

Basic Communication Course Annual

Volume 17

Article 4

2005

Editor's Page

Scott Titsworth
Ohio University

Follow this and additional works at: <http://ecommons.udayton.edu/bcca>

 Part of the [Higher Education Commons](#), [Interpersonal and Small Group Communication Commons](#), [Mass Communication Commons](#), [Other Communication Commons](#), and the [Speech and Rhetorical Studies Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Titsworth, Scott (2005) "Editor's Page," *Basic Communication Course Annual*: Vol. 17 , Article 4.
Available at: <http://ecommons.udayton.edu/bcca/vol17/iss1/4>

This Front Matter is brought to you for free and open access by the Department of Communication at eCommons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Basic Communication Course Annual by an authorized editor of eCommons. For more information, please contact frice1@udayton.edu, mschlangen1@udayton.edu.

Editor's Page

As educators we attempt to capture the imagination of students through carefully planned discourses capturing the complexity, richness, and humanity of our discipline. The basic course in communication is at once “fundamental” in the sense that it equips students with important skills; at the same time, the basic communication course is humanizing because it provides students with an opportunity to form community. Indeed, the basic communication course fully embodies the complexity, richness, and humanity apparent in communication scholarship.

Volume 17 of the *Basic Communication Course Annual* offers a great deal of insight on the varied dimensions of basic course pedagogy which, at the end of the day, allows the basic course to embody the ideals of our discipline. The complexity of communication is best illustrated in Turman's article exploring the use of technology in the basic course. As Paul explains, students' perceptions of teacher immediacy and affect are influenced not only by gender, but also by the use of technology. Paul's findings show us that the classroom communication environment must not be characterized with a “one approach fits all” mentality. Communication richness could be defined in a number of ways. As Marshall and Violanti show us, the use of on-line individual conferences dramatically improve students' perceptions of the class while at the same time causing students to feel better prepared. Last, the humanity present in all human communication is revealed through three separate studies. Javette Hayes reminds us of the very human behavior of using symbols to resolve classroom conflict and other problematic behaviors; Ratzenborg, Simonds, and Hunt provide all teachers with a shot

of humanity by taking us inside the minds of students as they prepare for classroom dialogue; and, Amy Rachelle Wolfson helps us understand how students with varying levels of communication apprehension react to different forms of pedagogy. Of course, this division of articles between complexity, richness, and humanity is arbitrary, for each article illustrates, in some way, these fundamental characteristics of human communication. For that we should all admire and attempt to emulate these scholars.

Basic course colleagues have heart and enact their own unique form of community as they intellectually engage and socially support their peers across the country. In this spirit, I must note the excellent summary of literature appearing as the lead article in this volume. Steve Hunt, David Novak, Julie Sendlak, and Kevin Meyer have provided all of us with an excellent look back at where this journal has been, while at the same time challenging us to continue advancing research and scholarship on the basic course. Their review is both comprehensive (spanning 15 years of this journal) and insightful.

In closing, I want to thank the many authors who contributed their work to the Annual for consideration. I was particularly impressed with both the quantity and quality of this year's submissions. I am also continually indebted to the rigorous and selfless work of the editorial board.

Best,
Scott Titsworth