

This thesis for honors recognition has been approved
for the Department of Communication

Brent L. Northup

Professor Brent L. Northup, Director

Mark Smillie

Dr. William Mark Smillie

Annette Moran, csj

Dr. Annette Moran, csj

May 14, 1997

CORETTE LIBRARY CARROLL COLLEGE



3 5962 00108 384

**Using the Personalized System of Instruction (PSI) Model
and the Forensic Laboratory to Modify and
Improve the Basic Speech Course**

**Submitted in Partial Fulfillment of Requirements for Graduation with Honors
to the Department of Communication Studies at
Carroll College, Helena, Montana.**

**Manda Hicks
May 7, 1997**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TITLE AND ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

STATEMENT OF PURPOSE.....	1
INTRODUCTION.....	3
CHAPTER I The Current Speech Classroom.....	6
CHAPTER II Communication Apprehension, Immediacy and Practice.....	17
CHAPTER III Basic Skills.....	24
CHAPTER IV Criticism, Evaluation and Practice.....	27
CHAPTER V The Forensic Laboratory and the Emergence of PSI.....	35
CHAPTER VI Redesigning a Course Using the PSI/Forensic Model.....	46
PROPOSED SYLLABUS.....	54
APPENDIX A.....	56
INDEX.....	62

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This paper would not exist, I would not have a diploma, I would not have graduated *cum laude* (oooh) and my family would have resigned me to the category of bum if it were not for Brent Northup. I would like to thank my Director, Professor Brent L. Northup from the bottom of my heart for going above and beyond the call of advisor duty. Without his support, encouragement and kleenex I never would have graduated. I am forever grateful to have a mentor such as Brent in my life and I deeply appreciate everything he has done for me, as well as everything he has done for others. He's what you would call a good egg.

I would also like to thank Sister Annette for her encouragement and support in all facets of my life and for her incredible sense of humor. Sister Annette always let me know that I was capable enough to do whatever I wanted. I will never forget the day she patted me on top of my head before a speech tournament and how great it made me feel. Whether it be speech, this thesis, or Father Sullivan's Medieval History class, Sister Annette has always cheered me on and I appreciate it so much. There is nothing as good as making Sister Annette laugh.

Also, I would like to thank Dr. Charlotte Jones for her intelligent, sophisticated classes and the standards that she set for me, as well as her enthusiastic involvement in my search for a graduate school. I would like to thank Dr. Smilie for being so cool that I took him twice and would have done it a third time. I would also like to thank Dr. Smilie for his insightful reading of my thesis.

I want to thank my family and friends who let me be a source of pride to them; It's the best thing I've ever been. Robin Saldivia, Violet Thornton, Laney-Bug Hicks, Melisa Burleson, Eryn Johnson, Ecco Barney, and Rachel Smith. I would also like to thank everyone at Carroll who made a difference in my life. God bless you, I'll send money.

Love,

Manda Violet Hicks

STATEMENT OF PURPOSE

The purpose of this paper is to develop a blueprint for modifying and improving the teaching of basic speech at the college level by applying methodologies used in college forensics coaching. Forensics coaching is too broad to serve as a model. Instead, one specific approach to Forensics coaching will serve as the paradigm for this research: the Personalized System of Instruction (PSI) model in the Forensic laboratory.

Although both speech communication and competitive college forensics programs have existed side by side for decades, surprisingly little effort has been made to incorporate the successful forensics coaching strategies into the college speech classroom. This is unusual when one takes into consideration the notably high level of speaker competency that forensics participants possess. It is also important to note that forensics participants generally do not begin at an accelerated level; they gradually improve over time within the forensics program. However, before the incorporation of forensics into a basic speech course takes place, we must establish that it would indeed be a successful marriage.

The forensics laboratory employs the PSI, a flexible, innovative model that can be adjusted to fit almost any classroom. Additionally, application of the PSI model allows a classroom to retain its original course goals while pinpointing and correcting trouble areas. An examination of the current basic speech course reveals three distinct problems: students seldom have the chance to incorporate and utilize instructor evaluations into their performances; fundamental speaking skills are neglected; and the course seldom reduces the varying degrees of student apprehension and anxiety that are typical of the basic speech class. These problems can be remedied using forensic tactics and the PSI model. Boylan (1980) identifies the three paramount characteristics of the PSI model as “individualized instruction, highly personalized relationships, and the reinforcement of basic learning.” These attributes of the PSI model

correspond closely with the three most prominent weaknesses in the current speech course. The PSI model is, therefore, an ideal corrective to improve the basic speech course.

The combination of the forensic laboratory and the PSI model create a powerful cure for the basic speech course problem areas. First, the forensic laboratory emphasizes repetition and practice, two factors that are noted for their importance in creating competent speakers (Zarefsky 1996). Second, the PSI model employs the component of *mastery*. Mastery refers to the required demonstration of basic skills by the student, an important component when one considers the neglect of basic skills in the speech classroom (Gibson, Hanna, and Huddleston, 1985; Johnson and Szczupakiewicz, 1987; Most, 1994). Finally, the laboratory setting has proven to be one of the most successful combatants of apprehension and anxiety.

The purpose of this paper is to design an improved basic speech course using the PSI model and strategies from the forensic laboratory. The inspiration for that goal is the forensics program here at Carroll College in Helena, Montana. I have been active in forensics for the last eight years and I plan on teaching and coaching speech at San Diego State University in the fall of 1997. This paper is in preparation for my career, with the hope that I can provide the best foundation possible for my basic speech students.

INTRODUCTION

The PSI model was developed by F. S. Keller in 1974 and is based primarily on behavioristic approaches to understanding human behavior, which assume that success is rewarding for students and a lack of success can be punishing (Keller, 1974). Keller's system is based on the idea of mastery; a student must succeed at a task before progressing to the next one. One of the biggest areas of concern within the speech communication field is the learning of basic skills, and Keller's "mastery component" addresses this concern directly. The PSI model does not allow a student to progress in the class until they demonstrate that they have mastered a particular skill.

The components of the PSI model create a support structure to assist the student in that mastery. Keller developed the Personalized System of Instruction for his psychology classes, but the PSI model has never been limited to one particular field. In a comparison between PSI-based adaptation and lecture-recitation formats of instruction in basic speech courses, Gray, Buerkel-Rothfuss and Yerby (1986) concluded that PSI components create an attractive model for multiple section introductory courses in speech communication. The PSI model (or an adaptation of the model) has also been used in several other fields. Boylan (1980) completed a survey of those disciplines that have most often relied on PSI as a preferred method of instruction in an introductory course: psychology, physics, mathematics, chemistry, engineering, biology, sociology, statistics, English composition, computer science, and astronomy. The Personalized System of Instruction can be a beneficial model in any field of study.

The main features of the Personalized System of Instruction model originally identified by Keller are: (1) mastery; (2) self-pacing; (3) emphasis upon the written word; (4) use of lectures and demonstrations for motivation, not as information sources; and (5) use of proctors for tutoring on a personal level, testing and scoring (Keller 1970). Boylan (1980) reports that

even though these five features are stressed, adaptations of PSI have been very effective as long as individualized instruction, highly personalized relationships and the basic learning reinforcement theory are retained.

The PSI model naturally lends itself to a laboratory setting: the use of proctors, the self-pacing feature, and the mastery concept are all indicative of a lab environment. However, Keller does not insist that a laboratory must always be used with or will always be the result of the PSI model. In 1979, the Sedalia Conference (a national Forensics Committee) introduced the metaphor of *forensics as a laboratory*, and it is in this laboratory is well suited to home the PSI model. The model advocated in this paper is a hybrid blending of forensic strategies of criticism, incorporation and practice within the parameters of the Personalized System of Instruction.

To suggest that one method could alleviate all problems associated with a public speaking classroom would be naive. Indeed, several different ‘therapies’ have been found to reduce communication apprehension (CA) and public speaking anxiety (PSA). These therapies are primarily dependent on knowing one’s student and adapting a solution to meet the students needs - i.e. trouble-shooting for standard problems one finds in the classroom.

There is no ‘magic formula’ that will make the various challenges in speech classes go away. Rather than focusing exclusively on the myriad of problems that exist and how to solve them, this paper proposes a ‘better way’ to teach speech. The PSI model can ‘seal the cracks’ that many students slip through while the forensic laboratory maintains a comprehensive speech class that produces skilled speakers. The combined approach of the forensic laboratory within the PSI model creates an environment in which students are protected from failure and encouraged to succeed.

This paper begins by examining the problems encountered in the traditional speech class (apprehension, lack of basic skill, absence of practice), continues by analyzing a possible

solution, (the PSI model) and concludes by applying this model to a specific course - an advanced speech course taught at Carroll College.

The short term goal is to provide a model for improving all speech courses by redesigning one specific course. The long term goal is to suggest a model that could be used to improve a variety of courses throughout communication curriculums.

CHAPTER I

THE CURRENT SPEECH CLASSROOM

We begin by asking the question, what is the traditional speech class? It is an often times feared class that provides the student with speaking skills necessary to function in the world. It is an exercise in expression and self-confidence. It is the practice of researching, organizing and presenting one's thoughts. It is one of the most challenging forms of communication: deliberate, effective and rewarding. It is frequently mandatory, and, it is not always entirely successful (Berko, 1994; Sprague, 1993).

The classical speech course can be improved. Research shows that the basic course does have predictable weaknesses that are passed on to the student. The questionable quality of speakers emerging from college and university classrooms has drawn attention for two reasons: America is demanding strong public speakers and classrooms are producing weak ones (Most 1994).

The 1994 passage of the "Goals 2000: Educate America Act" by the United States Congress has brought speech communication into the forefront of the national concerns on educational accountability, assessment and proof of outcomes. Vangelisti & Daly reported in 1989 that "approximately 15%-20% of the national population of 21-25 year-olds cannot adequately communicate orally ." Goal 5 of the act states: "Every adult American will be literate and will possess the knowledge and skills necessary to compete in a global economy and exercise the rights and responsibilities of citizenship" (US Department of Education, 1994). "Goals 2000" represents an important step in acknowledging and repairing communication deficiencies.

This inadequacy has not been overlooked. Over the past 15 years, researchers have expressed concern that basic concepts and skills of speech communication are being neglected in classrooms (Gray, 1982; Bolieau & McBath, 1987; Arliss, 1992; Sprague, 1993; Berko, 1994;

Most, 1994). Gray, Buerkel-Rothfuss and Yerby (1986) note that more and more institutions are calling for a program that will produce competent communicators. Unfortunately, the majority of current programs are hampered by one specific weaknesses: many speech courses are only 50 percent speech - with the rest of the time spent on communication theory. These courses are termed “hybrids” and they have gone from being the exception to being the rule in the past 30 years.

Current textbooks and current research both describe the basic course as lecture/performance oriented, with criticism typically provided by an evaluation and or grade that is in reference to the performance given (Ogilvie, 1961; Gilman, Aly & White, 1968; Devito, 1981; Osborn, 1981; Ehninger, Gronbeck & Monroe, 1984; Lucas, 1995; Zarefsky, 1996). Correspondingly, the same research reveals that the typical public speaking class rarely allows repeat practices of the same speech.

A review of the literature reveals that the bulk of the research does not focus on how speech is *taught* but rather how it is *learned*. Or rather, how it is not learned. It is not learned because of apprehension, anxiety, and flawed evaluation. Too little research has been devoted to the methods in which speech is taught; This paper examines the opportunity for problem solving in *teaching* the basic speech course.

The very structure of the traditional speech class may be its biggest detriment, to the average student as well as the at-risk student. Research even indicates that traditional public speaking courses may actually have a negative impact on highly apprehensive students (Kinzer, 1985; McCroskey, 1977; Newburger & Daniel, 1985), perhaps even a negative impact on all students as well. It is important to observe what are regarded as the most important factors in a speech class (basic skills, immediacy and practice) , and how they appear (or don't appear) in a traditional public speaking classroom. By describing the current speech classroom, one can observe areas of emphasis as well as areas of neglect.

