaches believe participation increases skill, but no research has compared the skill level of forensics students to the skill level of public speaking students. The fourth research question is:

> RQ4 Is there a difference, taking into account students' prior experience, in self-perceived skill effectiveness resulting from the instructional treatments of individual events participation and enrollment in a public speaking course?

Interpersonal skills. The second area of skills that will be explored in this study is interpersonal skills. Although there has been an extensive amount of research published concerning interpersonal theory and relationships, this study is limited to literature exploring interpersonal research in forensics. One of the earliest articles in forensics

exploring interpersonal relationships compared the language and strategies used by policy debaters to those in romantic or sexual relationships (Brockriede, 1972). Brockriede labeled roles as "rapist" and "seducer". His study argued that some strategies used by debaters are metaphorically similar to the physical strategies used by rapists and seducers. For instance, a debater sees an opponent not as a person, but as something to be conquered, much like a rapist sees a victim. Dowling (1982) explored these labels and roles in debaters and discussed the implications of these findings for forensic educators. Burnett and Olson (1998) also painted a negative portrait of debate concerning interpersonal relationships. This study examines six common interpersonal theories, such as Uncertainty Reduction Theory and Social Penetration Theory, and explains how a debater might fail in his or her relationship by violating the tenets of these theories. Their thesis is that "the very type of thinking in which one is trained to engage while debating can be detrimental to interpersonal relationships" (p. 31).

Antithetically, Friedley (1992) claimed that forensic participation is an excellent laboratory to practice good interpersonal behaviors, and that forensics experience leads to the development of positive interpersonal skills. In order to support this claim, Friedley examined the coach-competitor dyad. One important note is that Friedley did not survey behaviors coaches and competitors engage in currently, but what they could do to enhance their skills. Also, an interesting factor in the perceptual differences between Dowling (1982) and Burnett and Olson (1998) and Friedley (1992) may be that the former examined policy debate, while Friedley focused mainly on individual events participation.

One main issue not explored is that of intimacy within teams or squads. Friedley (1992) broached the issue but did not examine the current state of intimacy among team members and coaches, or the implications of varying levels of intimacy on these relationships. She stated only that a coach-competitor relationship is a good context to practice good intimacy and disclosure behavior. There has not been any discussion about whether forensic participants violate norms of disclosure and intimacy.

The discussion of interpersonal behavior and how it relates to forensics could be interesting and give outsiders more insight into the dynamics of the relationships that the activity fosters. Given the amount of time forensic participants spend with their coaches and fellow competitors compared to the time students spend with classmates and professors, there may be some interpersonal skill differences among these groups. However, there is not enough research to support a hypothesis in this area. Again, a research question will be used to explore this dynamic. The fifth and final research question this study will explore is:

> RQ5: Is there a difference, taking into account students' prior experience, in the conversational skills resulting from the instructional treatments of individual events participation and student enrollment in a public speaking course?

This review has examined several areas of literature pertaining to the current study. Research on forensics, competence, cognitive learning, affective learning, and behavioral learning has been addressed. Based on the findings of previous research, no hypotheses could be advanced. Most of the preceding literature in forensics has not

explored these avenues of research. However, based on the justifications presented in Chapter One, five research questions have been developed.

CHAPTER THREE:

METHOD

This chapter outlines the methodology used to investigate the research questions posed in chapter two. This method is explained in four sections. The first section defines the participants of the study and their characteristics. The second section explains the administration of the survey form. The third section details the instruments included in the questionnaire and explains how the criterion variables are operationalized. The fourth section explains how the data were analyzed.

Participants

The sample consisted of two independent groups. The first group was composed of public speaking students. All of these participants were undergraduate students enrolled in a public speaking course at one of two universities located in the Southern U.S. or the Northeastern U.S. Both of these undergraduate programs have a hybrid basic course as a prerequisite for the public speaking course. A hybrid course goes beyond public speaking, covering many topics in communication such as interpersonal communication and small group communication. This similarity assured that all students in the sample had similar collegiate educational backgrounds. All survey participants self-selected the public speaking course either by having communication as their major or by selecting public speaking as an elective.

The second group of survey participants was composed of undergraduate students in their first semester of competition in collegiate individual events. The students were surveyed while attending tournaments. Many were students at a large state tournament. All of these students were enrolled at one of twenty-two universities and colleges or community colleges attending the tournament. Participants were also drawn from competitors at an invitational tournament in the Northern U.S. All of these students were enrolled at one of the colleges or universities that was in attendance at that tournament. Because individual events competition is extra-curricular, the students in this group self-selected to be involved in this activity. Both groups of survey participants included students who have self-selected to involve themselves with communication-related activities either by enrolling in a course or by participating in individual events.

This study included a total of 126 survey participants. Of this 126, 39.7% (50) were male and 60.3% (76) were female. The average age of all respondents was 20.2 with a range of 17 to 38. Participants' current academic classification indicates that 35.7% (45) were freshman, 31% (39) were sophomores, 19.8% (25) are juniors, and 13.5% (17) were seniors. For a review of descriptive data examining survey participants' level of experience refer to Tables 3.1, 3.2, and 3.3.

Table 3.1
Collegiate Individual Events Experience

No. of semesters	% of students	N
0	50.0	63
1	34.9	44
2	.8	1
3	8.7	11
4	0.0	0
5	1.6	2
6	.8	1
7	1.6	2
8	.8	1

Table 3.2
High School Individual Events Experience

No. of years	% of students	N
0	46.0	58
1	11.1	14
2	9.5	12
3	12.7	16
4	19.8	25

Table 3.3
Comparison Between Instructional Conditions

Confounding variables	IE participants	Public speaking participants
# of previous classes	x = .88 (SD=1.53)	x = 1.97 (SD=2.38)
Collegiate experience	x = 1.86 (SD=1.62)	x = .32 (SD=1.08)
High school experience	x = 2.26 (SD=1.54)	x = .97 (SD=1.49)

Table 3.1 shows the number of semesters that the survey participants have competed in individual events on the collegiate level. As you can see, 50% (63) participants have never competed, while the other 49.6% (62) have had one to eight semesters, with the majority of that group having only one semester of collegiate individual events experience 34.9% (44). Table 3.2 shows the number of high school years individual events experience. Again, nearly half, 46% (58) had no experience. The other 53.6% (67) had 1 to 4 years of experience, with the majority of that group having four years of experience, 19.8% (25). Table 3.3 shows the comparison of the three variables, prior coursework, collegiate experience, and high school experience. As you can see form the means, the public speaking participants had much higher mean of prior coursework, while the individual events participants had much higher means of collegiate and high school individual events experience.

Data Collection and Procedures

The public speaking sample data were collected during the fourteenth week of a fifteen-week semester. All of the class assignments had been completed at this point.

The individual events competitor sample data were collected at different times during the same semester. The state tournament was held in the tenth week of the semester, while the invitational tournament was held in the thirteenth week of the semester. Participants were given an eight-page questionnaire including a cover letter requesting their assistance and thanking them for their participation. Please see Appendix A for a copy of the cover letter and questionnaire. The letter assured participants of confidentiality. Participants were instructed to sign the letter if they agreed to participate and completed the attached surveys. The questionnaire contained seven surveys approved by the university's Office of Research and Sponsored Programs and by the Internal Review Board. The surveys asked participants to respond to questions that dealt with their communication behavior and their affect towards communication. For the public speaking sample, the proctor collected the questionnaires immediately after the participants completed the survey instruments. For the individual events sample, the competitors returned the questionnaires to their coaches after completion and the coaches returned them to the tournament staff. The questionnaire took approximately twenty minutes to complete.

Instrumentation

Seven survey instruments were included in the questionnaire. The first instrument asked survey participants to report demographic information about their age, sex, classification, grade point average, background in communication, and experience in competitive individual events. The second survey instrument asked survey participants to rate their perceived level of skill on communication behaviors; the third instrument evaluated the survey participants' level of communication apprehension. The fourth survey instrument tested survey participants' cognitive knowledge of basic public

speaking information, and the fifth measured the affective component of communication. The sixth survey instrument asked the survey participants to rate their level of conversational skills. The remaining instrument was composed of three qualitative questions that intended to assess survey participants' perception of their teachers' or coaches' style of working with them, and strengths and weaknesses of their teachers or coaches. For the specific qualitative questions and to examine the other instruments, please see Appendix A.

Self-perceived communication effectiveness. This survey instrument asked survey participants to rate their self-perceived effectiveness on nine communication behaviors dealing with public speaking. Survey participants were instructed to use a 100-point scale, with 0 equaling completely ineffective and 100 equaling completely effective. This system of rating is adapted from the Self-Perceived Communication Competence (SPCC) instrument developed by McCroskey and McCroskey (1988). In previous studies the SPCC has been highly reliable with Cronbach's alphas ranging from .70 to .90 (McCroskey, 1994).

The Self-Perceived Skill Effectiveness survey instrument used the scale of McCroskey's SPCC, but used the behaviors outlined in the Competent Speaker Evaluation Form created by Morreale, Moore, Taylor, Surges-Tatum, & Hulbert-Johnson, (1993). The behaviors on the Competent Speaker Evaluation Form include skills such as choosing and organizing a topic, communicating a thesis, providing supporting material, using appropriate language, using vocal variety, using proper pronunciation, grammar, and articulation, and properly using physical behaviors. All of these skills are viewed as important elements for an effective speech. However, nowhere on the Competent

Speaker Evaluation Form could a rater assess fluency and the use of pauses. A ninth item was added to assess two important factors, fluency and pausing, "Delivering a presentation with minimal fluency breaks, such as awkward pauses and verbal fillers." Verbal fluency (or the lack of verbal fillers such as "er", "uh", and "um" is an important skill for public speaking. Minimal disfluencies are natural and create a conversational delivery, but there is a point at which disfluencies can become distracting to the audience, undermining the credibility of the message and the speaker (Krannich, 1998, Grice & Skinner, 1993, Hill & Ross, 1990). None of the items in the Competent Speaker Evaluation Form assess fluency. Vocal variety comes close and a rater might be able to infer that it accounts for verbal fluency, but in reality it does not.

