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Communication Apprehension in Hybrid and Public Speaking Basic Communication Course Textbooks

Emily A. Paskewitz

Public speaking continues to be one of the most common fears for college students. At the beginning of every semester, students express fear and anxiety regarding the speeches that are inevitably required as a part of their basic communication course. Many of them are anxious about giving a speech. Dwyer and Davidson (2012) found as many as 61% students reported having a fear of speaking in front of a group. As instructors, it becomes important to figure out how best to help these students deal with their communication apprehension (CA).

Richmond & McCroskey (1998) define CA as fear or anxiety that is relative to either actual or potential communication with others (p. 37). Two related concepts, reticence and stage fright, serve as a foundation for research into CA. Reticence reflects the larger idea of people who are not competent communicators, with CA being a possible cause for reticence (McCroskey, 1982). Stage fright refers to anxiety related to public speaking or public presentations, and is one of the most common forms of context-based CA (Richmond & McCroskey, 1998). Context-based CA is “a relatively enduring, personality-type orientation toward communication in a given type of context” (McCroskey, 1984, p. 16). Research on stage fright fits in as one specific context...
(public speaking), while other contexts also play into context-based CA including meetings or classes, small groups, and interpersonal conversations (Richmond & McCroskey, 1998).

For many students, their first experience with a course on public speaking is in college. Morreale, Worley, and Hugenberg (2010) report 60.5% of schools require some sort of basic communication course for their students, and most of these courses take one of two approaches: public speaking or hybrid. The focus of a public speaking course is on developing fully planned and well thought out persuasive and informative speeches, with the lecture materials and textbooks for this type of course focus on the organizing, writing, and presenting of speeches (Morreale et al., 2010). The other common type of basic communication course is a hybrid course, which addresses several other communication contexts in addition to public speaking, such as interpersonal, small group, and intrapersonal communication (Morreale et al., 2010). Public speaking courses are the most common type of basic communication course, with 50% of schools using this approach, while 36% report using a hybrid approach to the basic course (Morreale et al., 2010).

Whether enrolled in a public speaking or hybrid focused basic communication course, students receive much of their information about CA from the textbooks used (Robinson, 1997). As noted by Pelias (1989), textbook selection becomes a complicated matter based on the number of textbooks available to departments, the primary goals of the department for the course, and the differences in coverage between different textbooks. Though researchers have dedicated years of literature to
understanding CA, what treatment methods are effective, and how the basic communication course impacts CA, little research exists looking at the content of textbooks in terms of helping address CA. The primary purpose of this study is to explore what differences exist between contemporary hybrid textbooks and public speaking textbooks in their discussions of CA.

CA AND THE BASIC COURSE

As students reach college, most are faced with a required communication class. The majority of studies addressing CA focus on this age group, allowing researchers the opportunity to see the impact that the basic communication course has on students. Over the past 30 years, multiple studies explored the connection between CA and the basic communication course (e.g., Carlson, Dwyer, Bingham, Cruz, Prisbell, & Fus, 2006; Dwyer & Fus, 2002; Pearson, Child, Herakova, Semlak, & Angelos, 2010; Robinson, 1997; Vevea, Pearson, Child, & Semlak, 2009/2010). CA can have a significant negative impact on student achievement in college, and the basic communication course. Students with higher levels of CA in their first two years of college were more likely to drop out of college and have lower GPA's (McCroskey, Booth-Butterfield, & Payne, 1989), and are more likely to drop out of basic communication courses or be absent on assigned speaking days (Richmond & McCroskey, 1992).

Students who persist and are able to complete the basic course tend to have lower CA scores at the end of the semester (Dwyer & Fus, 2002; Finn, Sawyer, &
Schrodt, 2009). Rubin, Rubin, and Jordan (1997) researched how instruction and experience in a public speaking course can help reduce a student’s CA across the semester. They administered a CA assessment at the beginning and the end of the semester, and found that CA scores decreased over the semester. Though the course was not structured to help reduce CA, the students that stayed had lower levels of CA than those that dropped out of the course.