Again we ask, “what is the traditional public speaking course?” The question is answered by members of the Undergraduate Speech Instruction Interest Group of the Speech Association of America. The following data supplied by Gibson, Hanna & Huddleston are essential in understanding the foundations of the basic speech course, as well as valuable in the insight they provide.

TABLE I
PERCENT OF SCHOOLS REPORTING SPECIFIC ORIENTATIONS TO THE BASIC COURSE

Orientation	1968	1974	1980	1984
Public Speaking	54.5%	21.3%	51.3%	54%
Fundamentals	21.3%	12.8%	—%	—%
Combination	—%	—%	40.3%	34%
Comm. Theory	—%	—%	4.7%	6%
Interpersonal	—%	—%	.5%	2%
Small Group	—%	—%	4.7%	6%
Voice & Diction	2.2%	1.3%	—%	—%

A large percentage of schools reported either a public speaking or a combination (hybrid) emphasis. The number of classrooms using the hybrid approach has increased 34 percent in the last 25 years. Macke (1991) notes that the hybrid method is now the most popular approach to the basic speech course. Classes such as communication theory, small group communication and interpersonal communication, typically, only share time in basic speech courses. These exclusive classes are represented in Table II. To get a further sense of how speech is being taught and what areas of study are demanding the most time in individual classes, we can look at additional research by Gibson into the context of current communication courses in Table II.

It is important to note that the combination (hybrid) class generally serves as a *substitute or an equivalent* to the required public speaking class, a circumstance that is not shared with the remaining courses surveyed. Table II should be read as five separate classes and the content of those classes, but bear in mind that currently the public speaking course and the combination course are regularly seen as interchangeable; public speaking and the remaining courses do not share this flexibility.

The distinction is substantial; the hybrid course is taking the place of, or considered the same as, the speech class. However, as one can see in Table II, the combination course and the public speaking course possess considerable differences. Acceptance of a hybrid course in place of a public speaking course is therefore one of the many contributing factors in the consistent decline of speaker competency and skill (Macke, 1987).

TABLE II
COURSE ORIENTATION AND TEN TOPICS RECEIVING GREATEST AMOUNT OF TIME

	Public Speaking	Combo/ Hybrid	Interpersonal Communication	Small Group	Theory/ Empirical
Informative Speaking	1	1	7	2	10
Persuasive Speaking	2	4	10	1	NR
Delivery	3	7	NR	4	NR
Supporting Material	4	8	NR	7.5	10
Outlining	5	10	8.5	11.5	NR
Audience Analysis	6	9	6	NR	5.5
Listening	7	3	1	7.5	4
Speech Anxiety	8	NR	NR	NR	10
Reasoning	9	NR	5	7.5	5.5
Language	10	NR	4	11.5	3
Interpersonal	NR	2	2	4	2
Group Discussion	NR	6	NR	7.5	7.5
Communication Theory	NR	5	3	4	1
Voice & Articulation	NR	NR	NR	11.5	NR
Rhetorical criticism	NR	NR	NR	11.5	7.5
Ethics	NR	NR	8.5	NR	NR

*NR signifies *not ranked* in the top ten of that orientation

According to Table II, the top three topics in a public speaking classroom are informative speaking, persuasive speaking and delivery. The top three topics in the hybrid classroom are informative speaking, interpersonal communication and listening. The ability to deliver a speech in front of an audience has long been identified as a necessary skill (Carlson and Smith-Howell, 1995; Devito, 1981; Ehninger, Gronbeck and Morre, 1984; Gibson, Hanna, and Huddleston, 1985; Gilman, Bower and White, 1968; Johnson and Szczupakiewicz, 1987; Lucas, 1995; Most, 1994; Ogilvie, 1961; Osborn, 1982; Zarefsky, 1996); a large percentage of colleges

and universities require that students take a basic speech class to learn that skill (Johnson and Szczupakiewixz, 1987).

Yet this goal of increasing speech competence is being hindered by the rise of the hybrid courses as a replacement for the basic speech class (Macke 1987). The top three topics in the public speaking class define speech as performing in front of an audience and learning basic skills, while the top three from the hybrid program emphasize interpersonal communication (listening is listed as number one in interpersonal communication), an area that is almost entirely theory-oriented. Interpersonal communication is an essential part of all communication departments, but has little effect on basic speech skills. In order to produce a proficient speaker, a full course must ideally be dedicated to the fundamentals of public speaking communication (Most, 1994).

TABLE III

MAJOR REPORTED PROBLEMS IN THE BASIC COURSE

	Number of Schools Reporting	
1. Class size	129	
2. Time to cover course context	115	
3. Acquiring qualified staff for basic course	93	
4. Students lacking basic communication skills	91	
5. Equitable evaluation of student performance	89	
6. Quality of instruction by GTA's & part-time instructors		78
7. Monitoring GTA performance		65
8. Grade inflation	61	
9. Lack of audio-visual equipment		51
10. Textbook selection	31	
11. Budgetary limitations		24

Table III contains information of a more general nature than Tables I and II. The problems cited are more instructor-oriented than student-oriented, but the problems that occupy the second and fourth place on the list are pertinent to the issue at hand. Problem 2, "Time to cover course context" assumes that the speech professor is working with a large amount of

information (possibly from a hybrid structure) that the professor is not always able to entirely cover. No examples of the responses are provided in the research, but one can assume if available time is a significant problem, then speech classes must be kept at the most fundamental level possible. This basic level is also sensible when we consider Problem 4, “Students lacking basic communication skills.”

It is also important to note the issue of evaluation tools. Problem number 5 on Table III lists “Equitable evaluation of student performance” as a concern. Many researchers attribute the problems of the current public speaking classroom to the instructor and his/her evaluations and bias. It’s not as serious as it sounds. Instructor-related (rather than student-related) problems are the focus of the bulk of the research in this field, but the weight attached to evaluation when considering a basic skill is minimal. Additionally, the issue of evaluation and bias are characteristic of ‘competition evaluation research’, not necessarily classroom grades. The research is significant, but not crucial in a skills class. However, in order to conduct a comprehensive literature review, it is necessary to include subject matter emphasis that is not directly related to the issue at hand.

These problems include validity of evaluation tools (Tiemens, 1965; Bock, 1970; DiSalvo & Bochner, 1972; Applebaum, 1974; Bock & Bock, 1984; Carlson & Smith-Howell, 1995) and refer to the concern instructors have, not necessarily in their evaluation of students, but the validity of the measuring devices that they use. There seems to be an overwhelming concern for “How to evaluate a speech objectively?” Carlson & Smith-Howell (1995) state, “A recurring issue for virtually anyone teaching speech communication is: How to evaluate student’s speech performances fairly and objectively?” This, of course, is a valid concern, but when dealing with the issue of a *basic skill* it becomes less and less of an obstacle.

Instructor competency (Dean, 1992; Most, 1994) is a prevalent concern in all educational fields and is not exclusive to speech communication. Instructor competency research

is closely tied to evaluation research, with the main issue regarded as *construction* of the evaluation tool. A “teacher-constructed” or “instructor-generated” form is often criticized as lacking reliability and validity (Backlund, 1983; Rubin, 1990). There is also evaluator bias, (Bertanen, 1984; Bohn & Bohn, 1985; Nance & Foeman, in 1993) which is an issue that occurs typically when a performance is rated, due to the context that must be evaluated in order to give an unbiased evaluation. The issue of bias in reference to evaluation has also been heavily researched (Stiggins et al., 1985). The question of bias is an important one, but one would be tempted to say that if one’s biggest problem in instructing a public speaking course is the evaluation of the student, one is producing some incredible public speakers. Typically evaluation rarely moves past, “spit out your gum and don’t put your hands in your pockets” (Tanner 1987).

Evaluation, bias and construction are all considerable and significant areas, but they deal less with producing a skilled speaker and more with the need for a consistent standard of evaluation. A consistent standard of evaluation is definitely one of the goals of a public speaking class, but we can assume a competent instructor will not have an evaluation method so flawed that he/she is the actual ruin of all his/her students.

Data compiled from the Gibson, Hanna, Huddleston (1985) survey provides a more meaningful look at instructor problems within a classroom than research on such an exclusive topic as evaluation tools. Instructors do report that ‘equitable evaluation of student performance’ is a concern, but the top four concerns for instructors were student-oriented. Instructors demonstrated a need to install basic communication skills in the students and identified the problems that prevented them from doing so. Class size and time to cover information were the top two reported problems; two problems that are specifically dealt with in the Personalized System of Instruction.

Although the traditional public speaking class is used as a reference point to show the weaknesses of the hybrid approach, the public speaking course is not advocated in this paper as

the perfect choice. The traditional speech course has as many weaknesses as the hybrid course, but in different areas. Among the goals of the traditional speech class, one is to instruct the student in public speaking and, therefore, produce a competent speaker. This goal is in agreement with the goals of this paper, but the traditional speech class is too often flawed in its approach to achieve those goals. The structure of the traditional class is faulty: too much time on text; too much time on theory; too little criticism; and too little practice. These weaknesses all serve to undermine the objectives of the basic public speaking course.

The hybrid approach is hampered by its desired finished product (an all-around “communication cowgirl”). The traditional approach is often unsuccessful due to the use of outdated pedagogical methods used in the class. There is little research on the comparative success rates of traditional speech classes and hybrid classes, only research in regard to how neither of them are producing competent speakers. Hybrid classes were non-existent in 1974, a major trend in 1980 (with 40 percent of classrooms reporting that they used the method), and dropping to 34 percent in 1984. Macke (1996) reports that hybrid classes are still very popular and have met with little opposition.

The growth in popularity of the hybrid program has indeed endangered the ability to produce competent speakers. Some may disagree with this statement, noting that it depends on the perceived goal of the classroom. However, if the goal of the classroom is primarily to produce a competent speaker, then the hybrid approach is, by definition, a compromised method. The need to focus on fundamentals in a basic speech course is a challenge that the hybrid approach can rarely meet. One can compare it to teaching two subjects in one class period, an undesirable situation for instructor as well as student.

At first glance, the combination approach appears to be an innovative way to introduce students to the many aspects of basic communication in their lives, but the result is too much

subject matter, too little time (Macke 1991). The hybrid trend has been traced as the consequence of the growth of other courses in the communication department.

It is tempting to view the progress of the social sciences as having, simply overtaken traditional speech and moved beyond it. Because of its pervasiveness and sophistication, it may be argued, the advance of social science research in speech made the displacement of an elocutionary or performance skills orientation in speech a practical and political inevitability (Macke 1991).

The hybrid approach is a blend of performance skills and the above-mentioned social science research in speech. Courses such as Small Group Communication, Organizational Communication, Interpersonal Communication, Health Communication, Human Communication Theory and Gender Communication have rightfully come into their own (and Rhetoric and Argumentation have gone on their way) in most communication departments. Unfortunately, this progression has reduced public speaking to the status of 'afterthought' (Johnson and Szczupakiewicz, 1987).

Macke (1991) observes that "It is the present state of speech that has become an object of displacement by departments, by the professional associations, and by leading scholars." Macke's statement is in direct reference to the popularity of the communication/speech class hybrid. This trend has been linked to the subsequent lowering of standards in the speech classroom (Ayres, 1993). The logical assumption is that the less time spent on speech in a speech classroom, the lower the quality of the speaker.