The use of pauses is also not evaluated by the Competent Speaker Evaluation Form. Pauses can be an effective tool in public speaking, and are especially necessary when asking rhetorical questions and making emotional arguments. Many students do not understand this, and they either ask questions without pausing to let the audience think, or rush through an emotional story or event without pausing and the effect is lost. On the flip side, there are awkward pauses that occur when students lose their train of thought or stop mid-sentence. These behaviors can undermine the credibility of the speaker and thus the message (Krannich, 1998, Grice & Skinner, 1993, Stuart, 1989). This is an oversight of the Competent Speaker Evaluation Form that will hopefully be remedied with the addition of the ninth behavior for this survey. The Competent Speaker Evaluation Form has been shown to be highly internally consistent in the past with Cronbach's alphas ranging from .76 to .84 (Morreale et al., 1993). In this study, the SPCE yielded a mean of 708.16 with a range from 323 to 900 (SD = 103.81). The

instrument was also shown to have high internal reliability with a Cronbach's alpha of .83.

Communication apprehension. Participants' level of communication apprehension (CA) for public speaking was measured with the public speaking subscale from McCroskey's instrument, Personal Report of Communication Apprehension (PRCA) (1993). The participants were given six statements. Three statements that showed a positive affect toward public speaking were alternated with three that showed a negative affect toward public speaking. Representative statements are, "I have no fear of giving a speech, " and "Certain parts of my body feel tense and rigid while I am giving a speech." Using a Likert-type scale (1=strongly agree, 5=strongly disagree) participants were instructed to indicate the degree to which they agree or disagree with the statements. The PRCA has been used extensively and has been shown to be reliable with Cronbach's alpha generally above .90 (McCroskey, 1994). The scale in the current study yielded a mean of 19.73 with a range from 6 to 29 (SD = 5.5). The scale yielded a Cronbach's alpha of .85.

Cognitive assessment. Ten sample test questions pertaining to basic public speaking principles were taken from Southwest Texas State University's Fundamentals of Speech Communication Student *Guidebook.* The questions addressed eye contact, supporting material, types of speeches, and signposting. The questions were multiple choice and had four foils. They were developed using instructional guidelines provided by Scannell and Tracy (1975). The scale yielded a mean of 6.60 with a range from 3 to 10 (SD = 1.69). The internal reliability was low with a Cronbach's alpha of .42. This means that 42% of the variance was attributable to true-score variance and 58% of the

variance was the result of measurement error. Ways to reduce this error will be discussed in chapter five.

Affective learning. This variable was measured using McCroskey's Affective Learning Scale (1994). This instrument was designed to gauge future behavior. Six subsections measured students' affect toward content, behaviors, and instructor, their likelihood of using the behaviors, of taking the course again, and of taking the same instructor again. Each dimension was measured using a set of five scales using a 7-point semantic differential scaling technique containing bipolar adjectives. The instrument was not altered for the public speaking sample, but some words were changed for the individual events sample to increase the relevancy to the participants. For example, "My attitude about my instructor is" became "My attitude about my coach is". In the past this scale has been shown to be reliable with Cronbach's alphas generally above .90 (McCroskey, 1994). The current study yielded a mean of 135.98 with a range from 26 to 168 (SD = 32.04). The reliability for each subset was high with Cronbach's alpha ranging from .85 to .97. Cronbach's alpha for the total instrument in this study was .93.

Interpersonal assessment. The final instrument measured students' perceptions of their conversational skills with Spitzberg's Conversational Skills Rating Scale (CSRS) (1995). The instrument described 25 behaviors relating to interpersonal conversations and asked survey participants to rate how frequently or infrequently they exhibited the behaviors described in the statements. The survey participants rate themselves with a 5-point semantic differential scale with 1 equaling very infrequently and 5 equaling very frequently. Cronbach's alpha for this study was .89, with a mean of 93.72 (SD = 13.0).

Qualitative evaluation. Three open-ended questions were posed to participants. The intent of these questions was to obtain data regarding students' perceptions of their teachers or coaches. The first question asked the participants to describe their teachers' or coaches' style of working with the students. The second and third questions asked the participant to identify what they think their teachers' or coaches' do well and what they could improve. The material was coded through the identification of themes within the two groups and if there were any differences in the themes between the two groups. Buzzanell & Burrell (1997) define a theme as "recurring ideas in talk" (p. 112). It is important to note for this study, that recurring ideas in print will be examined with text-only answers. The criteria for identifying themes in this article is derived from three components presented as criterion by Owen (1984). The first criterion is recurrence, which is a recurring idea, but not necessarily the same words or terms. The second criterion is repetition of key words, phrases, or sentences, and the third criterion is forcefulness. Forcefulness for written material refers to underlining of words and phrases, increased size in writing. or circling to focus on particular segments (pp. 275-276). Ideas and terms which recurred frequently or were used with forcefulness were identified in responses to qualitative survey questions.

Data Analysis

All quantitative survey data were entered and processed using *SPSS*. Several inferential statistics were computed to analyze the data: Analysis of covariance (ANCOVA), Analysis of variance (ANOVA), and unpaired tests of significant difference (t-test). The qualitative data were coded to identify themes.

CHAPTER FOUR:

RESULTS

This chapter reports the results of the five research questions presented in chapter two. Each section will state the research question, then answer the question by stating the statistical tests used and the results of those tests. However, before the results are presented, there will be a discussion of three potentially confounding variables and how they were controlled. Also, standards for statistical significance will be reviewed.

Possible Confounding Variables

There were three potentially confounding variables in the demographic portion of the survey. These variables all dealt with the experience of the student. The first variable, referred to hereafter as prior coursework, asked the participants for the number of speech communication courses they had completed. As mentioned in chapter three, the individual events instructional condition had a mean of .88 (SD = 1.53) for their prior course work, while the students in the public speaking course instructional condition had a mean of 1.97 (SD = 2.38). To determine if these means were significantly different from each other, an unpaired test of significant difference (t-test) was computed. This test was significant $t(121.77) = -3.11$, $p < .005$. This suggests that there is a significant difference between the statistical means. This variable could affect the results because prior coursework in speech communication could alter a student's level of communication apprehension, level of knowledge, or their perception of their skill effectiveness.

The second variable measured the amount of participants' collegiate individual events experience. This variable will be referred to as collegiate experience. The mean for students in the individual events instructional treatment was 1.86 semesters of experience ($SD = 1.62$). The mean for the students in the public speaking course instructional treatment was .32 ($SD = 1.08$). To determine if these means were significantly different from each other, an unpaired test of significant difference (t-test) was computed. This test was significant $t(77.94) = 5.91, p < .001$. This suggests that there is a significant difference between the statistical means. This is important because students with excessive competitive experience would not be comparable to students with just one semester of public speaking. The study attempted to gather data from students with just one semester of collegiate experience to equate with students completing a one-semester public speaking course. As the data indicate, many of the IE participants had completed almost two semesters and the means were statistically different. This difference could influence the variables examined in this study.

The third variable that may confound the results asks participants about their high school experience in competitive individual events. The individual events instructional condition had a mean of 2.26 years of high school experience ($SD = 1.54$), while the public speaking course instructional treatment had a mean .97 years of high school experience ($SD = 1.49$). To determine if these means were significantly different from each other, an unpaired test of significant difference (t-test) was computed. This test was significant $t(123) = 4.67, p < .001$. This suggests that there is a significant difference between the statistical means. This variable is potentially confounding because students with high school experience in individual events competition in either instructional

condition may have less communication apprehension or higher self-perceived skill effectiveness.

It is important to eliminate the variance related to students' experience in order to examine the effects of instruction. Because of this, Analyses of Covariance (ANCOVA) were computed for each of the dependant measures (i.e. self-perceived skill effectiveness, communication apprehension). If the ANCOVA was significant those results will be reported. If not significant, then the Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) statistic was computed and reported. Because three ANCOVAs were computed for each research question, the significance level was adjusted from .05 to .01 to protect against Type I error. The ANOVA was computed rather than tests of significant difference (t-test) as a way to obtain the effect size or eta^2. Again, because a number of ANOVAs were computed, one for each research question, the significance level was adjusted from .05 to .01 to protect against Type I error. The reader can assume that Levene's Test of Homogeneity of Variance was not significant, meaning that there is homogeneity of variance between the two groups. If the Levene's Test is significant it will be reported so the reader can take caution when interpreting the results.

Results of Research Questions

This section of the chapter will review the results of each research question by assessment variable.

Cognitive learning. The first research question asked if there was a significant difference, taking into account students' prior experience, in the level of knowledge resulting from the instructional treatments of individual events participation and student enrollment in a public speaking course. Again, three ANCOVAs were computed to

answer this question. The first ANCOVA used condition of instruction as the independent variable, prior coursework as the covariate, and cognitive knowledge as the dependent variable. This statistical model was not significant, F (1, 121) = 3.725, p = .06. The second ANCOVA used collegiate experience as the covariate and was not found to be significant, F (1, 122) = .999, p = .32. The covariate for the third ANCOVA was high school experience. It also was not significant, F (1, 122) = 1.55, p = .22.

An ANOVA was computed with condition of instruction serving as the independent variable and cognitive knowledge serving as the dependent variable. The F ratio was not significant, F (1,125)= 2.72, $p > .01$.

Affective learning. The second research question asked if there was a difference, taking into account students' prior experience, in the affective learning resulting from the instructional treatments of individual events participation and student enrollment in a public speaking course. Three ANCOVAs were computed to answer this question. The first ANCOVA used condition as the independent variable, prior coursework as the covariate, and total affective learning as the dependant variable. This statistical model was not significant, F (1, 119) = 3.154, p = .078. The second ANCOVA used collegiate experience as the covariate. This model was also not significant, F (1, 120) = .302, p = .584. Finally, a third ANCOVA using high school experience as the covariate was computed. This ANCOVA was not significant, F (1, 120) = 6.595, p = .011.

An ANOVA was computed with condition serving as the independent variable and total affective learning serving as the dependant variable. The results of this ANOVA was not significant, F (1, 125) =. 114, $p > .01$.