**Basic Communication Course Textbooks and CA**

With the majority of schools across the nation using commercially published textbooks (81.3%), selecting a basic course textbook involves matching text content to the department goals for the basic course (Morreale et al., 2010). Previous research has focused on content included in the textbooks, and approaches used by both types of textbooks in teaching the basic communication course (e.g., Allen & Preiss, 1990; Clevenger & Phifer, 1959; Dedmon & Frandsen, 1964; Gibson, Gruner, Brooks, & Petrie, 1970; Gibson, Gruner, Hanna, Smythe, & Hayes, 1980; Gibson, Hanna, & Huddleston, 1985; Gibson, Kline, & Gruner, 1974; Hess & Pearson, 1992; Pelias, 1989; Schneider, 2011; Schneider & Walter-Reed, 2009; Worley, Worley, & McMahan, 1999). Hess and Pearson (1992) explored basic public speaking textbooks based on the common themes discussed within the texts. Five common themes emerged, with the majority of space going to discussion of speech prep-
aration, and only an average of five pages going towards discussion about anxiety.

Worley, Worley, and McMahan (1999) analyzed eight different hybrid textbooks to explore what common themes and topics were present within the texts. They analyzed the top hybrid textbooks from eight separate publishers, and noted that all eight texts were very similar. Though there were a few differences in chapter topics and coverage of public speaking, Worley, Worley, and McMahan (1999) noted all the texts had a very similar discussions about the common contexts of communication, including interpersonal, small group, and intrapersonal.

Two other studies specifically explored how public speaking textbooks address CA and anxiety. Clevenger and Phifer (1959) first completed a review of public speaking textbooks regarding their discussion of stage fright. Through their analysis, Clevenger and Phifer (1959) noted three common topics were covered in every public speaking textbook regarding stage fright, including a general overview, causes, and cures. Clevenger and Phifer (1959) found that most textbooks provide reasonable suggestions for addressing CA, but rarely connect treatments with the symptoms and causes presented.

In examining public speaking textbooks, Pelias (1989) noted how little attention is paid to CA. When referring to anxiety within the text, terminology was used interchangeably, and Pelias (1989) noted the lack of clear distinctions in the literature as the cause. Textbooks also left readers the responsibility to self-diagnose their apprehension. Instead of discussing higher level treatment options, textbook authors instead referred to
practicing, relaxing, positive thinking, focusing on the audience, and relying on previous experience to help students deal with their anxiety.

**Rationale**

The existing literature on CA demonstrates the important role that instruction and training about apprehension in the basic communication course have in reducing levels of CA over the course of the semester (Dwyer & Fus, 2002; Finn, Sawyer, & Schrodt, 2009). It becomes the job of the department and the instructor to provide students with the necessary sources and information to help them reduce their levels of CA. The primary way departments provide information about CA is through their textbooks (Robinson, 1997). Though previous studies have identified differences between basic communication textbooks on their content, no research comparing the discussion of CA in public speaking and hybrid textbooks exists. Thus, the primary purpose of this study was to identify any differences between introductory public speaking textbooks and introductory communication hybrid textbooks in their coverage of CA. Since the primary mode of instruction about CA is through the textbooks used in basic communication courses, it becomes important to understand what differences exist in the information students receive.

Though CA is primarily studied in public speaking settings, the concept also applies to other settings (i.e. interpersonal, small group, and meetings from McCroskey’s PRCA-24; Richmond & McCroskey, 1998). As Pelias (1989) noted in her study of public speaking text-
books, many different terms have been used to refer to CA, including anxiety, stage fright, fear, and nervousness; however, the research rarely differentiates between these terms clearly. Additionally, most discussions of CA in textbooks and the literature focus on the public speaking context exclusively. Though CA research has foundations in stage fright and reticence, conceptually the term refers to a variety of contexts for apprehension, including interpersonally, in small groups, and in meetings (Richmond & McCroskey, 1998). Since hybrid communication textbooks discuss these other contexts, the terminology may differ from public speaking textbooks. Thus, the first research question asks the following:

RQ1: What terms do public speaking and hybrid textbooks use to discuss CA?