Perhaps this is one of the better explanations for the downfall of the high quality speaker. It is necessary to focus on a classroom that is devoted to improving the skill of the speaker. That devotion typically does not occur in the traditional speech classroom. And, as the hybrid classroom invests so much time to theory and other communication sections that the remaining time available is also not sufficient to teach public speaking. Yet the number of

classrooms using the hybrid approach has increased 34 percent in the last 25 years, a curiosity when we note that the second largest reported problem in the speech classroom is the lack of time to cover course content (Gibson, Hanna, Huddleston, 1984). The hybrid trend is popular with students (perhaps because of the lesser number of required performances), but it is not beneficial to them (Gibson, Hanna, and Huddleston, 1985). The hybrid course embraces the same basic elements of the traditional speech class, while simultaneously (and ironically) de-emphasizing the importance of speech. Regardless of the approach used (the public speaking classroom isn't doing its job and the hybrid approach is inadequate) the current speech classroom is ready for improvement.

The current speech course has been examined. The objective of the basic speech class is to invest the student with the basic skills necessary to communicate effectively in front of a group of people. Yet the present course offerings do not completely meet these objectives. The traditional public speaking course dedicates a greater amount of time to presentations and participation than the hybrid approach, but still falls short in producing speakers equipped with skills that can be utilized after graduation (Johnson and Szczupakiewicz 1987). The traditional course also retains its preoccupation with unnecessary texts and lectures. The hybrid approach, at best, is a watered down version of the traditional approach. Basic skills are not always nurtured in the traditional classroom and rarely acknowledged in the hybrid classroom. Basic skills are only developed through criticism, evaluation and practice (Devito, 1981; Ehninger, Gronbeck and Monroe, 1984; Gilman, Aly and White, 1968; Lucas, 1995; Ogilvie, 1961; Osborn, 1981; Zarefsky, 1996), three elements that are glaringly absent from both the traditional public speaking course and the hybrid course.

The traditional public speaking course stands today as an opportunity. A trend toward the combination programs has reduced the emphasis of basic skills in some classrooms. The structure of other classrooms are filled with cracks that students easily fall through. Finally, the

three paramount factors in speaker skill (criticism, incorporation and practice) are absent from the traditional speech class.

CHAPTER II

COMMUNICATION APPREHENSION, IMMEDIACY AND PRACTICE

Much research has been devoted to the present state of speech classes, but even more concern has been generated over the individual problems that students encounter specifically in a public speaking course. Many researchers believe public speaking anxiety (PSA) leads people to present speeches of lower quality (Daly, Vangelisti & Weber, 1995), an important issue in designing a speech class. According to current research, CA and PSA are the two biggest challenges in a speech classroom, for the student as well as the instructor. At the very minimum a speech classroom should empower one with enough skill to stand in front of an audience and speak. Anxiety and apprehension (normal to all speakers) have a debilitating effect on the speaker and, when present at a high level, require an enormous investment of time from the instructor.

Communication apprehension (known as CA) has been defined as “an individual’s level of fear or anxiety associated with real or anticipated communication with another person or persons” (McCroskey, 1977). It is beneficial to move directly from this definition to the statement that ‘everyone has some level of CA’. This distinction is important. The term ‘communication apprehension’ is foreboding, and it would not be unlikely for one to assume that CA is a debilitating condition in the speech classroom. *High* levels of CA are detrimental in the speech classroom, but few members of the general population are so profoundly affected. Ellis (1995) suggests that 20 percent of the general population suffers from “high CA” (which translates into three to five students in a typical class), but the majority of other researchers report a much lower number. Stacks and Stone (1982) note in their own research that they would perhaps have obtained a different result had their method for assigning subjects to the “high”

category of communication apprehension been more extreme. It is important to note that CA is typically measured using McCroskey's Personal Report of Communication Apprehension, which divides only into three sections: low, moderate and high.

Research indicates that perceptions of communicative ability may be central to apprehension. Richmond, McCroskey and McCroskey (1989) discovered negative correlations between students' overall apprehension as measured on several apprehension instruments and students' self-perceived communication competence. Additionally, Miller (1987) reported that increases in public speaking anxiety were associated with less positive self-ratings on speech skills typically cited in public speaking textbooks and speech rating forms. When students feel that they are not able to successfully speak in public and perceive themselves as incompetent speakers, anxiety increases. This aspect of CA can typically be remedied by participating in a speech class and learning the basic skills. Stacks and Stone (1984) reported that a course in speech communication can *positively* affect the high communication apprehensive student. Ellis (1995) states that "it is expected that by the end of the semester, most students will report an increase in self-perceived competency as well as a decrease in public speaking anxiety."

However, there are existing levels of CA that cannot be solved simply by attending a speech class. Moderate to high levels of CA generally need a more detailed solution than attendance, and researchers are working toward that solution. Byers & Weber observed that in a public speaking course there are no guarantees about communication apprehension (whether a speech class will make the problem worse or better), but other research reveals hope that CA can be lowered with the integration of special teaching methods. Immediacy, behavior that reduces physical and psychological distance between people, is a method that has been most beneficial in reducing CA. Ellis notes that for those students with high levels of communication apprehension, perceived instructor immediacy behavior may significantly lower both public speaking and

overall communication apprehension. Additionally, immediacy has been found to positively affect all levels of CA and PSA, not just high levels.

CA has not been linked to intelligence nor aptitude (McCroskey and Richmond, 1979), and students who report high trait-like CA have consistently exhibited several characteristics that may interfere with positive outcomes in public speaking courses. However, because *everyone* does have some level of communication apprehension and it does have negative effects on many aspects of public speaking, the research on this topic is highly beneficial in highlighting problem areas in the basic speech class. We can assume that whatever 'works' for the high CA student in a public speaking class will also be helpful to their lesser CA counterparts. Ellis (1995) found that CA decreased 'across the board' when all members of the class were subject to the *same method of treatment*. The fact that research has given us treatments that are not exclusively for high CA students and treatments that do not directly modify the general class structure gives us hope that high CA can be remedied within a mainstream class.

In a public speaking classroom, CA transforms into Public Speaking Anxiety (PSA). PSA is representative of all the negative elements that might hinder a person's success when performing before an audience. CA and PSA are not exclusive traits that emotionally cripple a person the moment they need to communicate. Instead, they are comprised of varied and endless character and personality aspects that are known to increase a person's communication anxiety. These characteristics are:

- (a) low self-esteem (McCroskey and Richmond, 1975, 1977; Snively, Merker, Becker, and Brook, 1976; Stacks and Stone, 1982)
- (b) lack of confidence (McCroskey et al., 1976)
- (c) lack of assertiveness (Richmond and McCroskey, 1989)
- (d) lowered interaction (Wells and Lashbrook, 1970)

(e) avoidance of communication with others (Richmond and McCroskey, 1989)

It is important to note the characteristics of CA for several reasons. This paper deals with the remedy of problems associated with public speaking classes through the PSI method. It has been determined that CA is a present and formidable enemy in the speech classroom. From the perspective of the student (in research), PSA (public speaking apprehension) is an invisible opponent, rarely acknowledged by the student, yet one of the most detrimental problems encountered in a speech course.

What is the best way to lower communication apprehension? Byers & Weber (1995) describe the usefulness of visualization treatment and its effects on public speaking anxiety. Ayres and Raftis (1995) noted the positive link between preparation time and decreased anxiety. Allison and Mitchell (1994) advocate peer, rather than instructor evaluations. The best method? Research has yet to answer that question, but two of the most effective methods to date are *instructor immediacy* (Frymier 1994) and *practice* (Zarefsky 1996). Not coincidentally, these are two important features of the laboratory setting, forensic strategies and the PSI model.

The issue of practice is the focus of a later chapter, but it rears its repetitive little head throughout the paper. That's how important practice is. One of the many positive aspects of practice is that it reduces speech anxiety (Ayres, 1996; Menzel and Carrell, 1995). All five of Zarefsky's (1996) five key strategies for overcoming speech anxiety have an emphasis on preparation and practice.

First, don't try to deny that you are nervous. Acknowledge your fears and hesitations directly. But also recognize that you can overcome them. Second, think about what you are going to say and what effect you want to have on your audience...Familiarity with your outline and frequent practice are important not only in their own right but also for the boost they can give to your confidence. Third, act confident. Your acting confident will actually help you to feel more comfortable in the speaking situation. Fourth, work

carefully on the introduction so that you can start the speech on a strong note. Finally, end the speech on a strong note as well. Even if you would like to rush back to your chair, finish in a deliberate manner...

One of the most common suggestions to help reduce speech anxiety is to practice and prepare (Devito, 1981; Ehninger, Gronbeck and Monroe, 1984; Gilman, Aly and White, 1968; Lucas, 1995; Monroe, 1984; Ogilvie, 1961; Osborn, 1981; Zarefsky, 1996). Menzel and Carrell (1995) established a direct relationship between amount of preparation time and performance.

Practice is found first and foremost in the forensics laboratory. The forensics laboratory stresses practice, and the PSI component of mastery guarantees that practice will be actively exercised by the student. Practice is an important part of every aspect of public speaking, and its power in reducing apprehension is extremely useful. Practice battles apprehension through preparation, while immediacy battles apprehension through support.

Teacher immediacy has been examined quite extensively in recent years with the encouraging results that it is a useful teaching strategy (Frymier 1994). A wealth of research has been conducted on the connection between immediacy and motivation, immediacy and enthusiasm, and immediacy and learning (Andersen, 1979; Christophel, 1990; Gorham, 1988; Kelley and Gorham, 1988; and McCroskey and Richmond, 1992; Richmond, 1990).

Instructor immediacy is beneficial in every classroom, but as a combatant against CA and PSA it is unsurpassed. A 1995 study by Ellis found that an increase in instructor immediacy with students in all apprehension groups (low, moderate, high) continuously decreased the student's public speaking anxiety.

Immediacy functions both figuratively and literally in the PSI laboratory. Mehrabian (1971) defined the immediacy construct as "communication behavior that reduces physical and/or psychological distance between people." In the laboratory, not only are instructors physically closer to the students, they are also sending messages of immediacy (moving around

the classroom, participating with the students in workshops, working one on one with the students). The major communicative function of immediacy behaviors is that they reflect a more positive attitude of the sender to the receiver. Liking encourages greater immediacy and immediacy produces more liking (Mehrabian, 1971).

When a student is in a comfortable, supportive environment, they have a higher opportunity for success. Indeed, Ellis (1993) states that “Given that immediacy increases liking and that liking increases immediacy, it is intuitively congruent that immediacy may be associated with reduction of anxiety since people are generally less apprehensive around people they like.”

Typical instructor immediacy variables can be verbal or nonverbal. Nonverbal include: smiling, eye contact, vocal expressiveness, movement, gesturing and posture (Andersen, 1979; Richmond, Gorham, and McCroskey, 1987). Verbal variables include using humor in class, praising students’ work, actions, or comments, frequently initiating and/or demonstrating willingness to become engaged in conversations with students before, after, or outside of class, self-disclosing, asking questions that solicit viewpoints or opinions, following up on student-initiated topics, providing feedback on students’ work, and inviting students to telephone or meet outside of class if they have questions (Gorham, 1988). Verbal as well as non-verbal variables increase the perceived involvement between the student and the instructor.

Immediacy variables are important, but their setting is also significant. Regardless of the subject matter, in the typical classroom instructors rarely have the opportunity to embrace and express all the verbal and non-verbal variables. In a laboratory environment, immediacy comes naturally. Ellis (1995) claims that a laboratory-supported instructional model provides a non-threatening, nurturing environment that helps all students, including high apprehensives, to perceive significant increases in self-perceived competency. The general laboratory model that Ellis provides suggests:

- (a) a clear definition of the specific public speaking behavior that constitute public speaking competency
- (b) curricular congruence among lecture topics, recitation activities, criteria for evaluation of speeches, and feedback strategies
- (c) constructive verbal and written feedback on speeches
- (d) small, comfortable recitation sections
- (e) one-on-one laboratory support consisting of goal setting and accountability interviews, optional coaching in preparation for upcoming speeches, video feedback and required, private feedback sessions with TAs following each speech.