Several other ANOVAs were computed using the subsets of the affective learning scale. The affective learning instrument assesses six dimensions of affective learning, including attitude towards content, attitude towards instructor, attitude towards behaviors, willingness to take another course with the content, willingness to take another course with instructor and likelihood of attempting to engage in behaviors learned in the course. Typically, the six dimensions are collapsed and interpreted as a uni-dimensional measure. However, researchers have interpreted the individual dimensions of the measure or the subscores to understand better affective learning (Kearney, 1994). Again, because five ANOVAs were computed, the significance level was adjusted to .01 to protect against Type I error. The results of the ANOVAs are referenced in Table 4.1

Table 4.1
Means, Standard Deviations, and F-Ratios for Instructional Treatment Conditions

Affective Learning Subscales	Individual Events		Public Speaking		N	F-Ratio	Significance	Significance of Levene's Test
	X	*SD*	X	*SD*				
Attitude to content	20.27	5.78	24.75	5.56	124	5.78	P = .018	.717
Attitude to behavior	21.18	6.28	23.24	5.86	124	3.44	P = .066	.416
Attitude to instructor	24.87	5.01	24.17	5.85	124	.480	P = .490	.236
Attitude to behavior	22.08	6.82	22.65	6.41	124	.224	P = .637	.660
Repeat behavior	25.16	6.02	19.44	8.42	124	16.97	P = .000	.000
Repeat course	23.61	6.78	22.92	7.02	124	.296	P = .588	.460
Total affective learning	137 18	28 60	135.19	34.30	124	.114	P = .736	.075

Table 4.1 shows the results for the subscores of the affective learning survey instrument. Attitude towards content and likelihood of repeating behavior were significant. The other subscores as well as the total affective learning score were not significant. It should be noted when interpreting results that the Levene's Test for

likelihood of repeating behavior is also significant. This suggests that the homogeneity of variance assumption within the sample was violated.

Communication apprehension. The third research question asked if there was a significant difference, taking into account students' prior experience, in self-reported public speaking communication apprehension resulting from the instructional treatments of individual events participation and student enrollment in a public speaking course. To answer this question, an ANCOVA was computed with condition of instruction as the independent variable, prior coursework as the covariate, and communication apprehension as the dependant variable. The ANCOVA statistical model was not significant, F (1, 121) = 4.035, p = .05. Again, the significance standard was lowered to .01 to prevent Type I error. A second ANCOVA was computed with the same independent and dependent variables, but with collegiate experience as the covariate. This statistical model was also not significant, F (1, 122) = .036, p = .85. A third ANCOVA using high school experience was also computed and found to be not significant, F (1, 122) = 3.08, p = .08.

An ANOVA was computed with condition of instruction serving as the independent variable and communication apprehension (CA) serving as the dependant variable. The results of the ANOVA yielded a significant F ratio, F (1, 125) = 17.40, $p < .01$. Students in the individual events instructional condition yielded a mean of 13.86 (Range = 7 - 25, SD = 4.68). That was significantly lower than students in the public speaking course instructional condition who yielded a mean of 17.78 (Range = 7 - 30, SD = 5.44). The instructional condition accounted for 12% (eta^2) of the variance in students' CA scores.

Self-perceived skill effectiveness. The fourth research question asked if there was a significant difference, taking into account students' prior experience, in self-perceived skill effectiveness resulting from the instructional treatments of individual events participation and student enrollment in a public speaking course. To answer this research question, an Analysis of Covariance (ANCOVA) was computed with the condition of instruction serving as the independent variable, prior coursework as the covariate, and Self-Perceived Skill Effectiveness (SPCE) as the dependent variable. The ANCOVA statistical model was not significant, F (1,121) = .008, p = .93. A second ANCOVA was also computed with the same independent and dependent variable, but using collegiate experience as the covariate. Again, the statistical model was not significant, F (1, 122) = .156, p = .69. A third ANCOVA was computed using prior high school experience as the covariate and this model was not significant, F (1, 122) = 3.54, p = .06.

An ANOVA was computed with condition of instruction serving as the independent variable and self-perceived skill effectiveness serving as the dependent variable. The ANOVA yielded a significant F ratio, F (1,125)=7.37, $p < .01$. Students in the individual events instructional condition yielded a mean of 677.96 (Range = 643.20 - 712.71, SD = 122.29). That was significantly lower than students in the public speaking course instructional condition who yielded a mean of 728.02 (Range = 708.66 - 747.39, SD = 84.75). The condition of instruction accounted for 6% (eta^2) of the variance in students' SPCE scores. The Levene Test for Homogeneity of Variance was significant at the .05 standard.

Conversational skills. The fifth research question asked if there was a difference, taking into account students' prior experience, in the conversational skills resulting from

the instructional treatments of individual events participation and student enrollment in a public speaking course. To answer this question ANCOVAs were computed. The first ANCOVA used condition of instruction as the independent variable, prior coursework as the covariate, and the conversational skills rating scale score (CSRS) as the dependent variable. The CSRS score is the sum of the first 25 questions on the CSRS instrument, as described in chapter three. The ANCOVA statistical model was not significant, $F(1, 121) = 4.009, p = .05$. Again, the significance standard was set at .01 to prevent type I error. The second ANCOVA used collegiate experience as the covariate and was also found to not be significant, $F(1, 122) = .84, p = .36$. The third ANCOVA used high school experience as the covariate and was not significant at the .01 level, $F(1, 122) = 4.01, p = .05$.

An ANOVA was computed with condition of instruction serving as the independent variable and the conversational skills rating scale score (CSRS) serving as the dependent variable. The ANOVA did not yield a significant F ratio, $F(1, 125) = .774, p > .05$.

Qualitative results. One prominent theme emerged from each instructional group, individual events participation and enrollment in a public speaking course. In response to the question, "What does your coach do well when working with you?" the individual events sample highlighted feedback, or criticism as the main theme for what their coach does well. Fifty percent of the individual events participants fall into the theme of feedback. The public speaking participants described what their coaches did well with comments like, "...gently calling attention to the mistakes we continually make in a performance", "offers examples of what she wants to be done and how she would like it

done", "practical critiques", "helps point out areas of improvement", and simply "critique". The public speaking sample participants only discussed feedback 6% of the time. Their main theme was personality. They focused on whether the teacher was "personable", had a "sense of humor" or made them feel "comfortable". The other two qualitative questions, which asked about the coaches' or teachers' style of working with students and about improvements the coach or teacher could make, did not yield any consistent themes.

Summary of Results

The results presented in this chapter reveal that prior experience was not a factor in determining the differences resulting from the instructional treatment of individual events participation and student enrollment in a public speaking course. Two research questions resulted in significant differences. Survey participants differed in their level of self-perceived skill effectiveness, with the public speaking course sample reporting a significantly higher SPCE mean score than students in the individual events sample. Survey participants' also differed in the level of communication apprehension, with individual events students reporting a CA score that was significantly lower than the students in the public speaking course sample.

This chapter has provided the results from the testing of the research questions presented in chapter two. The following chapter will interpret these results, and discuss theoretical and methodological explanations for these results, as well as any unexpected results.

CHAPTER FIVE

CONCLUSIONS

This chapter will interpret the results presented in chapter four and offer conclusions based on those results. The findings will be presented by dependent variables. Results of *post hoc* analyses, implications of the results, limitations of the research, and suggestions for future research will be discussed. A summary of the entire study is provided at the end of the chapter.

Review of Study

This thesis explored self-perceived competency by comparing students involved in two different types of instructional programs. The first program was traditional and included students enrolled in a public speaking course. The second program included students participating in collegiate individual event competition. To investigate this issue, the following five research questions were examined:

RQ1: Is there a difference, taking into account students' prior experience, in the level of knowledge resulting from the instructional treatments of individual events participation and student enrollment in a public speaking course?

RQ2: Is there a difference, taking into account students' prior experience, in the affective learning resulting from the instructional treatments of individual events participation and student enrollment in a public speaking course?

RQ3: Is there a difference, taking into account students' prior experience, in self-reported public speaking communication apprehension resulting from the instructional treatments of individual events participation and student enrollment in a public speaking course?

RQ4: Is there a difference, taking into account students' prior experience, in self-perceived skill effectiveness resulting from the instructional treatments of individual events participation and student enrollment in a public speaking course?

RQ5: Is there a difference, taking into account students' prior experience, in the conversational skills resulting from the instructional treatments of individual events participation and student enrollment in a public speaking course?

The results of these research questions will be discussed by the assessment variables.

Results of Research Questions

This section will present the interpretations of results of the research questions by assessment variable. Each question will be presented and the significance will be explained. The results will be reviewed and conclusions based on these results will be discussed.

Cognitive knowledge. The first research question investigated whether there was a difference in the amount of cognitive knowledge that students gained in the different instructional conditions. This research question is significant because cognitive knowledge is the most commonly used measure for comprehension but also because cognitive knowledge is an integral component of competence. To measure the success of the instruction, the knowledge of the student must be assessed. The results of this study remain inconclusive as a result of measurement error. The instrument used to assess cognitive knowledge yielded a Cronbach's alpha of only .42. Approximately 58% of the

variance in the measure was the result of measurement error. To reduce measurement error, this instrument would need to be refined by adding additional assessment items and/or reducing the breadth of the questions. Currently, only ten items were used to assess a number of public speaking constructs. The data suggest that regardless of the instructional condition (individual events competition or enrollment in a public speaking course), students acquired similar amounts of knowledge. No statistically significant differences emerged between the two groups of students. It was also established that prior educational or competitive experience had no effect on the students' level of cognitive knowledge. This suggests that individual events may be just as effective in terms of getting students to acquire the knowledge of the content as the traditional methods of teaching. Authors in past studies have suggested that individual events participation may be just as effective in getting students to acquire the knowledge of the discipline as the traditional classroom (Bartanen, 1998; Dean & Levasseur, 1989; Miles, 1972; Millsap, 1998). These results may support this past research, but again, readers should interpret the results with some caution since an above average amount of measurement error existed in the instrument. Although the current assessment of cognitive knowledge included an above average amount of measurement error for a study of this type, the assessment or exam remains quite typical of what is used in speech communication classrooms throughout the country.

Affective learning. The second research question investigated whether there was a difference in the affective learning of students in the different instructional conditions, individual events participation, or enrollment in a public speaking course. Affective learning is a domain of learning that allows instructors to assess to what depth have

students internalized their learning. This type of learning often times leads to self-directed forms of learning (McCroskey, 1994). If individual events participation were to be used as an instructional technique, whether or not it facilitates affective learning must be assessed.

The data suggest that prior educational or competitive experience had no effect on the students' total affective learning. Tests also showed that no significant statistical differences emerged between individual events participants and students in public speaking for total affective learning. This suggests that the instructional conditions are equally effective in creating affective learning. Two significant differences did emerge when examining the six dimensions of this particular measure. As mentioned in chapter four, the six subsets or dimensions of affective learning are often times interpreted separately (Kearney, 1994). Two differences emerged. One, the attitude towards content subset yielded a statistically significant difference. Students enrolled in public speaking showed significantly more positive attitudes towards the content learned in that instructional condition than did individual events participants. This suggests that public speaking students have more liking for the content than individual events participants. Two, the likelihood of repeating the behaviors taught in the instructional condition subset yielded a statistically significant difference. The individual events participants had a significantly higher likelihood of repeating their learned behaviors. These results suggest that individual events may be just as effective if not more so in terms of facilitating affective learning, a necessary component of competence.