Ellis provides a framework that is nearly identical to the PSI model to ensure immediacy, therefore her findings on the benefits of instructor immediacy can easily be transferred to the more structured and skills-oriented Personalized System of Instruction.

The Personalized System of Instruction and the forensic laboratory it utilizes practically guarantees a high level of immediacy between student and instructor. In the PSI model, students are required to work one on one with proctors and interact with the professor, other students and mentors in classroom workshops. Granted, the immediacy advocated is not exclusively found in the PSI model; it is the laboratory environment that fosters high rates of immediacy. Although immediacy does exist in other methods, few 'other methods' comprehensively cover the area that the PSI model does.

CHAPTER III

BASIC SKILLS

The main agenda of any speech class is to prepare the student for those occasions when the student will speak in front of an audience. This is a basic skill and is taught as one. As in any other discipline, students will move at their own pace, excel, get by, or fail. Classes will produce mediocre to excellent speakers, but the one objective remains: the student will be able to speak in front of an audience.

As one can imagine, very little lecture/text material is necessary in speech training; the emphasis is on research and performance. Typically, the student learns basic speech structure, presentation skills, and audience information (Ogilvie, 1961; Gilman, Aly and White, 1968; Devito, 1981; Osborn, 1981; Ehninger, Gronbeck and Monroe, 1984; Lucas, 1995; Zarefsky, 1996). Unfortunately, the traditional speech course still devotes a large percentage of time to lecture and the reading of text, in addition to a pace that frequently leaves students behind (Seiler and Fuss-Reineck 1986). The large emphasis placed on lecture and text is unnecessary (Johnson and Szczupakiewicz, 1987) in a speech course, and only takes valuable time away from the refinement of skills.

Very few higher education courses are dedicated to such an exclusive topic as a speech class; however, when dealing with a *skill*, minimal theory and maximum applications should be the norm. The basic skills of public speaking are research, organization and delivery (Zarefsky 1991), concluding with the ability to stand before an audience and effectively present a speech.

Although the term “basic skill” has moved from reform buzzword to cliché, it continues to imply knowledge and competencies that are so crucial to becoming a functional, contributing member of American society that every student should *master* them (Most 1994).

The use of the word *master* foreshadows the PSI model. Most (1994) advocates a classroom that guarantees that students have a thorough understanding of fundamentals: step Two of the PSI model deals directly with the question of competency and mastery. The word mastery may be misleading. It is common knowledge that speaking in front of an audience is a top fear of some people, and the word mastery suggests a level that not many could attain. However, *mastery learning* in the PSI model represents the expectation of students to demonstrate specific abilities in one task before moving on to the next - in essence, to master distinct elements of a basic skill in order to create a competent speaker.

In PSI, success is rewarded and errors are not punished, a method that allows students more than one opportunity to successfully reach a specific grade level (mastery). If a student's performance is unsatisfactory, the student has the option to try again. The student also has the opportunity to work with class proctors, and is encouraged to do so. In the traditional PSI course, students demonstrate mastery through multiple test taking procedures (Sherman 1974). However, the five components of PSI are flexible - and, in the forensic laboratory, mastery would be established through student demonstration of basic skills, not test taking.

In typical PSI courses, mastery learning is consistent with expectations about competence because this type of learning requires students to demonstrate cognitive or behavioral abilities in one task before moving on to the next (Gray, Buerkel-Rothfus and Yerby, 1986). In the forensic laboratory, mastery learning is the requirement that students must demonstrate basic skill and application of that skill before moving on to the next presentation. The PSI philosophy allows students to correct mistakes, therefore students are allowed to 're-take' or 're-present' speeches. In the forensic laboratory, the students are encouraged to practice (without a grade given) to attain a level that is suitable for an assigned grade. Specific objectives establish requirements for mastery at each level in the course and students repeat assignments as many times as is necessary

to achieve mastery. In a traditional speech classroom, students seldom have the opportunity to repeat performances.

CHAPTER IV

CRITICISM, EVALUATION AND PRACTICE

Student-focused research in speech communication deals primarily with CA and PSA, but a smaller tier of research examines the elements that contribute to student success in speech communication. All research points to the same leading factor: practice.

An instructor has a limited number of hours to teach various speeches. Typically, a speech (persuasive) is assigned, a lecture given, a presentation performed and a grade awarded. Using a new 'type' of speech (historical rather than persuasive), one goes through the motions again. Ideally, if a student is marked down for unnecessary movement on one speech, the student will correct that problem for the next speech. However, this is not always the case. There is a general attitude in public-speaking classrooms that assignments are something to 'dread and deal with'. Get up, give the speech, sit down and hope you don't implode with fright in the process. This attitude does not produce skilled speakers and lowers the morale of class in general.

Criticism, application and practice go hand in hand. If the student is expected to *utilize* the criticism received from the instructor for his/her performance, he/she must *apply* the criticism to the *already existing speech* and *practice* the suggestions and advice given by the instructor. This method encourages a greater level of growth by the student from the expectation of improvement. This concept is *completely* absent from the traditional speech classroom - very little incorporation of evaluation is expected. The PSI model and the forensic laboratory feature one important factor that is blatantly absent from most traditional speech classrooms - an application of received criticism. Devito defines the role of criticism in the speech classroom as one of improvement, rather than evaluation.

The major purpose of criticism in the classroom is to improve public speaking. Through criticism you, as a speaker and as a listener-critic, will more effectively learn the principles of public speaking (DeVito, 1981).

Though it is true that through criticism we become better speakers, a method to apply this criticism is seldom to be found within the traditional speech class. From the 522 useable respondents in the Gibson, Hanna and Huddelston study:

Seventy percent reported assigning from one to three performance assignments, about 16 percent reported seven to 10 performance assignments, four percent reported more than 10 performance assignments while six percent said they did not assign any performances. Four hundred and thirty-two of the respondents state that the students perform the *different* speeches before the *same* audience as a group.

Typically, students present one speech one time and move on to the next presentation. Admittedly, they should carry the critique received from one presentation to another and use the criticism to identify weaknesses within their speeches and speaking style. However, in the forensic laboratory and the PSI model, students are required to give the same speech more than once. The repetition provides a higher degree of application (in the forensic laboratory and the PSI model, students are required to incorporate instructor criticism and evaluation into their presentation until *mastery*, which is 95 percent, is assured) and forces the student to *practice* their presentation until it is satisfactory.

Again, the most common advice given in speech textbooks is to practice and to follow the instructor's advice and evaluations. Research affirms that there is a link between quality of performance and preparation time. An emphasis of the forensic laboratory model is practice. The application of the forensic laboratory is two-fold: first, to implement the necessary factors listed in research and texts in the speech classroom; second, to provide a better foundation to combat common problems within the public speaking class.

Practice is a concept that is *naturally* neglected in the structure of the speech classroom. When a student need only perform one version of one speech, with no expectation of improvement, practice is not necessary. Students in public speaking classes who do practice are generally more successful than their non-practicing counterparts (Ayres, 1991), but that success is manifested through student initiative and not class structure. Practice is seen as something that might have to be taken into consideration *if* the speech ever had to make another appearance. Because the traditional speech classroom does not typically demand this of the student, the student is not introduced to the vital and necessary world of practice. According to Reisch and Ballard-Reisch (1985), “practice at any time, in any place will do more to bolster the self-confidence of a novice speaker than any other factor”. Self-confidence does not necessarily create a skilled public speaker, just as anxiety does not necessarily produce a flawed speaker. Byers & Weber (1995) observe that in a public speaking course there are no guarantees. There are, however, no known drawbacks to practice, and its benefits to the public speaker are universally accepted.

Data compiled from a survey of all participants in the January 1996 edition of the Carroll speech course Communication 225 (Professional Communication) reveals that students as well as researchers have found practice to be a paramount element in the speech class. Sixteen of the seventeen students emphasized the importance of practice. This data is unique in the fact that it provides insight into what the students consider important and what they want: very little current research furnishes that type of information.

Practice in Communication 225 was conducted in three different ways: students participated in class practice (workshop style), worked with mentors, and were encouraged to practice on their own. The predominant theme that emerged from the student evaluations was that they considered practice to be the most effective and productive method to improve as speakers. Practice was not seen as an un-fulfilling requirement; students appreciated the practice

only as long as they found it meaningful, and resented time taken away from productive practice or wasted on skills they felt they already possessed. Again we observe the ideas of basic skill and mastery. Once a student masters a task, it is imperative that they move on to the next.

Student insight is important because the concept of practice (how it helps, the best way to do it, its importance) is completely understood and utilized by the students, yet it is an area that is insufficiently incorporated into most speech courses (Communication 225 was designed specifically to utilize mentors/proctors in a skills course). Professors mention the importance of practice in their lectures and texts (Ogilvie, 1961; Gilman, Aly and White, 1968; Devito, 1981; Osborn, 1981; Ehninger, Gronbeck and Monroe, 1984; Lucas, 1995; Zarefsky, 1996), but students are seldom *taught* the importance of practice.

Students in CO 225 demonstrated an awareness of knowing what they needed to practice and what they didn't need to practice; all students that reported that they wanted less practice in a certain area also stated that they wanted more practice in another area. When the 17 respondents were asked for feedback to design an 'ideal' course, they responded with mixed messages: some were unhappy with the structure of the class, others wanted more time devoted to a particular area, many didn't like the text used, but they spoke with one voice on the value of practice. 11 of the 16 respondents who mentioned practice felt it was necessary for their improvement. The remaining five were not satisfied with the use of practice in a particular section (interviewing, interpretation), not practice in general. Only one respondent felt that practice had no place in the classroom, and two respondents felt that the practice time was not utilized in a productive manner.

The information from the students of Communication 225 sheds more light on the bulk of the research on the speech classroom. Current research, devoted to CA and PSA, at times depicts the speech classroom as an emotionally dangerous environment. The evaluations that emerged from Communication 225 suggest that all students are different, all students need emphasis in different areas, and that all students are capable of becoming quality public speakers.

It is evident that the idea of practice is extremely important in speaker skill (Zarefsky 1996; Menzel & Carrell, 1994; Ayres, 1996). Practice reduces speaker anxiety, 'polishes' the speech, builds confidence and, in the case of applied criticism, provides an opportunity for the student to directly implement into the speech any suggestions provided by the instructor. A traditional speech class too often does not achieve this. A traditional speech class typically provides no review of the original source being critiqued, only a progression into a new speech that a student may not be ready for (Ogilvie, 1961; Gilman, Aly and White, 1968; Devito, 1981; Osborn, 1981; Ehninger, Gronbeck and Monroe, 1984; Lucas, 1995; Zarefsely, 1996). The opportunity for practice and correction is imperative in a speech classroom.

Not only does practice make perfect, it also makes the speaker a *lot* less nervous. But how is practice incorporated into a speech class? The Personalized System of Instruction provides the opportunity for students to proceed at their own pace and establish a level of mastery, two factors that depend entirely on practice.

Not everyone has problems in public speaking classes, some people are naturally good speakers. McCroskey & Sheahan (1978) label some of these people as low CA (low communication apprehension/anxiety) and create a link between level of apprehension and quality of performance. This level is not always a see-saw relationship. Very often, speakers who are extremely nervous give an excellent presentation - they simply have harnessed the nervous energy within and utilized it. Nervousness cannot be equated with apprehension/anxiety, lower forms of apprehension and anxiety (particularly in the beginning of the semester) are the universal nervousness speakers experience. When dealing with the problems that exist, the practices that are advocated and the discrepancies between the two, common sense is the biggest link from problem (traditional method) to solution (forensic model). This paper deals with the idea of modifying the existing method of teaching speech to provide a better foundation to battle the relevant and serious problems within the speech classroom.