Communication apprehension. The third research question investigated whether there was a difference in the level of communication apprehension (CA) of students in

different instructional conditions, individual events participation, or enrollment in a public speaking course. Assessing students' level of apprehension is critical in determining a course of instruction.

The data suggest that prior educational or competitive experience did not affect the students' level of communication apprehension. Tests also show that there was a significant statistical difference in the level of communication apprehension between individual events participants and students enrolled in a public speaking course. Individual events participants had significantly less communication apprehension than students in public speaking. There are a number of possible interpretations for this finding. One interpretation is that individual events participation may be a more effective treatment for communication apprehension. It is possible that students who are drawn to individual events have lower levels of trait-like communication apprehension, but individual events participation does employ some techniques of skills training and systematic desensitization, both of which have been successful at treating communication apprehension (Kelly, 1997; Kelly and Keaten, 2000). Another interpretation is that as an instructional treatment, individual events may help students process and manage their apprehension.

Self-perceived skill effectiveness

The fourth research question investigated whether there was a difference in the level of self-perceived skill effectiveness of students in different instructional conditions, individual events participation or enrollment in a public speaking course. This question attempted to explore the behavior and skill level of the participants.

The data suggest that prior experience in education or competition had no effect on the students' self-perceived skill effectiveness. A statistically significant difference did emerge in the level of self-perceived skill effectiveness between students in the two conditions. Students enrolled in the public speaking course showed significantly higher levels of self-perceived skill effectiveness than participants in individual events. This finding suggests that students in the more traditional course perceive themselves to be more skilled in terms of public speaking behaviors. Because there were no trained coders to observe students' behaviors, it is not known if participants' perceptions were accurate. It seems counterintuitive that the public speaking students have a higher skill level than individual events participants because individual events participants are given intense skills training and perform more speeches. There are several explanations for this result. First, the participating individual events students were mostly students in their first semester of collegiate competition. These participants were competing against students who had been participating for numerous semesters. In comparison, the first semester students may have felt more inadequate than they actually were.

Second, the qualitative data gathered suggested that public speaking teachers are viewed by their students as very "encouraging", "supportive", and "positive". In contrast, the individual events participants described their coaches as giving "good criticism" and "suggesting improvements". These answers suggested that individual events coaches may be more critical of their students than public speaking teachers are of theirs. This element of criticism gives the students a more realistic assessment of their skills. For a transcript of the answers provided to each question by each group, please see Appendix B.

Conversational skills. The fifth research question investigated whether there was a difference in the level of conversational skills of students in different instructional conditions, individual events participation or enrollment in a public speaking course. Again, this question attempts to explore the behavior and skill level of the participants and determine if there is a difference in the interpersonal behaviors of the two groups.

The data suggest that prior competitive or educational experience did not affect students' level of conversational skills. Data also suggest that there were no significant differences between the two groups in terms of conversational skills. These results suggest that either instructional condition, individual events participation or public speaking course enrollment, produce the same level of conversational skills.

Post-hoc Analyses

To probe the data further, several *post-hoc* analyses were computed. Multiple correlations were computed and some yielded significant results. Please refer to table 5.1.

Table 5.1

Correlations Between Prior Experience and Assessment Variables

		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
1. Prior coursework	Pearson	1.000	.073	.057	.068	.083	-.225	.148	.152	.185
	Sig	.	.420	.530	.450	.358	.012	.104	.092	.040
	N	124	123	123	124	124	124	122	124	123
2. H.S. exp.	Pearson	.073	1.00.	.287	-.150	.160	-.120	.061	.113	-.041
	Sig	.420	.	.001	.096	.075	.184	.505	.211	.649
	N	123	125	125	125	125	125	123	125	124
3. Coll. Exp.	Pearson	.057	.287	1.000	.057	.279	.051	.224	.196	-.054
	Sig	.530	.001	.	.526	.002	.574	.013	.029	.550
	N	123	125	125	125	125	125	123	125	124
4. SPCE	Pearson	.068	-.150	.057	1.000	.142	-.112	.090	.190	.180
	Sig	.450	.096	.526	.	.113	.214	.321	.033	.044
	N	124	125	125	126	126	126	124	126	125
5. CA	Pearson	.083	.160	.279	.142	1.000	.012	.191	.319	.110
	Sig	.358	.075	.002	.113	.	.897	.034	.000	.222
	N	124	125	125	126	126	126	124	126	125
6. Cognitive	Pearson	-.225	-.120	.051	-.112	.012	1.000	.077	-.004	.072
	Sig	.012	.184	.574	.214	.897	.	.398	.962	.426
	N	124	125	125	126	126	126	124	126	125
7. Affect	Pearson	.148	.061	.224	.090	.191	.077	1.000	.205	.363
	Sig	.104	.505	.013	.321	.034	.398	.	.023	.000
	N	122	123	123	124	124	124	124	124	123
8. Conversation skills	Pearson	.152	.113	.196	.190	.319	-.004	.205	1.000	.487
	Sig	.092	.211	.029	.033	.000	.962	.023	.	.000
	N	124	125	125	126	126	126	124	126	125
9. Global conversation skills	Pearson	.185	-.041	-.054	.180	.110	.072	.363	.487	1.000
	Sig	.040	.069	.550	.044	.222	.426	.000	.000	.
	N	123	124	124	125	125	125	123	125	125

NOTE: Two-tailed correlations significant at < .05.

Table 5.1 shows significant correlations exist between CA and collegiate individual events experience. This suggests that the more competitive experience one has, the less likely they are to exhibit communication apprehension. Communication apprehension also correlates with conversational skills. Conversational skills also correlate with affective learning and global conversational skills.

The table also shows a significant correlation between cognitive learning and the number of prior speech courses taken. This suggests that more coursework corresponds with more knowledge. Correlations can also be seen between collegiate experience and total affective learning and also between high school experience and conversational

skills. These correlations suggest that high school experience is an important indicator of behavior.

Summary of Findings

Significant differences were found between the two instructional conditions, individual events participation and public speaking course enrollment, concerning communication apprehension, liking towards content, likelihood to repeat learned behaviors, and self-perceived skill effectiveness. Individual events participation yielded means significantly lower for communication apprehension and fostered more behavioral affect. Public speaking course enrollment yielded a higher level of self-perceived skill effectiveness and a higher liking for content in students. No significant differences were found between the instructional conditions regarding total affective learning, conversational skills and cognitive knowledge. Each instructional condition was satisfactory in these dimensions.

Implications of Research

This study yields several instructional implications for instructors in terms of assessing communication on the cognitive, affective, and behavioral levels.

Cognitive. Both conditions should increase the development of cognitive learning. Students in each group received approximately the same score, 70%. While passing, this is average and could be improved for a sophomore level course or its equivalent. In order to increase cognitive development, individual events coaches could accompany their skills training with a lecture aimed at meeting cognitive learning objectives, and public speaking instructors could use more "hands-on" activities to create meaning for the information and help students remember it. These actions can create a

balance between knowledge and behavior that will ultimately facilitate the students' learning.

Affective. The results of this study show that communication apprehension is significantly higher in students participating in public speaking courses. Public speaking instructors could incorporate techniques from individual events. This could include increasing the amount of skills training and more individual coaching or ungraded practice. Giving a student the opportunity to speak without the fear of penalty such as a grade could lower their fear. This could also be an excellent way of increasing the likelihood of repeating the behaviors. This principle could be incorporated more into public speaking courses.

Behavior. As discussed earlier, students in the public speaking course condition described their teachers as very encouraging and supportive, but few mentioned criticism as a technique used by their teachers. The prominent theme focused on "supportive" and "encouraging". This overwhelmingly positive feedback could be developing an unrealistic perception for the students regarding their skills. In order to teach proper behavior feedback, constructive criticism, and correction of behaviors must be given.

Limitations of the Current Study

There were several limitations to the current study that should be addressed before suggestions for future research can be discussed. These limitations are examined in the following paragraphs and include homogeneity of sample, instrumentation, and operationalization of behavior.

First, the current study did not have a homogenous sample. Participants in the individual events condition were from all over the country, attended different types and

sizes of universities, colleges, and community colleges, and had varying levels of experience. The students enrolled in the public speaking course were from three different institutions, located in three different states. Two were universities; one much larger than the other, and one was a small liberal-arts college. Not only were the programs of the universities different, but all of these students had different backgrounds and levels of experience. Some of the variance in the study may be attributable to the heterogeneous nature of the sample. More care should have been taken to control for all of these extraneous variables.

Second, the instrument used to measure cognitive learning was not highly reliable, but similar to cognitive assessment in the college classroom. The instrument had a Cronbach's alpha of only .42. This means that 58% of the variance is the result of measurement error. A more reliable instrument should have been used, or different items that refine the breadth of the questions should have been developed. This error in instrumentation mitigates the results of the cognitive measure, making it difficult to fully assess the competency of the students.

Third, the behavior component was not operationalized correctly. In order to assess behavior, one must evaluate that behavior, not rely on a self-report measure. This study does not truly compare the students' behavior, rather what each group thinks about their own behavior. This is a significant difference.

The limitations of the current study include a homogenous sample, improper instrumentation for the cognitive domain, and misoperationalization for the behavioral domain. Now that some of the limitations have been discussed, suggestions for future research will be examined.

Possible Suggestions for Future Research

There are a multitude of possibilities for research in forensics. First, evidence is still needed to show tangible benefits of forensics. This may be an endless quest, due to the chicken/egg debate of whether forensic students become skilled through participation in forensics, or participate in forensics because they are already skilled. Future researchers should utilize a pre-test/post-test design that controls for prior experience in order to determine the effects that forensics has on learning and behavior. This may be the only research design that will provide the answers for which forensics researchers have been searching.

Second, the use of forensics as an instructional option merits further attention. This study investigates if forensics could be useful as an instructional tool, and finds that it does achieve many of the same outcomes as a traditional public speaking course. Future researchers could take this further and perhaps develop a pilot for an individual events program as a substitute for a public speaking course and compare the progress of students in each. This type of research would not only demonstrate the effectiveness of individual events, but would also promote the activity and if successful, alleviate any overcrowding of public speaking classes.

Third, research exploring interpersonal relationships in forensics is still warranted. Past research has looked at how forensics training effects interpersonal relationships, but future research could look at the differences in interpersonal relationships between forensic participants (coaches and competitors) and non-participants. An interesting question would involve the level of intimacy between teammates and/or the rate of self-disclosure.