As necessary as practice is, it does little good when not backed up by instruction (Fryar, 1981). The role of *evaluation* is perhaps the most underused in the traditional speech classroom. Evaluation is seen as an end, rather than a means; this is true of the vast research available on the subject as well. The concern for evaluation in research is validity; the concern for evaluation in this paper is how it is used. Granted, invalid evaluation is hardly useful, but truly invalid evaluation is relatively rare (Allison and Mitchell, 1994; Ayres and Raftis, 1995; Carlson and Smith-howell, 1995;). With the proposal that application of evaluation be the emphasis in the speech classroom, the research on the validity of evaluation tools again must be addressed.

The idea that 'poor evaluation' is contributing to the low quality of speakers is an interesting one. Whether a teacher is qualified certainly has bearing on the quality of students emerging from the classrooms, but instructor qualification is not a generally acknowledged widespread problem (Most, 1994). Again, when one considers that the objective of the speech class is to provide speakers with basic skill, evaluation appears to be an unlikely culprit in producing low quality speakers. When we consider the typical structure of a speech class, evaluation falls short. The student is evaluated and then moves on to the next speech, never given the opportunity to *implement* instructor criticism into practice and presentation. The average speech class performs three different types of speeches and rarely presents the same speech twice. In an area where practice is key, it is ironic that repetition is not utilized.

The issue of evaluation is paramount. It is the root of all possible improvement. It is the foundation that everyone relies upon. Instructors rely upon evaluation for grading, suggestions and areas of improvement. Students rely on evaluation for guidance, criticism and areas of improvement. Because public speaking is a *performance evaluation*, there is a lot more at stake than there is in grading essay questions; there is clearly a need for research on how we evaluate students and how we can do a better job of it.

At the ‘beginner level’ of any skill, students need to be taught at an almost remedial level (Ogilvie, 1961). In *theory* the issue of evaluation tools is producing innovative, beneficial research. But in *practice*, when a student is not able to communicate effectively (a common occurrence in a basic course) evaluation rarely moves past “Don’t pass out when you get up to speak” (Mannen, 1991). Instructors must provide competent evaluation in order for a student to excel, but that competent evaluation is rarely as complicated in basic courses as research would lead us to believe. The most important student/instructor factor is not one of evaluation, it is the utilization and incorporation of that evaluation.

In regard to practice, research on the average speech student reveals two things: First, anxiety is a formidable threat, and is a contributing factor to low speaker quality. Learning a skill such as public speaking is accompanied by a lot of nervousness and apprehension, and measures need to be taken to alleviate the anxiety as much as possible. Second, practice is necessary and desired by the student. Students are aware of how to improve and have discovered that practice is one of the best ways to achieve that improvement.

Review of existing literature reveals a definite problem within the communication field and more specifically within the speech classroom. These troubles are varied, and cannot be remedied with one formula. The literature review traces the problem of low speaker quality. From evolution into the hybrid courses, problems with evaluation tools, and the ever-present apprehension and anxiety, we see what problems plague the traditional speech class and what reasons are given for them. The question of the quality of speakers leaving speech classes has received many answers from various areas of the communication field. For some it is the credibility of the evaluation, for others it is the form of evaluation, and yet others believe the quality of the speaker to be linked to the method used to instruct that particular student.

The emphasis of current study is symptom, not disease. A large amount of scholarly writing has been dedicated on how to better train the instructor or evaluator, but the topic of how to better

train the student has been widely ignored. Most research that does involve how to better instruct the student has a defeating tone to it: apprehension is high and must be accounted for, speech anxiety is a widespread problem in the classroom, peer evaluation rather than instructor evaluation, etc. A better breed of speakers will not exist if research continues to follow a 'coddling' trend. The purpose of this thesis is to suggest a 'better way' to teach public speaking rather than a better way to support student weaknesses.

CHAPTER V

THE FORENSIC LAB AND THE EMERGENCE OF PSI

The first organized intercollegiate forensics competition in the United States was either a debate between Michigan and Wisconsin in 1893 or between Harvard and Yale in 1892 (Pelham & Watt, 1985). However, to assume that forensic activity is strictly debate-related is a fallacy. Individual Events (known as I.E.s) are also part of the forensic circuit and have become a very popular aspect of forensics. Although forensic research typically focuses on a combination of debate (CEDA, Parliamentary and Lincoln-Douglas) and I.E.s (Informative, Persuasive, Short-Prep, Oral Interpretation and After Dinner), the focus of this paper is on I.E.s for one very important reason: These are the speeches that are taught and performed in a speech classroom. Traditionally, classes on debate are reserved for an exclusive argumentation course. Very few speech classrooms incorporate debate into their curriculum (Devito, 1981; Ehninger, Gronbeck, and Monroe, 1984; Gilman, Aly and White, 1968; Lucas, 1995; Ogilvie, 1961; Osborn, 1981; Zarefsky, 1996). Therefore, research on debate is not pertinent to the issue at hand.

The similarities between the traditional speech class and the typical forensics program are important to note. Even more important, however, is the difference. The major difference between forensics and a public speaking class is the quality of speakers that emerge from each respective program. This fact serves as my inspiration for incorporating the more successful (and applicable) elements of forensics into a speech classroom, using the forensic laboratory as a foundation. Through application of the laboratory we can observe a common sense approach as well as the introduction of a concept that can alleviate some of the major problems associated with learning public speaking skills.

A common misconception in regard to the forensics model is that it is competition-based. Admittedly most forensics programs or teams in the high school and college circuit are based on various competitions attended year round, and culminate with some sort of "National" of

“Regional” championship. The reasons students participate in forensics, however, is not so narrow.

Many students participate in forensics activities to provide the skills necessary to further themselves (or get a head start) in their careers. Other students find that forensics enhances their lives socially and academically. There are few extracurricular intercollegiate activities available at the college level that are not sports associated. Indeed, even forensics competition is set up so that beginners and novices can compete with people of the same level of experience - a policy that fosters learning and improvement rather than competition (Stanton, 1991).

Forensics must be viewed as primarily an educational activity (Dittus & Davies, 1990). The existence of a forensics program at a college or university is a unique extracurricular event. No one makes a living competing professionally in forensics and the elements of forensics are universal skills that everyone must have in order to speak and defend ideas in public. Forensics thus has the goal of education in the fact that it focuses on preparing students to speak. Having the same goals is the primary reason forensics is an excellent model for a public speaking class.

Within the sphere of individual events, the laboratory is crucial because it covers areas that can easily be overlooked in a competitive atmosphere. In a speech classroom it is crucial because it attends to problem areas that are not consistently resolved in a traditional classroom. Ziegelmeueller (1980) summarized the importance of the laboratory within the confines of forensics competition, but his analysis is just as beneficial to a speech classroom:

The laboratory must teach students about communication. The laboratory should acquaint students with a variety of perspectives on communication, provide a forum for testing those perspectives and provide knowledge transferable to the genus when the participants make their transition from the laboratory to the real world.

Ziegelmeueller is directly addressing the question of how a student is prepared, taught and encouraged to take the skills learned in the laboratory setting with them from the class.

Ziegelmueller has identified the responsibilities and goals of the forensics laboratory, but how does the forensics laboratory differ from the speech classroom? First, the traditional speech class works from a lecture/performance perspective while the laboratory model depends upon instructor immediacy and assistance. Second, assistance can be in the form of teaching assistants, volunteers, members of the forensic team or students assisting for credit. The lab is comparable to the 'math labs' or 'English labs' offered at most schools.

The Forensic laboratory creates an excellent learning environment for basic speech students while employing the teaching methods of the PSI model. Five defining characteristics differentiate the PSI approach from other teaching/learning models (Keller, 1971):

- 1) mastery learning
- 2) self-pacing
- 3) a stress on the written word
- 4) student proctors
- 5) the use of lectures to motivate rather than to supply essential information.

(Keller and Sherman, 1982)

Mastery Learning. In typical PSI taught courses, mastery learning is consistent with expectations about competence because this type of learning requires students to demonstrate cognitive or behavioral abilities in one task before moving on to the next. In the forensic laboratory, mastery learning is the requirement that students must demonstrate a basic skill and application of that skill before moving on to the next presentation. The PSI philosophy allows students to correct mistakes, therefore students are required to 're-take' or 're-present' speeches that have not demonstrate sufficient mastery. In the forensic laboratory, the students are encouraged to practice (without a grade given) to attain a level that is suitable for an assigned grade. Specific objectives establish requirements for mastery at each level in the course and

students repeat assignments as many times as is necessary to achieve mastery. In a traditional speech classroom, students typically do not have the opportunity to repeat performances.

The practice typical of forensics programs and the forensics laboratory is represented by the PSI component of mastery. Mastery learning reflects actual skills rather than simple participation. The mastery component guarantees that a student has demonstrated completed competence in the task assigned. Additionally, the self-pacing component supports the guarantee of mastery by allowing the student to move at his/her own ability level.

Self-Pacing. Self-pacing allows students to move through the course at a pace commensurate with their abilities and past experiences with the material. In the forensic laboratory, pacing is particularly important. Skill levels of students are different, and the forensic laboratory allows students to proceed at their own level. The traditional speech class forces the student to move through the course at a rate dictated by the syllabus and other students

Moving at one's own pace is a luxury in any classroom, but in a skills classroom it is imperative. The self-pacing feature of the PSI model allows students to cover the necessary material at a rate that is comfortable to them and creates an environment that provides the student with the knowledge that they have as many chances as they have efforts. The self-pacing component also gives students the opportunity to dedicate time to their trouble areas, while moving quickly through their areas of strength. In the forensic laboratory, the student has the opportunity to take advantage of the mentors and other forms of assistance. If a particular student's pace is slower than others, that student can seek out additional help that is always accessible.

A stress on the written word. With the self-pacing feature, which depends upon students having continuous access to materials, selecting the proper sources for the course is extremely important. A stress on the written word allows students to complete significant portions of the course work independently.

The role that written evaluations play in guiding the student through the laboratory is in synch with the PSI component of emphasis on the written word. The emphasis serves two functions: it provides detailed instructions for the student to consult and saves precious class time. Lectures are used as workshops or to motivate, and are infrequent in the forensic laboratory. The bulk of class time is used for the practice of skills and demonstration of those skills.

Use of proctors. The use of student proctors has been described by the designers of the program as the most important component of the PSI model (Keller and Sherman, 1982). Student assistants both personalize the communication that takes place within the course and also help make the best possible use of the instructor's time. In addition to monitoring tests and playing the role of tutor, student proctors answer questions, and generate enthusiasm for the course (Gray, Buerkel-Rothfus and Yearby, 1986). Students appreciate personalized interactions with their instructors and proctoring appears to enhance student achievement (Farmor, et al., 1972). In the forensic lab, proctors are utilized just as they are in other academic resource labs: they are available at scheduled times to assist the student in a variety of tasks. Proctors are able to help a student with an outline, listen and evaluate a presentation, or 'coach' the student on how to improve his/her speaking skills. In a traditional speech class, the instructor and perhaps one TA (teaching assistant) is available to the students and their time is limited. The opportunity for practice and evaluation *before* being graded is rare.

Use of Lectures to motivate rather than to supply essential information. An interesting characteristic of the PSI model is the use of lectures to motivate rather than to disseminate essential information. Because the course content relies heavily on written materials (evaluations and a course supplement rather than texts), lectures can be used more creatively to generate interest in the course content or to supplement the basic information. Seiler and Fuss-Reineck (1986) note that "the idea of self-pacing is incompatible with an approach requiring attendance at

daily lectures". Thus, most lectures and tapes of lectures in PSI courses are supplementary. We have already discovered that the basic speech course relies very little on lectures and texts. The forensic laboratory places emphasis on performance, evaluation and practice rather than mass lecture or dependency on text.

The PSI forensic laboratory is a multi-tiered system. The student has a goal (mastery), the student must identify the time necessary for that goal (self-pacing), the student must follow directions to achieve that goal (written evaluations), and ascertain how much assistance is necessary for that goal (proctors).

In the PSI model, preliminary considerations must be taken into account before components of the model can be implemented. One must first decide, "what are the general objectives of the course." The goal throughout this paper has been clear: to produce a competent, quality speaker. The general objective proposed in this paper is to create an environment that produces a skilled speaker. The forensic elements of criticism, incorporation and practice have been advocated as the best way for a student to become a proficient speaker. The PSI components of mastery, self-pacing and the use of proctors are key for incorporating these elements into the laboratory.

The goal of mastery is usually achieved through repeated testing of students, and in this class design, mastery is the component that is altered the most. Instead of taking tests the students will be "demonstrating skills". This class design proposes that mastery not only be a criterion level achieved before proceeding to a new task, but a demonstration that criticism and evaluation has been incorporated into the task by way of a percentage system. Students present an initial speech (not graded) and receive a written evaluation from the instructor. This first evaluation will focus primarily on the student's basic weaknesses and serve as a point base for the grading of the next presentation. The next presentation will be graded in accordance with the first evaluation: the percentage of instructor criticism that is utilized and corrected in the

presentation will be the grade percentage received. If the student amends 90 percent of the weaknesses identified by the instructor, the student receives a grade of “90 percent” on the presentation. Keller originally defined mastery as achieving “100 percent” on quizzes, but the expectancy for mastery in the class design is “95 percent”. The “95 percent” standard gives the student leeway and prevents repetition of an already quality performance.

The percentage system in mastery is beneficial for several reasons. First, the grading system in traditional speech courses treats each speech exclusively. A student can be expected to give a persuasive speech one week, a speech to entertain the next. The focus is on students preparing for and writing a different type of speech, regardless of proficiencies they demonstrated in the last speech. The forensic laboratory demands that a student confirm that he/she has processed all necessary information and is capable of incorporating that information into their presentation. Second, the initial evaluation used in the proposed forensic laboratory positions each individual student at his/her own level, a benefit that continues with the PSI component of self-pacing. Finally, the student is given a specific evaluation enabling them to target precise areas of improvement, typically with the help of a proctor. The student knows exactly what must be accomplished in order for them to precede to the next level.

Self-pacing is an excellent method to ‘even out’ the speech classroom. Members of the basic speech course are at different skill levels, and it is important that a student spend only the time necessary on a particular task. “A-Goal, B-Goal, C-Goal” also encourages students to maintain a pace they feel comfortable with and are capable of. Public speaking is a *skill*, and the grade given in that class is a reflection of that skill. One must type 40 wpm to get an A in typing class and so one must reach the highest level of mastery in this class design to get an A. “A-Goal, B-Goal, C-Goal” acknowledges that students start and progress at different levels, and while some students will only give six speeches (three graded) and get an A, some students will give nine speeches (three graded) and get a B.

“A-Goal, B-Goal, C-Goal” refers to the mastery of the goals of the program. If a student has reached a point where he/she must move on in order to meet a deadline, they take the percentage of the mastery of the task as their grade. When a deadline to make an attempt is looming around the corner, and a student has made several attempts at mastery without complete success, the student must progress with the expectation that the remainder of the course will be even more challenging and that their goals may need to be modified in accordance. If a student cannot break 95 percent of skill level, they accept a B grade and move on with the prospect of a B goal from this point on.

Students in the Carroll Communication 225 class were aware of the imbalance that can occur in a speech class, and the reasons for that imbalance. The use of proctors and the opportunity to repeat a task until right creates a ‘custom’ classroom combine to create ‘the best environment’ possible when one is learning a skill. Students are not lost in a classroom, frequently they know what they want, what their strengths and weaknesses are, and what they need to succeed. Allowing them to work at their own pace with available proctors guarantees a fulfilling course that avoids many of the pitfalls of the traditional speech course. Again, here are excerpts from student evaluations in CO 225:

We need more real time spent refining our skills; maybe giving a speech everyday under strict time restrictions (S5) More help with actual speech writing would have been helpful to me (S8) The text was helpful but hated the tests - just memorizing facts was not helpful. The practice interviewing was not particularly helpful for me personally because I’ve been interviewed (S9) I liked this (Platform), but I think we should have done more speeches like this....I would have liked more practice giving speeches (S1) The content of the course was O.K., I would scrap the interviewing part and have more practice and graded speeches (S14) Spend more time on teaching how to be relaxed and tips on how to memorize speeches. This is what I was hoping to get out of class.

Basically what I wanted to get out of this class (is) to be a dynamic speaker. I wanted to learn how to give speeches in a relaxed manner and to be able to make speeches entertaining (S15).

Comments like these prove that students are entirely capable of pacing themselves and spending the necessary time on various sections. The comments also demonstrate the students' ability to pinpoint their strengths and weaknesses, and work accordingly. Self-pacing and proctors create a custom-made environment for the students: From the Communication 225 comments, we can observe that the students are eager to take full advantage of that environment.

Self-pacing does have a downfall. Research in the 1970s blamed self-pacing as a contributing factor to a high dropout rate, because of the tendency for students to procrastinate. To remedy this, Glick and Semb (1978) suggest certain deadlines for both attempting and passing the different units. Students who fall behind the deadlines are required to begin daily testing. The suggestion of attempt deadlines is incorporated into the forensic lab design of this paper, but the percentage grading system and the "A-Goal, B-Goal, C-Goal" provides enough opportunity to progress at one's own level that the need for a passing deadline is eliminated.

Self-pacing allows students to move through the course at a pace commensurate with their abilities and past experiences with the material. In the forensic laboratory, pacing is particularly important. Skill levels of students are different, and the forensic laboratory allows a student to proceed at their own level. The traditional speech class forces the student to move through the course at a rate dictated by the syllabus and other students. In the PSI method of instruction, written materials form the primary vehicle for disseminating information.

With the self-pacing feature, which depends upon students having continuous access to materials, selecting the proper sources for the course is extremely important. A stress on the written word allows students to complete significant portions of the course work independently.

The written word is the primary vehicle for disseminating information in the PSI method. In the forensic laboratory, evaluations are considered the principal source of information. Evaluations provide the student with the necessary information to attempt progression to the next level. Instructors tell the students exactly where they need improvement to achieve mastery. The written evaluations enable students to progress independently through the course units at their own pace. In a typical PSI classroom, a study guide is developed to take the students through the class. A PSI study guide generally includes course objectives, unit purpose and objectives, and study questions (Seiler and Fuss-Reineck, 1986). Because this particular class tests only on skill, study guides are not necessary, but could be a welcome addition to the program.

In the class design, there are only four required lecture/workshop classrooms. Seiler and Fuss-Reineck (1986) state that “the idea of self-pacing is incompatible with an approach requiring attendance at daily lectures.” Students are required to attend all the lectures presented, but these lectures number fewer than five. An interesting characteristic of the PSI model is the use of lectures to motivate rather than to disseminate essential information. Because the course content contains written materials, lectures can be used more creatively to generate interest in the course content or to supplement the basic information. Thus, most lectures and tapes of lectures in PSI courses are supplementary. The forensic laboratory places emphasis on performance, evaluation and practice rather than mass lecture or dependency on text.

The use of student proctors has been described by the designers of the program as the most important component of the PSI model (Keller and Sherman, 1982). Student assistants both personalize the communication that takes place within the course and also help make the best possible use of the instructor’s time. In addition to monitoring tests and playing the role of tutor, student proctors answer questions, and generate enthusiasm for the course (Gray, Buerkel-Rothfus and Yearby, 1986). Students appreciate personalized interactions with their instructors and proctoring appears to enhance student achievement (Farmor, et al., 1972). In the forensic

lab, proctors are utilized just as they are in other academic resource labs: they are available at scheduled times to assist the student in a variety of tasks.

There are many advantages that forensics has to offer to students in the basic speech course. These advantages are best represented in the “forensics as a laboratory” metaphor. The PSI model takes this metaphor one step further, providing a tested environment to implement and teach the benefits of forensics, as well as the foremost program to guarantee skill development.

The research has revealed three central areas of concern within the speech classroom: basic skills, practice, and apprehension. The PSI model serves to remedy through individual instruction, immediate relationships and an emphasis on basic learning. The PSI model is extremely flexible, and can be applied to almost an existing classroom. Speech classrooms, whether they are traditional or hybrid, can pinpoint their weak areas and apply the PSI model accordingly. When one considers the many factors that contribute to declines in the basic speech course, and how the forensic elements combined with the Personalized System of Instruction can solve those problems, the final step is to redesign courses using this model.

CHAPTER VI

REDESIGNING A COURSE USING THE PSI/FORENSIC MODEL

Professional Communication CO225 was taught Spring semester 1996 at Carroll College. Professional Communication was a hybrid course, involving speeches, interviews and a multi-media presentation. Two class periods were devoted to actual interviewing and one class period to a lecture on interviewing. The rest of the class was a combination of lectures, workshops and individual practices with mentors. The lectures were minimal due to the use of a workshop structure: information that could be presented to the group as a whole typically was represented by instruction and participation, rather than recitation. Individual practices with mentors involved one class period a week, and one hour of practice per week outside of the classroom.

In order to redesign CO 225 using the PSI method, it was first necessary to identify the weaknesses within the course. Professional Communication consisted of three primary units:

1. Job interviewing
2. Oral interpretation
3. Public speaking.

Out of 600 possible points, speech presentations comprised 400 points. The remaining 200 points involved interviewing and quizzes.

In order to establish weaknesses it is necessary to look not only at what sections students criticized, but also at what sections students praised. We know from data cited earlier in the paper that the students advocated an increase in practice time, a predictable request when one observes the importance of practice and its absence from most programs. The students in Communication 225 acquired a very definite idea of what practice is and how it is important to them. Here are excerpts from those evaluations.

When we did practice (interview) **it didn't seem as if we were practicing anything seriously**. I really liked (Interpretation) because it **gave me a chance to get up in front of the room and practice speaking** (S1). It seems like this section (interview) might be better left to the Student Development Center. I say this, not because it wasn't helpful, but because **it took too much time away from "public speaking" practice** (S2). **Practice speeches very important** Interpretation useful but need not so (sic) much practice time for it (S3). Keep interview section..., however **the more practice the better**. Platform was good - **again more practice** (S5). Keep it (interview) but with **less practice** (S6). **More practice. ...would like more practice...on this** (S12). **..have more practice. ..we needed more time to practice ..this (platform) is always useful, allow people more time to practice** (S14). **More practice** (S16). Interpretation, very useful, maybe a little **more practice**. Platform, **more practice** (S17).

Students demonstrated that they did indeed know what they needed and where they needed it. The *mastery, self-pacing, and proctor* components of the PSI/Forensic laboratory would enable the students to attain the desired level of skill through practice, move through difficult as well as less difficult sections at their own pace (reserving practice for their areas of need) and seek out assistance in the form of proctors to help the student practice in the most efficient manner possible.

Students also commented on the time allocation for the class. Frequently when a student wanted more of a particular section, they wanted less of another. In the following excerpts from evaluations, students voiced concern about the hybrid nature of the class.

Interview, this is important but I think we spent too much time on it. Platform, I think we should have done more speeches like this. I would (sic) of liked more practice giving speeches (S1). Interviewing not important. Platform very useful (S3). Interviewing portion of the class was very good, don't change it. Interpretation was lost, give less time

to it and more time to an actual business speech (S4). Interview, keep it with less practice (S6). Interpretation; While I think this probably helped me relax somewhat, I'm not sure what I'll ever use it for in the future (S9). Interpretation seemed useless and a waste of time (S10). The content of the course was ok I would scrap the interviewing part and have more practice and graded speeches (S14). Eliminate interviewing portion, I did not find it to be helpful. The interpretation was good but we should have spent less time with that and interviewing, more time with speeches (S15). Less interviewing, if any. Interpretation: I still don't see it as critical to professional communication (S16).