Fourth, research should continue to explore the relationship between communication apprehension and individual events. Again, a pre-test/ post-test design could be effective in determining whether or not people with low CA are drawn to individual events or if individual events helps lower CA.

Summary of Thesis

The purpose of this thesis was to examine individual events as an instructional tool and compare the competency of students in individual events to students enrolled in public speaking course. Competency was assessed by investigating the three domains of communication competence: cognitive, affective, and behavioral. The following five research questions were tested:

RQ1: Is there a difference, taking into account students' prior experience, in the level of knowledge resulting from the instructional treatments of individual events participation and student enrollment in a public speaking course?

RQ2: Is there a difference, taking into account students' prior experience, in the affective learning resulting from the instructional treatments of individual events participation and student enrollment in a public speaking course?

RQ3: Is there a difference, taking into account students' prior experience, in self-reported public speaking communication apprehension resulting from the instructional treatments of individual events participation and student enrollment in a public speaking course?

RQ4: Is there a difference, taking into account students' prior experience, in self-perceived skill effectiveness resulting from the instructional treatments of individual events participation and student enrollment in a public speaking course?

RQ5: Is there a difference, taking into account students' prior experience, in the conversational skills resulting from the instructional treatments of individual events participation and student enrollment in a public speaking course?

Subjects in this study consisted of 76 individual events participants and 124 students enrolled in a public speaking course. All participants were asked to complete a questionnaire containing a variety of scales including communication apprehension, self-perceived skill effectiveness, affective learning, cognitive knowledge, and conversational skills. Subjects were also asked to respond to demographic questions, such as age, sex, grade-point average, and educational and competitive experience.

The study used Analyses of covariance and analyses of variance. *Post-hoc* analyses were also computed to find correlations between the variables. A summary of the results suggest the following:

1) Individual events participants have lower levels of CA than students enrolled in a public speaking course.
2) Individual events participants have lower levels of SPCE than students enrolled in a public speaking course.
3) Individual events participants are more likely to repeat the behaviors they learn than students enrolled in a public speaking course.
4) Individual events participants have lower levels of liking then students enrolled in a public speaking course.
5) A significant correlation exists between experience in competition and CA. The more experience a student has, the less CA they have.

6) A significant correlation exists between high school IE competition and conversational skills.

Limitations to the current study and possible suggestions for future research were discussed. Implications of these findings suggest that individual events is a comparable instructional method to a traditional public speaking course.

APPENDIX A

October 25, 2001

Before taking the survey, I would like to thank you for your participation in this research study. Your participation will facilitate the completion of this project, and furthermore, the completion of my graduate degree at Southwest Texas State University.

This study investigates student's perceptions of communication skills. With your assistance, I hope to better understand the role of student perceptions in teaching communication. If you decide to participate in this study after reading and signing this consent form, you will be asked to complete a survey that will require approximately 15 minutes. I encourage you to complete the survey as accurately and thoroughly as possible.

Any information obtained in connection with this study will remain confidential and anonymous. Confidential means that the collected data will be used only for research purposes. Anonymous means that you will not be providing me with any type of identifying information.

Your decision whether or not to participate will in no way penalize your grade in any class or activity. You are free to discontinue participation at any time after signing this form, should you choose to discontinue participation in this study.

You are making a decision to whether or not to participate. Your signature indicates that you have read the information provided above and have decided to participate.

If you have any questions, or are interested in finding out more about this study, please feel free to contact me at 512-754-2766 or at ld41312@swt.edu.

Again, thank you for your assistance.

Ms. Leigh-Anne R. Dowdy
Department of Speech Communication
Southwest Texas State University

_____ _____

Signature of participant Date

Self-Perceived Effectiveness Scale

Please read all directions and questions carefully. All answers will remain confidential. Thank you for your participation in this study.

Please complete the following information:

Your current classification: **(check one)**

Freshman ____ Sophomore ____ Junior____ Senior____

Your current GPA is: **(check one)**

less than 2.0 ___ 2.0-2.5 ___ 2.51-3.0 ___ 3.01-3.51 ___ 3.52 or higher ___

You are: **(check one)**

Male ____ Female ____

Your age: _____ **(fill in your age)**

Have you taken a public speaking course on the college level? **(check one)** Yes ____ No ____

How many other speech communication courses on the college level have you completed? _____ **(fill in)**
(Speech communication does not include mass media course such as broadcasting or journalism.)

How long have you competed in individual events on the college level: (College Individual Events means competitive forensics excluding debate. E.g. extemporaneous, impromptu, persuasive, after-dinner, informative speaking, communication analysis, prose, poetry, Program oral interpretation, dramatic or duo interpretation). **(check one)**

1 semester____ 2 semesters____ 3 semesters____ 4 semesters____

5 semesters____ 6 semesters____ 7 semesters____ 8 semesters____

Never competed ____

How long did you compete in high school individual events: (High school individual events means competitive forensics excluding debate. E.g. reader's theatre, oration, extemporaneous or impromptu speaking, humorous or dramatic interpretation, duet acting, etc.) **(check one)**

1 year____ 2 years____ 3 years____ 4 years____

Never competed ____

Below is a list of several communication skills. Please indicate in the space to the left of each skill your estimate of your effectiveness on a scale of 0 to 100. 0 = completely ineffective and 100 = completely effective. Work quickly and record your first impression.

_____ Choosing and narrowing a topic.

_____ Communicating a thesis or specific purpose.

_____ Providing appropriate supporting material.

_____ Organizing a topic.

_____ Using language that is appropriate to your audience, occasion and purpose.

_____ Using vocal variety in rate, pitch, and intensity to heighten and maintain interest.

_____ Using pronunciation, grammar, and articulation.

_____ Using physical behaviors that support and do not distract from your verbal message.

_____ Delivering a presentation with minimal fluency breaks, such as awkward pauses and verbal fillers.

Please answer the following questions:

1. How would you describe your teacher's style of working with you?

2. What do you think your teacher does well when working with you?

3. What do you wish your teacher would do when working with you?

Please indicate the degree to which each statement applies to you by marking whether you (1) strongly agree, (2) agree, (3) are undecided, (4) disagree, (5) strongly disagree. Work quickly and record your first impression.

_____ I have no fear of giving a speech.

_____ Certain parts of my body feel tense and rigid while I am giving a speech.

_____ I feel relaxed while giving a speech.

_____ My thoughts become confused and jumbled when I am giving a speech.

_____ I face the prospect of giving a speech with confidence.

_____ While giving a speech, I get so nervous I forget facts I really know.

Please choose the best answer for each item. (circle one)

1. Appropriate eye contact for delivering a speech in a classroom setting would be to
    a. Look at each member of the audience at least once
    b. Look at the front and back rows
    c. Look just slightly over the heads of the audience members
    d. Focus on those who look supportive

2. Because the attitudes of audience members are unlikely to change instantly or dramatically, persuasion is usually
    a. Incremental
    b. Charismatic
    c. Direct
    d. Ethical

3. When you support your speech by telling a brief story you are using
    a. An analogy
    b. A definition
    c. A description
    d. An anecdote

4. All of the following "visual" nonverbal guidelines have been shown to enhance speaker credibility except
    a. Control involuntary movement by moving voluntarily
    b. Avoid facial expressions while speaking; keep a "deadpan" face
    c. Do not let posture get too relaxed; remain comfortably erect
    d. Look each member of the audience in the eyes at least once

5. Some of the disadvantages of the _____ mode of delivery include excessive formality, difficult to deliver, and tends to make audience members think of words rather than ideas. Some of the disadvantages of the _____ mode of delivery include not being able to keep exact time limits and not being able to deliver a grammatically perfect speech.
    a. Extemporaneous, memorized
    b. Memorized, extemporaneous
    c. Manuscript, impromptu
    d. Extemporaneous, impromptu

6. The level of enthusiasm a speaker displays during a speech is most closely related to the speaker's
    a. Charisma
    b. Competence
    c. Character
    d. Consistency

7. The first main point of Elsa's speech states, "Cars that use gasoline pollute the air." Her second main point states, "Solar powered cars should be used to prevent pollution." What type of organizational pattern is Elsa using:
    a. Topical
    b. Spatial
    c. Cause and effect
    d. Problem and solution

8. Bradley states his strongest piece of evidence first. He states his weakest piece of evidence last. What method is Bradley using to organize his supporting material?
    a. Specificity
    b. Recency
    c. Primacy
    d. Complexity

9. Which of the following statements best illustrates a speaker using a signpost?
    a. "You will remember that in my introduction I defined a sexually transmitted disease."
    b. "My speech is going to describe several types of sexually transmitted diseases."
    c. "In conclusion, the most important things to remember are the causes of these diseases."
    d. "Let me tell you a brief story to set the tone of what I want to say."

10. Lisa takes one step each time she transitions between main ideas. Her steps are an example of:
    a. Gestures
    b. Posture
    c. Appearance
    d. Movement

Using the following scales, please evaluate this class. Please circle the number for each item that best represents your feelings.

(circle one)

A. My attitude about the content I learn in this class is:

1. Good	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Bad
2. Worthless	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Valuable
3. Fair	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Unfair
4. Negative	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Positive

B. My attitude about the behaviors recommended in this class is:

5. Good	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Bad
6. Worthless	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Valuable
7. Fair	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Unfair
8. Negative	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Positive

C. My attitude about the instructor in this class is:

9. Good	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Bad
10. Worthless	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Valuable
11. Fair	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Unfair
12. Negative	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Positive

D. My likelihood of actually attempting to engage in the behaviors recommended in this class is:

13. Likely	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Unlikely
14. Impossible	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Possible
15. Probable	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Improbable
16. Would Not	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Would

E. My likelihood of actually enrolling in another class with similar content, if I had the choice and if my schedule permitted: (If you are graduating, assume you would still be here.)

17. Likely	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Unlikely
18. Impossible	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Possible
19. Probable	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Improbable
20. Would Not	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Would

F. The likelihood of my taking another course with this teacher, if I had a choice, is (If you are graduating, assume you would still be here.)