Though there was no consensus (excluding the importance of practice), consistent patterns emerged from the evaluations. Many students who advocated keeping the interviewing section also suggested removing the interpretation section. Most reasoning was based on time availability; the students who recommended removal of a section requested more time for another section, or stated that the offending section took too much time away from other sections. This reestablishes the need for more practice time and also acknowledges the weaknesses in the hybrid nature of the course.

Additionally, students felt short-changed by their texts and by their quizzes. Adding to student concerns in regard to section allocation was the belief that the class had no room for the texts or time to thoroughly cover the material.

Eloquence (book) basically worthless (S17). I don't know if the Interview book is necessary (S16). I think that the Interview book was lacking (S14). Test okay; quizzes were very detailed and picky, that is the only area that hurt my grade (S13). Not discussing the text was odd. I didn't like taking a test without discussing the important points within (S10). Like the book but it was difficult to read. Would have appreciated some discussion on this book before taking an exam. The text was helpful but hated the test, just memorizing was not helpful (S9). I felt the Eloquence book, though interesting,

used too much time; material could have been covered in a single lecture (S5).

Eloquence text; lose it, I did not gain anything from the book (S4).

The PSI/Forensic laboratory would remedy this situation through the components of *emphasis on the written word* and the *reduction of lecture time*.

Communication 225 possessed an active mentor system; one mentor for every four students. However, the mentors did not participate within a laboratory setting, rather they participated in a classroom setting working side by side with the students and the instructor.

Mentors do not seem to work so well (especially for interviewing) but yes, important for helping with speech organization and thought (S3). Mentors were great and should be kept (S5). Mentor: Great, helped a lot, had a great deal of insight (S6). Mentor: Excellent, very much appreciated expertise and patience (S9). Mentor; ok, didn't seem like they knew what direction to take us (S11). The mentors were nice. I should have used them more, I think that this is a point to be stressed. This is because they know what they are doing, and if they are not there, I don't know how I would have changed (S11). Mentors were great, all the mentors made themselves available (S12). Mentors: I think they can be useful if we have a clear criteria and schedule set up before hand (S14). The mentoring was a good idea but needs to be better structured. I didn't find the mentors extremely helpful (S15). Mentors: A good idea, but they should be here every class (S17).

This mentor structure was identified as the most 'fixable' weakness by the students. Students who took advantage of the mentor's time were satisfied with the system, but many students got lost in the shuffle. The mentors were present one of two class periods every week and available for help outside of the class. In the classroom, the instructor typically devoted half of the class to a lecture or workshop, and the other half of the class was left to students and their mentors. The PSI/Forensic laboratory provides two key elements in repairing CO 225's mentoring system: an

established walk-in lab and one-on-one proctoring. Students in CO 225 did not have a comfortable environment to walk into and begin working one on one. Students had to approach and arrange a meeting with a mentor to get full attention; if not, they practiced with three other group members and the mentor at the same time. Immediacy was threatened by the approach the student had to make and the likelihood of working with other students as well as mentors.

The examination of Communication 225 reveals three problem areas: practice time, hybrid structure and the mentor system. With the application of the PSI/Forensic laboratory model to Communication 225, three goals emerge: to increase available practice time, reduce the hybrid nature of the course, and repair the mentor system.

The focus of attack, and the modification that will make additional modifications possible, is the mentor system. By changing the in-class mentors to scheduled lab mentors, practice time increases and structure is established. The fact that the mentors evaluate and test the students for mastery means that the mentors will play a larger part in the course and will be utilized by the students. The PSI components of mastery and self-pacing create a structure that depends on the relationship between mentor and student.

Because of its other preoccupations, the very nature of the hybrid course takes away from practice time. The hybrid course incorporates text, lectures, and theory into the classroom. Two books were required reading for the course: "Eloquence in an Electronic Age" by Kathleen Jamieson and "Interviewing" by Stewart and Cash. These two books and the sections (rhetoric and interviewing) they accompanied comprised almost half of the points available in the class, yet were covered in less than seven out of twenty-six possible class periods. These particular sections were also the most lecture-dependent and not always the clearest.

The PSI/Forensic laboratory structure removes the emphasis on lectures as information sources and focuses on the mastery of basic skills. The hybrid nature of CO 225 can be reduced

by removing the theory (Jamieson's "Eloquence in an Electronic Age") and focusing on the development of skills.

An increase in practice is one of the most consistent characteristics within the PSI/Forensic laboratory. The components of mastery, self-pacing and availability of proctors naturally increase practice time and are not a removal from the original goals of the course:

Course goals: To prepare students from all majors for public speaking situations they may encounter in their professional lives. The course has three primary units: job interviewing (being interviewed and interviewing); oral interpretation (performing self-written material and published material); and public speaking (multimedia presentations, question and answer sessions, small group leadership). This is a skills course with emphasis on perfecting practical skills which will have immediate application in career situations (Northup, 1996).

Changing CO 225 from a classroom to a laboratory opens up more time for practice, provides a better environment for the mentor system and reduces the hybrid structure of the course.

In summary, the redesign of CO 225 involves the specific implementation of the three primary goals of the PSI/Forensic methodology. Not coincidentally, this change directly addresses the three most often cited weaknesses of CO 225. In other words the application of PSI to CO 225 directly addresses the course weaknesses, an outcome foreshadowed by the research presented in this paper.

BEFORE	AFTER
Hybrid Character: Rhetorical Theory	Delete from syllabus Text: "Eloquence in an Electronic Age"
Hybrid Character: Interviewing Text: "Interviewing"	Reduce to two workshop-style classes Reduce text to a supplement
Public Speaking Interpretation Platform Multimedia	Maintain Add time Simplify
Mentors attend every other class with the students, work outside of class at students request.	Laboratory has scheduled hours and required meetings with mentors. Students use the lab to develop and demonstrate mastery in order to progress in the course.
Practice is reserved for class time and is only one on one when student requests it. Student is not allowed to discriminate between practices.	Practice is one on one with as much as the student wants and needs. Student practices only as much as necessary (self-pacing and mastery).

FUTURE DIRECTIONS

The redesign of Communication 225 provides a practical application of the theory examined in this paper. The popularity of the hybrid approach prevents many speech courses from benefiting from the complete adoption of the Personalized System of Instruction Forensic Laboratory, but the model is flexible enough to help identify and correct problems within the speech classroom. The next suggested step involves redesigning other classes from a speech curriculum.

A return to a 'bare bones' public speaking course may not be possible at many institutions. As long as that fact remains a reality, individual components of the PSI model and the forensic laboratory can be used to improve the existing classroom. One opportunity remains: A comparison between a public speaking class based entirely of the PSI/Forensic lab and an existing classroom. Research suggests that the lab has a higher probability of producing a competent speaker than the existing classroom.

Any information that contributes to the improvement of the public speaking classroom is beneficial information. Very little research has adopted an 'holistic' approach to improving the speech classroom; most research deals with exclusive problems and obstacles. By examining the state of the current speech classroom and identifying strengths and weaknesses within that classroom through research, student opinion and texts, an appealing solution has emerged.

It's surprising that the PSI model has not been utilized more often in the speech classroom, but the wheels of change are slow. While student speaking skills were declining, the hybrid classroom was growing and many scholars did not notice the correlation. The PSI/Forensics laboratory provides a model that not only returns to an emphasis on speech fundamentals, but incorporates the often-times ignored variables that contribute to the learning of those fundamentals.

Proposed Syllabus

1/22/96

Lecture

Speech structure

-Introduction

-Preview

-Signposting

-Body

-Conclusion

Sign up for first speech in lab

1/24/96

Lab

Three minute speech on yourself

-structure 40%

-movement 20%

-eye contact 20%

-pronunciation 10%

-volume 10%

Please note you have only one week to master this speech.

1/29/96

Lab

Required meeting with proctor

1/31/96

Lab

Four minute speech on a hobby

-introduction 10%

-structure 20%

-movement 15%

-eye contact 15%

-pronunciation 5%

-volume 5%

-conclusion 10%

-delivery 20%

2/5/96

Lecture

Informative speaking

Persuasive speaking

Researching your speech

Discussion

2/7/96

Video: Examples of Informative, Persuasive, and Drama

Self-evaluation

2/12/96
Delivery workshop

*Seven minute Informative Attempt Deadline: 2/23/97

*Ten minute Informative Attempt Deadline: 3/08/97

*Ten minute Persuasive Attempt Deadline: 3/29/97

Final Presentations 5/6 and 5/8

*under 95%, student must repeat

Attempt refers to the first time you attempt to receive a grade on a speech.

Count on giving a speech at least twice to receive a grade unless you receive a 95%

Lab Hours

Proctor #1 Monday, Wednesday and Friday 9:00 a.m. - 9:50 a.m.

Proctor #2 Tuesday, Wednesday and Thursday 10:00 a.m. - 10:50 a.m.

Proctor #3 Tuesday and Thursday 2:00 p.m. - 3:15 p.m.

Proctor #4 Monday and Wednesday 8:00 a.m. - 9:15 a.m.

Proctor #5 Schedule up to three hours, availability varies.

APPENDIX A

STUDENT EVALUATIONS OF CO225 (SPRING 1996)

Evaluations are duplicated as closely as possible to the original data in order to retain their flavor.

S1

Interview-this is important but I think we spent too much time on it. When we did practice it didn't seem as if we were practicing anything seriously.

Text was good if we had more structure in lectures.

Interp-I really like this because it gave me a chance to get up in front of the room and practice speaking. It helped ease my nervousness.

Platform-I liked this, but I think we should have done more speeches like this. I would of liked more practice giving speeches.

Multi-Media-good idea, but not enough time of (sic) info about this type of speech to put it together.

S2

Interview-it seems like this section, although valuable for students, might be better left to the Student Development Center. I say this -not because it wasn't helpful- but because it took too much time away from "public speaking" practice. Interviewing seems more of a "private speaking" act.

Interp-I found this part helpful in making me feel more comfortable speaking in front of my peers. However, students should be told specifically what the purpose of interp is.

Platform-this section was great because I think it best reflects the type of speaking most professionals do. Perhaps there could be two types of platform speeches: one informative and one reflective.

Multi-media-good in theory, but more time should be allotted to ensure a quality multi-media presentation.

S3

Practice speeches very important - muy importante

Interviewing not important - maybe just lecture - no book or yes book, no test.

Interp useful but need not so much practice time for it.

Platform useful, very, liked the organizational input.

Media would be nice, a good thing to know something about.

Mentors do not seem to work so well (especially for interviewing) but yes important for helping with speech organization and thought.

S4

Interviewing portion of the class was very good, don't change it.

Interp portion seemed to be lost. (G)ive less time to it and more time to an actual business speech.

Platform portion was o.k., more time using actual business topics. Maybe assign the topic.

Multi-media was not clear.

Mentors- some seemed to really want to help, a couple just seemed bothered by having to be here.

Eloquence text- lose it, I did not gain anything from the book.

S5

(K)keep interview section with text, however the more practice the better; maybe focus first on selection interview and EEO questions(,) not so much text.

Interp was necessary to delivering (sic) engaging speeches.

(P)platform was good - again more practice(,) would really enjoy using more media visuals; especially computers POWER POINT.

I felt the Eloquence book, though interesting, used too much time; material could have been covered in a single lecture.

Mentors were great and should be kept.

In summary: more real time spent refining our skills; maybe giving a speech everyday under strict time restrictions.

S6

Interview - keep it but with less practice. (W)ill help a great deal in job search. Text was good, quizzes o.k.

Interp - useful to make more comfortable in front of audience. Taught body and speech control.

Platform & Multimedia should be combined.

Eloquence book was interesting but needed instructor input. (E)very day instructor overview would be good.

Mentor - great, helped a lot, had a great deal of insight.

S7

I think the text book (interviewing) is very good. The interviewing practice is very helpful to me. The poetry reading section took a little long time. The group project is fun to work. The "eloquence" book is fun to read, but not really fun to take the test. Tutoring is great idea too. I think for the next semester, they can did (do) some Impromptu. However, overall it is a good and informative class to take.

S8

Interviews

very good. Not many other courses even consider interviewing. It is an imporant "Pro Com" skill.

Text

at times enlightening but I didn't retain enough - but reviewing the book was helpful.

Practice

practice is important in order to become comfortable with Q & A.

Interp

is important to start becoming comfortable in front of a group but not something that needs repeated(.) (I)t is covered in Basic Com(munication).

Platform

mentors could have been utilized more. (S)et times should be set up with Mentors like a required class

I had trouble brainstorming and getting started with speech writing.

Multimedia

should be considered in order to be true "Pro Com" when used poorly(,) visual aids are distracting

help with ideas to use for visuals.

Eloquence

good book. (S)hould let students know that after the first chapter it gets a lot better. I only did well on the test because we had a discussion group to discuss what we thought we read.

*Group Projects are worth continuing with the allowance of more time.

Overall: more help with actual speech writing would have been helpful to me.

S9

Interview

The text was helpful but hated the test - just memorizing (?) was not helpful. The practice interviewing was not particularly helpful for me personally because I've both interviewed and been interviewed numerous times.

Interp While I think this probably helped me relax somewhat, I'm not sure what I'll ever use it for in the future.

Platform Was the strength. Could have spent more time on this. Very much appreciated the sign posting and structure(.) Will be the most helpful since public speaking is a major part of my job.

Multimedia Should be developed. A necessary component in today's technological society.

Mentor Excellent - very much appreciated Jeff's expertise and patience.

Eloquence Liked the book but it was difficult to read. Would have appreciated some discussion on this book before taking an exam.

S10

Interview - good, keep, make more realistic

Interp - seemed useless and a waste of time.

Platform - nice background to have for future.

Media - was nice to have a group format.

Mentor - okay, didn't seem like they knew what direction to take us. Some have ego problems.

Eloquence - Not discussing the text was odd. I didn't like taking a test without discussing the important points within it.

The class overall seemed to not utilize much of the time available in class. It was quite frustrating and wasted time.

S11

I feel that it is very important to have the interviewing section! Just in this time I have realized how much this has helped me out! The practice time was spent kind of foolishly.

The Interp Section was nice, but I am really kind of on the edge of feeling how important it is to our skills.

I feel that the last two speeches are the most important. I know that throughout life, I will be using these skills that I have learned all the time.

The mentors were nice. I should have used them more, I think that this is a point to be stressed. This is because they know what they are doing, and if they are not there, I don't know how I would have changed.

S12

Interviewing? - thought interviewing was great practice.

Text? Parts of the book I had a hard time with.

Practice more practice

Interp? Just right

Platform just right
multimedia would like more practice and discussion on this.
Mentor? Mentors were great - all the mentors made themselves available.
Eloquence text - was great, interesting, would have liked some discussion on this text.

S13*

I think practice should be more out of class type work. Sometimes it was a waste of time - such as interviewing. HRM also goes over interviewing.

Text okay - quizzes were very detailed and picky - that is the only area that hurt my grade.

Interpretation speech was useless for me - good for other.

Platforms I enjoyed a lot (3 points and sign posting was interesting).

Mentors - It would be better to not use all forensic students even if they do have more experience.
Jeff was very hard to take serious - he's still a kid.

Eloquence text I hated reading it and talking the test but when I look back at this course I enjoyed what I learned from reading it. Maybe test on sections instead of entire book.

I believe it helped me feel more comfortable at giving presentations and I'm glad I took this class (after all it is now over!)

S14

The content of the course was o.k. I would scrap the interviewing part and have more practice and graded speeches.

Text? Eloquence was good I think that the Interview Book was lacking.

Practice - We needed more time to practice. The use of the mentors was under what we could have done.

Interp= I am not quite sure the value gained from this section if we are supposed to be helping people for the professional job world I don't see how this fits in.

Platform= this is always useful to allow people more time to practice platform.

Multimedia = This could have been done more. I feel it would be useful to gain some experience in the use of computers and other electronic visual aids.

Mentors. I think they can be useful if we have a clear criteria and schedule set up before hand.

Eloquence = This was a good book and I feel (it) had some useful points in it.

S15

Eliminate Interviewing portion, I did not find it to be helpful.

Spend more time on teaching how to be relaxed and tips on how to memorize speeches. This is what I was hoping to get out of class.

The mentoring was a good idea but needs to be better structured. I didn't find the mentors extremely helpful.

Basically what I wanted to get out of this class is (sic) to be a dynamic speaker. I wanted to learn how to give speeches in a relaxed manner and to be able to make speeches entertaining.

The interp was good but we should have spent less time with that and interviewing, more time with speeches.

S16

Less interviewing, if any (I still think a couple weeks for it would be good)

Eloquence is a great book, I don't know if the Interview Book is necessary.

More practice: A Platform every week or so.

Interp - I still don't see it as critical to professional communication....scrap it.

*Mentors were great - Especially Jeff! (S16 drew a smiley face here).

S17

Interview - very helpful, in no way lose this, unless you make a class specifically for interviewing.

Text - Interview book helpful. Eloquence basically worthless.

Practice - Not very well divided.

Interp - Very useful, may be a little more practice.

Platform - More practice.

Multimedia - we need more of this.

Mentors - A good idea, but they should be here every class.

REFERENCES

- Allison, J. Jr. & Mitchell, K (1994) Textual power and the pragmatics of assessing and evaluating powerful performances. *Communication Education*, 43,206-221
- Andersen, J. F. (1979). Teacher immediacy as a predictor of teaching effectiveness. *Communication yearbook* 3. New Brunswick, NJ: Prentice-Hall. 543-559.
- Ayres, J. (1986). Perceptions of speaking ability: An explanation for stage fright. *Communication Education*, 35, 275-287.
- Ayres, J. (1996) Speech preparation processes and speech apprehension. *Communication Education*, 45:4, 228-236
- Ayres, J., and Raftis, S. M. (1995). The impact of evaluation and preparation time on high public speaking anxious speakers' thoughts, behavior, and state-communication apprehension. *The Southern Communication Journal*. 323-327
- Behnke, R., Sawyer, C., & King, P. (1994) Contagion theory and the communication of public speaking state anxiety. *Communication Education*, 43:3, 246-250
- Byers, P., & Weber, C (1995) The timing of speech anxiety reduction treatments in the public speaking classroom. *The Southern Communication Journal*, 60, 246-256
- Carlson, R. & Smith-Howell, D (1995) Classroom public speaking assessment: Reliability and validity of selected evaluation instruments. *Communication Education*, 44, 87-95
- Cronin, M., Grice, G., Olsen, R. Jr. (1994) *Communication Education*, 43:1, 42-54
- DeVito, J (1981) *The elements of public speaking*: Harper & Row, 12,13,157-180
- Ehninger, D., Gronbeck, B. & Moore, L (1984) *Principles of Speech Communication*: Scott, Foresman & Company, 21-37
- Ellis, K. (1993). The relationship among communication apprehension, self-perception of public speaking competency, and instructor immediacy behavior in laboratory-supported, video-based public speaking instruction. SCA conference, Miami Beach, FL
- Ellis, K. (1994) Apprehension, self-perceived competency and teacher immediacy in the laboratory-supported public speaking course: trends and relationships. *Communication Education*,44:1, 64-79
- Frymier, A. (1993). The relationship among communication apprehension, immediacy and motivation to study. *Communication Reports*, 6, 8-17.
- Gorham, J. (1988). The relationship between verbal teacher immediacy behaviors and student learning. *Communication Education*, 37, 40-53.
- Gibson, J. W., Hanna, M. S. And Huddleston, B. M. (1985). The basic speech course at U.S. colleges and universities: IV. *Communication Education*, 34, 281-290
- Gilman, W., Bower, A., White, H (1968) *An introduction to speaking*: Macmillan Company 180-187
- Gray, P. L., Buerkel-Rothfuss, N. L. And Yerby, J. (1986). A comparison between PSI-based and lecture-recitation formats of instruction in the introductory speech communication course. *Communication Education*,35, 110-125.
- Johnson, J. R. And Szczupakiewicz, N. (1987). The public speaking course: Is it preparing students with work related public speaking skills? *Communication Education*,36, 131-136.
- Kay, J., Borchers, T., and Williams, S. (1992). Gridiron nights, comedy clubs and after dinner speaking: Prescriptions from real world analogues. *Argumentation and Advocacy*, 28, 168-177
- Keller, F. S. And Sherman, J. G. (1974) Ten years of personalized instruction. *Teaching of Psychology*,1, 4-9.
- Keller, F. S., and Sherman, J. G. (1982). *The PSI handbook: essays on personalized instruction*. Menlo Park, CA: W. A. Benjamin.

- Lucas, S (1995) The art of public speaking: McGraw-Hill, 162-187
- Macke, F. J. (1991). Communication left speechless: A critical examination of the evolution of speech communication as an academic discipline. *Communication Education*, 40, 126-143
- Madsen, A (1994) Teaching & directing forensics. *Argumentation and Advocacy*, 31:2, 113
- McCroskey, J.C., Booth-Butterfield, S., and Payne, S.K. (1989). The impact of communication apprehension on college student retention and success. *Communication Quarterly*, 37, 100-107
- McCroskey, J.C., Daly, J.A., Richmond, V.P., and Falcione, R.L. (1977). Studies of the relationship between communication apprehension and self-esteem. *Human Communication Research*, 3(3), 264-277.
- McCroskey, J. C., and Richmond, V. P. (1992). Power in the classroom: Communication, control, and concern. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum. 101-119.
- McCroskey, J. C., and Richmond, V. P.. (1979). The effects of communication apprehension on individuals in organizations. *Communication Quarterly*, Summer, 55-61.
- Meulmans, T. (1986). Precautions in applying forensic experiences to classroom practices. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Eastern Communication Association.
- Miller, M. D. (1987). The relationship of communication reticence and negative expectations. *Communication Education*, 36, 228-235.
- Most, M. (1994) Certification standards for speech communication teachers: A nationwide survey. *Communication Education*, 43, 195-204
- Motley, M. (1988) Taking the terror out of talk. *Psychology Today*, 22, 46-49
- Ogilvie, M (1961) Teaching Speech in the high school: Andrews and Woods
- Osborn, M (1982) Speaking in public: Houghton Mifflin Company, 119-132, 179-188
- Pelham, W. D. and Watt, W. (1985). Profile of Academic Debate. Wood and J. Midgley editors. 3-14.
- Richmond, V.P., McCroskey, J.C. and McCroskey, L.L. (1989). An investigation of self-perceived communication competence and personality orientations. *Communication Research Reports*, 6, 28-36
- Rubin, R., Welch, S.A, Buerkel, R (1995) Performance-based assessment of high school speech instruction. *Communication Education*, 44, 30-39
- Seiler, W. J. And Fuss-Reineck, M. (1986). Developing the personalized system of instruction for the basic speech communication course. *Communication Education*, 35, 127-133.
- Stacks, D.W., & Stone, J.D (1984) An examination of the effect of basic speech courses, self-concept, and self disclosure on communication apprehension. *Communication Education*, 33, 257-266.
- Thomas, D. A. (1990). Sedalia plus five: Forensics as laboratory. Paper presented at the Sedalia Conference.
- Vangelisti, A., Daly, J., Weber, D (1995) Speech anxiety affects how people prepare speeches: A protocol analysis of the preparation processes of speakers. *Communication Monographs*, 62, 383-397
- Zarefsky, D (1996) Public Speaking: Strategies for success. Allyn & Bacon 22-59, 394-405, 477
- Ziegelmueller, G. W. (1980). Forensics as communication: An argumentative perspective. Paper presented at the Sedalia Conference