21. Likely	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Unlikely
22. Impossible	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Possible
23. Probable	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Improbable
24. Would Not	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Would

Conversational Skills Rating Scale

Rate how frequently or infrequently YOUR OWN communicative behavior displays the following characteristics in conversations with others:

VERY INFREQUENTLY 1 2 3 4 5 VERY FREQUENTLY

Circle the most accurate response for each behavior:

1	2	3	4	5	(1) Rapid speaking rate
1	2	3	4	5	(2) Speaking dysfluency (e.g. pauses, silences, "uh", etc.)
1	2	3	4	5	(3) Vocal confidence (confident and assertive sounding)
1	2	3	4	5	(4) Clear articulation (pronunciation and linguistic expression
1	2	3	4	5	(5) Vocal Variety (neither monotone nor dramatic voice)
1	2	3	4	5	(6) Loud (but not shouting) volume
1	2	3	4	5	(7) Open posture (arms and legs uncrossed)
1	2	3	4	5	(8) Body lean toward partner
1	2	3	4	5	(9) Shaking or nervous twitches
1	2	3	4	5	(10) Unmotivated movements (tapping feet)
1	2	3	4	5	(11) Vivid facial expressions
1	2	3	4	5	(12) Nodding of head in response to partner statements
1	2	3	4	5	(13) Use of gestures to emphasize what is being said
1	2	3	4	5	(14) Use of humor and/or stories
1	2	3	4	5	(15) Smiling and/or laughing
1	2	3	4	5	(16) Use of eye contact with the other person
1	2	3	4	5	(17) Asking of questions
1	2	3	4	5	(18) Speaking about partner and partner's interests
1	2	3	4	5	(19) Speaking about self and self's interests
1	2	3	4	5	(20) Encouragements or agreements (e.g., yeh, uh-huh)
1	2	3	4	5	(21) Expression/assertion of personal opinion
1	2	3	4	5	(22) Initiation of new topics
1	2	3	4	5	(23) Maintenance of topics and follow up comments
1	2	3	4	5	(24) Interruption of partner speaking turns
1	2	3	4	5	(25) Using more time speaking than the other person

For the next five items, rate YOUR OWN general communicative performance:

(26) POOR CONVERSATIONALIST:	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	:GOOD CONVERSATIONALIST
(27) SOCIALLY UNSKILLED	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	:SOCIALLY SKILLED
(28) INCOMPETENT INTERACTANT	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	:COMPETENT INTERACTANT
(29) INAPPROPRIATE INTERACTANT	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	:APPROPRIATE INTERACTANT
(30) INEFFECTIVE INTERACTANT	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	: EFFECTIVE INTERCTANT

APPENDIX B

IE Sample

QUESTION ONE - How would you describe your teacher or coach's style of working with you?

1- One on one with support and enthusiasm

2- Our coach pushes us to practice and improve our skills both independently and with him.

3- My coach's style is very supportive and caring. She has a firm grasp of all the events, is able to point out areas of change and cause that change to happen, and most importantly knows when to have fun.

4- She tries to be helpful and is usually always available. But doesn't keep my attention/ enthusiasm going.

5- Step by step explanation of constructive criticism after a performance focusing on what can be added to enhance the performance and what awkward elements should be eliminated for the same purpose. Laidback style of offering advice with room for personal opinion and individual style. More suggestive than directive.

6- Gives great suggestions but lets us do as we feel.

7- He works to insure I give a good presentation while not being overly forceful.

8- I feel that our coach works very closely with me. He really cares about each of us as individuals.

9- Very open and honest. I consider my coach a friend of mine.

10- Patient. My coach spends a lot of time working with everyone on the team. She takes time to understand my viewpoint and understanding of a piece before telling me hers.

11- Very casual and very laid back.

12- Personable

13- She is very supportive, genuine and helpful. She uses a more personal style. She coach us individually, gives us freedom in choosing topic and very helpful

14- She allows us the freedom for creativity to do what we want, while offering useful suggestions to improve our performance.

15- Personal, thoughtful, encouraging, professional

16- Awesome! He does a great job. I think he's a great coach. I'm learning tons from him and respect him highly. This is my 5th semester at school and I truly believe this is my best semester ever!

17- Passive/ active She will let you run, but with constructive criticism.

18- Lets us practice without help first, then check and make comments about it.

19- Very friendly, informal. Gets me to do my best because I want to make her happy after all her hard work.

20- My coach tends to use a stop and go method rather than listening to my entire performance and then having me go back.

21 High expectations, strict, very personal

22- She is very passionate. She understands my inexperience and takes time to work with me to improve. She has a very directed style.

23 Personal - one on one

24- One on one rehearsals twice a week

25- Kind of a freestyle. She lets me do as I do and only corrects gross errors as long as my performance is within the guidelines

26 They are quick and specific. They teach responsibility and independency. Furthermore, they are thorough in what needs to be done.

27 Hands off - little reference checking with me

28 I have seven coaches total so I have a wide variance in coach opinions and options. Therefore I have very helpful people with a great desire to help me.

29- Hands on, yet allows me many liberties.

30 Very personal and efficient

31- Personal

32- Very relaxed and personal. He's very emotional.

33- Loving, knows people do this because they enjoy it, but still competitive

34- My coach's style of working with me is laid back and comfortable

35- Laid back - buddy buddy, but not really strict enough on work habits.

36- Minimal contact; however through argumentation (his only style, basically of conversation) we practice refutation ALL THE TIME.

37- It is very one on one and informative

38- He teaches by example he explains the shows, then he has us work together to complete a common goal

39- Does not really work with us one on one. He mainly directs us on where to go and what to do.

40- Distant

41- Open to suggestions and ideas. Always willing to help

42- Supportive. skills teacher.

43- Open to suggestions and ideas. Always willing to help

44- Good, but we haven't worked together much this year, yet

45- Great help

46- Difficult to follow his logic sometimes but overall he is positive and beneficial

47- offering arguments and styles of arguments strategy and generally thought provoking

48- very hands on

49- very good - hard working and very interested in my success. She gives a lot of time to help me get everything perfect. She is tough, but it is what helps me to become better.

50- good

IE Sample

QUESTION TWO - What do you think your teacher or coach does well when working with you?

1- Listening, then instructing

2- Encourages good habits and teaches formats well.

3- My coach never makes you feel stupid. She always points out the things that need improvement first and then follows with a positive comment. She is also very good at finding pieces that fall in our interest level.

4- Listens and attentive, gives full attention

5- My coach is excellent at providing support and encouragement during practice as well as gently calling to our attention the common mistakes we continually make in a performance.

6- Stops me when I need a change during practice at the time it needs work.

7- Making suggestions to improve my speech. Not giving orders

8- He never forgets that I am a student first, and that school should come before forensics.

9- He provides excellent suggestions and ideas. He is also a motivator.

10- She offers examples of what she wants to be done and how she would like it done.

11- They work on what needs to be worked out, but they don't waste my time.

12- Practical critiques, suggests of things to try

13- She is very pleasantly critical, she catches our weaknesses and helps us fix it

14- Pinpoint effective ways for us to do work on our own.

15- Pays close attention to all aspects of my performance. Listens to my perspectives.

16- Everything! When you have never done forensics everything counts. I think he is great at being patient and telling me things more than once to understand them.

17- Listens

18- Help me lead the emotions

19- Keeps it fun. Cares about me as a person.

20- She gives comments all aspects of my performance rather then vocal. She also understands my other obligations other then competition.

21- She knows what she's looking for and helps point out areas of improvement; constructive criticism

22- She concentrates on my strengths. She also can be very encouraging and fun

23- Capitalizing on what I do well and my personality when suggesting pieces or topics. She really helps me understand how the college level works and what will do well

24- Immediate feedback

25- Lots of positive feedback and encouragement

26- Giving you choices in what you want to do with selection or speech. Challenge my thinking and always questioning why I chose the reasons I chose.

27- Understand my thinking style and knows how to put things

28- When we fix the mistakes I didn't know I was making

29- Makes me think, opens my eyes to new ideas.

30- Relating to me

31- Makes me understand what I am not doing and what I need to do

32- He tries to make me convey my feelings into whatever I do.

33- Criticizes while ensuring maximum confidence.

34- While working with me, my coach creates a comfortable setting for me to practice my piece.

35- Makes it a comfortable environment

36- See above on refute [referring to question one]

37- He does well with his communication of helpful ideas.

38- Letting me know what I am doing wrong and trying to fix it

39- He clearly describes what is supposed to be done

40- Critique

41- Lets you go and then critiques

42- Gives the ideas of how to use the skills you obtain

43- Lets you go then critiques you later

44- Pays attn. Has good input]

45- Critique

46- Showing us the arguments we should have made

47- His style of teaching demands that you think for yourself rather than simply regurgitate his words

48- Tells me exactly what I could change to be successful

49- Gives a lot of suggestions and critiques in both a positive and negative way

50- yes

IE Sample

QUESTION THREE - What do you wish your teacher or coach would do when working with you?

1- give me even more constructive criticism

2- Pickier with the small things

3- Sometimes I wish we could simply get more rehearsal time with her.

4- Have fun, and let me have fun with the piece.

5- I wish that my coach would take more time doing a technique we call "stop and go." This is when, instead of performing the entire piece, the coach stops you when he sees a problem, gives you a directive on how to fix it, and requires you to repeat that section with the adjustment.

6- Blank

7- More direct with ideas

8- I wish that we would socialize a little less sometimes.

9- Be more specific when voicing concern over my piece.

10- Stop me when she sees a problem and fix it then, not wait until the end of the piece and think back. I like immediate feedback better, the sooner it comes the better.

11- --

12- blank

13- I like her the way she is

14- Help us more in finding pieces

15- Give me more guidance on how to choose a piece or write a speech -Guidance on preliminary work.

16- Nothing different. I like it the way he does things now. I can pretty much work with him as much as I chose to right now and I love it.

17- ?

18- I wish my coach would make us discuss our piece together.

19- No suggestions

20- Spend more time on my particular weaknesses.

21- Can't think of anything

22- I wish she could just wave a wand and make me talented, but unfortunately she can't.

23- Honestly, I don't know. I think she does a good job

24- Avoid outside distraction

25- More guidance, ex. Helping me work on specific sentences rather than just saying this point needs to be narrower

26- I wish there would be more intensity involved

27- A little more time to me

28- Be my friend.

29- Answer a few of the questions posed by my coach

30- Be more assertive

31- Be as truthful as possible

32- Nothing

33- Interrupt me and tell me if I am doing something wrong

34- While working with me, I wish my coach would be a little more critical.

35- Give more practice time

36- Be less domineering

37- What he already does

38- Make me feel a little more confident about my debating skills

39- Wish he would work with us one on one more often

40- Spend more time

41- Explain more options and styles

42- Do a little more indepth discussion

43- Explain more options and styles

44- Nothing

45- N/A

46- Give us candy

47- Stop every once in a while ☺

48- Allow me to add "questionable" humor that other competitors have in their pieces

49- I am satisfied with everything

50- same

Public Speaking Sample

QUESTION ONE - How would you describe your teacher or coach's style of working with you?

51. Informs us of strategies and gives us tips backed up by basic communication theory research.

52. very relaxed

53. flexible but firm

54. He is a great teacher. He is always a phone call away. He explains thoroughly and effectively.

55. constructive criticism interspersed with praise

56. personal, conversational, and encouraging

57. effective, to the point. Appropriate and interesting.

58. very formal, but effective

59. whenever I have question I go to office have, one on one.

60. excellent feedback and suggestions

61. energetic

62. animated and vibrant

63. laid back, yet extremely effective

64. good

65. real blunt, forward, and get to the point

66. other-oriented, comodating, easy to understand, clear and concise.

67. few directions, not much structure

68. present a written critique with hours available outside class to talk and practice mandatory lab presentation practice

69. causal and direct, to the point!

70. hands on

71. professional

72. he is really helpful and laid back

73. relaxed, personal, and intertaining

74. he is very understainding

75. he has a very personal style that gives lots of examples and calls for reflective thinking

76 he's really got a smooth style and clear instructions to give

77. he lectures and you listen but there is no real interaction.

78. ---

79. he makes it very easy to communicate with him and he is not intimidating but seems to know what he is talking about

80. very helpful, easy fun

81. by the book, encourages us to be comfortable & does a great job of praising us

82. very patient

83. very nice, a little on the boring side, fast paced sometimes, but effective and interesting

84. cooperative

85. very personal and inspiring (he tries to bring you to a place where you believe you can do it)

86. relaxed, informative

87. individual, focuses on most important issues, compliments a lot

88. very laid back

89. very effective

90. very effective, & informative

91. very effective, tells you your strengths & weaknesses

92. energetic, trys to relate to students

93. I would describe my teacher's style of working with me as personal & helpful.

94. very open & willing to help

95. great

96. very good, fun and interesting

97. my professor approaches the class with humor. This allowed the class to relax & have fun

98. tries his best to make me understand everything

99. he is very outgoing and fun

100. wonderful, first class, caring

101. open class discussions & evaluations

102. enthusiastic and involved with the students

103. I would label the teacher's style – lecture & also hands-on projects such as the speeches we had to work on alone

104. I would describe him as using many humorous techniques to make us feel comfortable an at ease

105. one on one as needed, group oriented

106. we have fun

107. humorous but stressing what is known

108. laid back approach. Made the students fell comfortable without compromising standards of grading

109. effective. He used humor to get points across, as critical of the speaking mistakes, but not to the point of being rude or mean (unlike many HS forensics teachers')

110. unique

111. he was fun and interesting but not very lenient

112. helpful

113. lecture, simple notes and comfortable learning setting

114. excellent. Dr. Chas showed his concern if help was needed. He gave plenty of time to see him if a problem arose.

115. He is personable, and does an excellent job getting us the information we need without a lot of extras that just waste time

116. he would watch a speech and then write down comments and discuss them with me later

117. calm, enthusiastic

118. lecture with notes, work in groups, class activities, very helpful and pen to questions and discussions

119 very friendly and outgoing, makes me feel comfortable in class

120. he incorporates humor into his course. He also tells stories about his life. This allows us to know him better and makes the class more enjoyable.

121. he had a friendly lecture style. Knew we didn't want to be in class sometimes.

122. overall pretty well

123. very humorous -> very understandable

124. fun, cool, relaxed, down to earth

125. humorous, but helpful

126. he was helpful and responded to my e-mails

Public Speaking Sample

QUESTION TWO - What do you think your teacher or coach does well when working with you?

51. gives effective tips
52. informing and persuading
53. explanation
54. He listens, always gives pointers on how to improve.
55. encourage, personality
56. he gives very little negative feedback. He believes that everyone can be a good speaker, this gives me more confidence.
57. encourages students, affirms and believes in them, very complimentary
58. he clearly explains what he expects and desires from me and also gives me praise
59. very encouraging
60. presenting the info and getting right to the point
61. through explanation
62. encourages the class
63. he speaks to us clearly, nothing is ambiguous, and he makes you want to do a great job n the speech.
64. makes me feel open to ask ?s
65. he has high expectation of the class, encourages
66. being audience centered. Knowing how to relate material to us.
67. does offer advice and is patient
68. encourages., tells me weaknesses and strengths, watching others
69. relating material to everyday life and use
70. use examples
71. making things easy to understand
72. he doesn't make me nervous
73. keeps interest up
74. he makes you comfortable

75. he makes it personal and is very good at making you feel comfortable
76. set a good example to adhere to
77. when you ask a question, he answers
78. he cites specific examples of past events, informing the students proper behavior
79. makes me feel like I matter that the student has a "say" he is always willing to listen to us
80. keeping my attention
81. very funny, shares interesting stories, encouraging, does not put anyone on the spot or make them feel embarrassed.
82. listens carefully and is always helpful
83. listens
84. gives adequate advice to help improve speech comm.. skills, not only provide us with help in giving the address, but also with you as the performer
85. explanation and thorough understanding of material
86. gives very good feedback and always willing to help you improve
87. explains well, points out things that could be improves, extremely informative.
88. constructive criticism, not insults
89. communicating what he expects from me and the course
90. –
91. gives you personal attention
92. relates
93. When working with me, my teacher answers my questions well and helps me when I have any problems
94. communicating/ stressing certain points that should be emphasized
95. he males you feel at ease also no matter what as long as you try you will pass which takes off some anxious
96. uses sense of humor, learns our names and has fun atmosphere
97. my professor did well working with us because he listen to us. He attempted to understand our questions & helped us out as much as he could

98. understanding where I am coming from

99. he is good at communicating in a humorous way

100. makes you laugh

101. keeps class interesting & enjoyable

102. presents the information in a easy-to understand way

103. explains thing well, cover a lot of material

104. same as number one

105. helping understand principles, help with speech preparation

106. use humor to relax everybody

107. proving & demonstrating a point

108. as I have stated, he makes the students feel comfortable.

109. keeping the atmosphere light and non-stressful

110. keep my focus & attention

111. he makes us feel comfortable, pretty supportive

112. keep students relaxed

113. good feedback, both positive and negative

114. his communication is great, very clear and percise

115. he is very funny

116. he wasn't afraid to say something was bad or that he didn't like certain word choices

117. reading students emotions and acting appropriately

118. relating material to the class

119. gets the point across- emphasizes major ideas well.

120. He is able to communicate well with us. Also he encourages us to ask questions

121. Making lectures interesting

122. keeps class interesting

123. adds in different stories relative to what we are talking about

124. talks at my level

125. keeps my attention

126. talks to me on a "college student" level (personable)

Public Speaking Sample

QUESTION THREE - What do you wish your teacher or coach would do when working with you?

51. give specific critiques based on individual performance.
52. be more specific in his reviews
53. nothing really
54. n/a
55. more constructive criticism
56. give us more specific topic. I spend a lot of time choosing a topic.
57. maybe a bit more challenging
58. a little more constructive criticism rather than just praise
59. write my speech for me (ha ha)
60. n/a
61. explore more possibilities
62. increase clarity of directions
63. ---
64. evaluate me more pos. and neg.
65. rcv more feedback from students
66. elaborate on text material a little more
67. more feedback after a speech
68. –
69. –
70. impromptu speech
71. slow down
72. –
73. be more specific during lecture and take more time when reviewing the chapters
74. nothing more
75. he does a great job and I would highly recommend him to other students

76. be is open to my questions, if he doesn't know, send me in the right direction
77. be more hands on & interactive with myself & the class
78. –
79. encourage more confidence in us about speaking in front of everyone
80. put us in group to get to know each other more.
81. examinations are pretty tricky, explain in more detail.
82. when teaching, do more demonstrations of speaking, physically instead of reading out the book all the time.
83. give me all the answers instead of me thinking of them
84. give you feedback on the critique
85. –
86. ask for student opinion
87. on critiques, write out specific problematic areas
88. write more legibly
89. nothing; he does everything good
90. listen
91. a little more feedback
92. n/a
93. nothing, really
94. a few more speeches
95. –
96. let us choose our on speech topics
97. I wish a few more examples would have been used.
98. understand my point of view
99. keep on with the same
100. tell me more on how to stay calm when presenting
101. –
102. offer more ideas or options

103. explains thing well & grade fairly

104. not really anything more than he already does

105. –

106. give me some useful pointers

107. maybe some more visual stuff

108. keep teaching as he has been

109. work more with presentation skills/ work one-on-one giving the speech

110. not sure

111. not grade so tough, understand that some people hate speaking

112. I think he does everything fine

113. help understand how to correct it or explain why its wrong

114. n/a

115. I think he does a good job

116. I wish he had taken more time to see events from my perspective

117. go over things more, repetition

118. everything was fine

119. the way we take notes makes me feel like a little child. He basically gives out every heading with what should proceed it.

120. he does everything good already.

121. seem more friendly and not make fun of people as much

122. ?

123. –

124. look at me & be genuine in listening

125. be open to more styles/formats of giving speeches, not just his.

126. gives more examples while we are taking notes; its important to repeat/ rephrase (he does)

REFERENCES

Allen, M., Berkowitz, S. & Louden, A. (1995). A study comparing the impact of communication classes and competitive forensics on critical thinking. *The Forensic, 81,* 1-7.

Allen, M., Berkowitz, S., Hunt, S. & Louden, A. (1999). A meta-analysis of the impact of forensics and communication education on critical thinking. *Communication Education, 48,* 18-30.

Andersen, K. (1974). A critical review of behavioral research in argumentation and forensics. *Journal of the American Forensic Association, 10,* 155.

Bartanen, K.M. (1998). The place of the forensics program in the liberal arts college of the twenty-first century: An essay in honor of Larry E. Norton. *The Forensic of Pi Kappa Delta, 84.* 1-16.

Bartanen, M.D. and Frank, D.A. (1991). *Debating values.* Scottsdale, AZ: Gorsuch Scarisbrick.

Bellon, J. (2000). A research-based justification for debate across the curriculum. *Argumentation and Advocacy, 36,* 161-175.

Brockriede, W. (1972). Arguers as lovers. *Philoso[hy and Rhetoric, 5.* 1-11.

Burnett, A. & Olson, C.D. (1998). The dark side of debate: The downfall of interpersonal relationships. *Speaker and Gavel, 35,* 31-45.

Buzzanell, P.M. & Burrell, N.A. (1997). Family and workplace conflict: Examining metaphorical conflict schemas and expression across content and sex. *Human Communication Research, 24,* 109-146.

Colbert, K. & Biggers, T. (1985). Why should we support debate? *The Journal of the American Forensic Association, 21,* 237-240.

Colbert, K. (1987). The effects of CEDA and NDT training on critical thinking ability. *Journal of the American Forensic Association, 23*, 194-201.

Colbert, K. (1993). The effects of debate participation on argumentativeness and verbal aggression. *Communication Education, 42,* 206-214.

Colbert, K. (1994). Replicating the effects of debate participation on argumentativeness and verbal aggression. *The Forensic of Pi Kappa Delta, Spring,* 1-13.

Dean, K.W. & Levasseur, D.G. (1989). Addressing the needs of academically talented students: A forensics model for the basic public speaking course. *National Forensic Journal, 7,* 133-141.

DeLancey, C. A. (1984) The values of forensics activities to speech communication programs in liberal arts colleges. *Association for Communication Administration Bulletin, 47,* 56-57.

Dickmeyer, S.G. & Boerboom, T. (1999). Diversity of academic interest among forensic participants. *Speaker and Gavel, 36,* 19-29.

Dowling, R.E. (1983). "Arguers as lovers": Implications for forensic educators. *Communication Education, 32,* 237-241.

Fremouw, W.J. and Zitter, R.E. (1978). A comparison of skills training and cognitive restructuring-relaxation for the treatment of speech anxiety. *Behavior Therapy, 9,* 248-259.

Fremouw, W.J. (1984). Cognitive-behavioral therapies for modification of communication apprehension. In J.C. McCroskey and J.A. Daly (Eds.), Avoiding communication: Shyness, reticence, and communication (pp.209-215). Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications.

Friedley, S.A. (1992). Forensics as a laboratory experience in interpersonal communication. *National Forensic Journal, 10,* 51-56.

Fryar, M. and Thomas, D.A. (1980). *Basic debate*. Skokie, IL: National Textbook.

Fuchs, G. (1954). About speech contests. *Speech Teacher, 3*, 54-58.

Gibson, J.W., Gruner, C.R., Hanna, M.S., Smythe, M.J. & Hayes, M.T. (1980). The basic course in speech at U.S. colleges and universities: III. *Communication Education, 29,* 1-9.

Gibson, J.W., Hanna, M.S. & Huddleston, B. (1985). The basic course in speech at U.S. colleges and universities: IV. *Communication Education, 34,* 281-291.

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

Greenstreet, R. (1993). Academic debate and critical thinking: A look at the evidence. *National Forensic Journal, 11.* 13-28.

Grice, G. L. & Skinner, J.F. (1993). *Mastering public speaking*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Gruner, C.R., Huseman, R.C. and Luck, J.I. (1971). Debating ability, critical thinking ability and authoritarianism. *Speaker and Gavel, 9.* 63-65.

Hill, B. (1982). Intercollegiate debate: Why do students bother? *The Southern Speech Communication Journal*, *48*, 77-88.

Hill, B. & Ross, C. (1990). *Public speaking: Process and product.* Dubuque, IA: Kendall/ Hunt Publishing Co.

Huseman, R., Ware, G., and Gruner, C. (1972). Critical thinking, reflective thinking and the ability to organize ideas: A multi-variate approach. *Journal of the American Forensics Association, 9.* 261-265.

Infante, D., Trebing, J., Sheperd, P. & Seeds, D. (1984). The relationship of argumentativeness to verbal aggression. *The Southern Speech Communication Journal, 50,* 67-77.

Johnson, J.R. & Szczupakiewicz, N. (1987). The public speaking course: Is it preparing students with work-related public speaking skills? *Communication Education, 36,* 131-137.

Kearney, P. (1994). Affective learning in .B. Rubin, P. Palmgreen, and H.E. Sypher, eds. *Communication research measures: A sourcebook.* New York: Guilford Press. pp. 81-85.

Kelly, L. (1997). Skills training as a treatment for communication problems. In J.A. Daly, J.C. McCroskey, J. Ayers, T. Hopf, & D.M. Ayers (Eds.), Avoiding communication: Shyness, reticence, and communication (pp. 361-365). Cresskill, NJ: Hampton Press.

Kelly, L. & Keaten, J.A. (2000). Treating communication anxiety: Implications of the communobiological paradigm. *Communication Education, 49,* 45-57.

Krannich, C. R. (1998). *101 secrets of highly effective speakers.* Manassas Park, VA: Impact Publications.

LaBan, F.K. (1980). Academic debate: Can we afford it. *Association for Communication Administration Bulletin, 34,* 73-75.

Littlefield, R.S., Sellnow, T.L., & Meister, M.A. (1994). Controlling speech anxiety: Academic recommendations and forensic applications. *National Forensic Journal, 11,* 15-28.

McCrskey, J.C. (1970). Measures of communication-bound anxiety. *Speech Monographs, 37,* 269-277.

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

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

McCroskey, J.C. (1982). Communication competence and performance: A research and pedagogical perspective. *Communication Education, 31,* 1-7.

McCroskey, J.C. & McCroskey, L.L. (1988). Self-report as an approach to measuring communication competence. *Communication Research Reports, 5,* 108-112.

McCroskey, J.C. (1993). An introduction to rhetorical communication. 6th edition. Englewoods Cliff, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

McCroskey, J.C. (1994). Assessment of affect toward communication and affect toward instruction in communication. In S. Morreale, M. Brooks, R. Berko, & C. Cooke (Eds.), The 1994 SCA summer conference proceedings and prepared remarks (from the 1994 summer conference on "Assessing college student competency in speech communication") (pp. 55-71). Annadale, VA: Speech Communication Association.

McCroskey, J.C., & Beatty, M.J. (1998). Communication apprehension. In J.C. McCroskey, J.A. Daly, M.M. Martin, & M.J. Beatty (Eds.), *Communication and personality: Trait perspectives* (pp.215-232). Cresskill, NJ: Hampton Press.

McGlone, E. (1974). The behavioral effects of forensics participation. *Journal of the American Forensic Association, 10,* 140-146.

McMillan, J.K. & Todd-Mancillas, W.R. (1991). An assessment of the value of individual events in forensics competition from students' perspectives. *National Forensic Journal, 9*, 1-17.

Miles, H.L. (1972). Competitive foreniscs: A remedial program for the disadvantaged. *The Journal of the American Forensic Association, 8,* 140-141.

Millsap, S. (1998). The benefits of forensics across the curriculum: An opportunity to expand the visibility of college forensics. *The Forensic of Pi Kappa Delta, 84*, 17-25.

Morreale, S.P., Moore, M.R., Taylor, K.P., Surges-Tatum, D., & Hulbert-Johnson, R. (1993). "The Competent Speaker" Speech Evaluation Form. Annadale, VA: Speech Communication Association.

Neer, M.R. and Kircher, W.F. (1989). The effects of delivery skills instruction on speech anxiety. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Central States Communication Association, Kansas City.

Owen, W.F. (1984). Interpretive themes in relational communication. *Quarterly Journal of Speech, 70,* 274-287.

Patterson, J.W. and Zarefsky, D. (1983). *Contemporary Debate.* Boston: Houghton-Mifflin.

Pearson, J.C., Nelson, P.E. & Sorenson, R.L. (1980). How students and alumni perceive the basic course. *Communication Education, 29*, 296-299.

Pelham, W.D. and Watt, W. (1989). Profile of academic debate. In Wood, S. and Midgley, J. (Eds), *Prima facie: A guide to value debate* pp. 3-15. Dubuque, IA: Kendall/Hunt.

Pollock, A. (1972). The relationship of a background in scholastic forensics to effective communication in the legislative assembly. *Speaker and Gavel, 10,* 16-17.

Pruett, R. (1972). The student's perceptions of the effects of a summer high school debate institute. *The Journal of the American Forensic Association, 9*, 279-281.

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

Sanders, G.H. (1983). *Introduction to contemporary academic debate.* (2nd ed.). Prospect Heights, IL: Waveland.

Scannell, D.P. & Tracy, D.B. (1975). *Testing and measurement in the classroom.* Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company.

Schneider, A. (1999, March 26). Taking aim at student incoherence. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, A16-18.

Sheckels Jr., T.F. (1984). *Debating: Applied rhetorical theory.* New York: Longman.

Spiker, B.K. (1980). Alternative perspectives in forensics: What do you do when the bottom falls out of the budget? *Association for Communication Administration Bulletin, 34,* 73-75.

Spitzberg, B.H. (1983). Communication competence as knowledge, skill, and impression. *Communication Education, 32,* 323-329.

Spitzberg, B. H. (1995). The conversational skills rating scale: An instructional assessment of interpersonal competence. Annandale, VA: Speech Communication Association.

Stenger, K. (1998). Forensics as preparation for participation in the academic world. *The Forenic of Pi Kappa Delta, 84,* 13-23.

Stuart, C. (1989). *How to be an effective speaker: The essential guide to making the most of your communication skills.* Chicago, IL: NTC Publishing Group.

Walsh, G. (1957). Tournaments: For better or worse. *Speech Teacher, 6,* 65-67.

Weaver, R.L. (1976). Directing the basic communication course. *Communication Education, 25,* 203-210.

Wilbanks, C. and Church, R.T. (1991). *Values and policy in controversy: An introduction to competitive debate* (2nd ed.). Dubuque, IA: Kendall/Hunt.

Williams, D.E., McGee, B.R. & Worth, D.S. (2001). University student perceptions of the efficacy of debate participation: An empirical investigation. *Argumentation and Advocacy, 37,* 198-209.

Wood, S.C. & Rowlan-Morin, P.A. (1989). Motivational tension: Winning vs. pedagogy in academic debate. *National Forensic Journal, 7,* 81-97.

Ziegelmueller, G., Kay, J. and Dause, C. (1990). *Argumentation: Inquiry and advocacy* (2nd ed.). Englewcod Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

VITA

Leigh-Anne R. Dowdy was born in Bay City, Texas, on May 9, 1979, the daughter of William M. Dowdy, Jr. and Cynthia A. Dowdy. After completing her work at Bay City High School, Bay City, Texas, in 1997, she entered Southwest Texas State University in San Marcos, Texas. She received her degree of Bachelor of Arts in Speech Communication from Southwest Texas State University in August, 2000. In August 2000, she entered the Graduate School of Southwest Texas State University, San Marcos, Texas. During her time as a graduate student, she served as a lab instructor in the Department of Speech Communication and as the assistant to the Director of Forensics at Southwest Texas State University.

Permanent Address: 1900 Candlewood
Bay City, Texas 77414

This thesis was typed by Leigh-Anne R. Dowdy.