Numerous self-report measures exist for assessing CA, including the PRCA-24 and the State-Trait Anxiety Inventory (Finn, Sawyer, & Behnke, 2009), and the PRPSA for public speaking anxiety (Richmond & McCroskey, 1998). The PRCA-24 is the primary tool used to assess CA, and consistently has reliability between .93 and .95 (McCroskey, Beatty, Kearney, & Plax, 1985). However, even with these readily available and reliable scales, the majority of previous research highlights very few diagnostic methods have been included in textbooks, with self-diagnosis being very common (Pelias, 1989). Basic course students are left with determining their own level of CA and anxiety when they may not have a lot of information about what CA is and looks like. In order to assess what methods are available...
to students for diagnosing CA, the following research question is posed:

**RQ2:** What methods of diagnosing CA are discussed in both public speaking and hybrid textbooks?

Within textbooks, Pelias (1989) also identified multiple coping and treatment strategies present in public speaking textbooks. These methods primarily focused on strategies students could do on their own (i.e. practice, relax, think positively), and skip over the more complex methods for coping (i.e. rhetoritherapy, systematic desensitization, cognitive restructuring). Though these complex treatment methods are still present in some literature, the majority of research still says basic skills training and completing a basic communication course is helpful in reducing CA (Finn, Sawyer, & Schrodt, 2009; Howe & Dwyer, 2007; Robinson, 1997). To explore the different treatment methods and strategies currently mentioned in both public speaking and hybrid textbooks, research question three is presented:

**RQ3:** What are the most common types of treatment described in public speaking and hybrid textbooks?

Many basic communication course instructors rely on the textbook to provide information about treating CA (Robinson, 1997). Pelias (1989) noted that the majority of textbooks do not provide comprehensive information about CA, but only include basic and surface information. Pelias (1989) noted an average of nine pages dedicated to CA in her analysis, yet only three years later Hess and Pearson (1992) find an average of five and a half pages to discussing CA. This change over amount of time prompts the final research question:
RQ4: Is there a difference between public speaking and hybrid textbooks in the amount of pages dedicated to CA?

**METHOD**

**Sample**

Twenty different textbooks were used for this study (see Table 1). Half of the textbooks were communication hybrid textbooks, which the author defined as an introductory communication textbook that includes information about the development, writing, and delivering of speeches, along with information about key communication topics, including group communication, interpersonal communication, and verbal and nonverbal communication. The second half of the textbooks were introductory public speaking textbooks, defined as an introductory communication textbook that focuses primarily on providing students with information regarding the development, writing, and delivering of speeches. In order to determine which textbooks were used for the analysis, the author contacted the book representatives for six major communication textbook publishers (Cengage Learning, Bedford/St. Martin’s, McGraw Hill, Pearson/Allyn & Bacon, Sage, and Oxford). These publishers were selected based on two criteria: presence at the National Communication Association convention, and sales within the field of communication. Five of the publishers were listed in the top 50 book publishers worldwide (Bedford/St. Martin’s, Pearson Company, McGraw Hill, Cengage Learning, and Oxford; Publishers Weekly, 2012).
### Table 1

**Textbooks Used for Content Analysis**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Public Speaking Textbooks</th>
<th>Hybrid Communication Textbooks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
Table 1 (continued)


The author contacted these five publishers’ sales representatives and requested copies of their top three introductory public speaking textbooks and top three introductory communication (hybrid) textbooks. Sales representatives were provided the author’s definitions of hybrid textbook and public speaking textbook, and were asked to send the top three texts that fit in each category based on sales and national adoption rates. After
receiving textbooks from these five publishers, only nine hybrid communication textbooks were available. In order to complete and balance the sample, the author contacted an additional prominent publisher within the field of communication, Sage, and requested their top hybrid communication textbook.

**Procedures**

Content analysis was used in order to collect data from both public speaking and hybrid textbooks. Content analysis is a form of coding used for both quantitative and qualitative research, and focuses on reducing the amount of material into categories. Krippendorff (1980) defines content analysis as: “a research technique for making replicable and valid inferences from data to their context” (p. 21). Krippendorff (1980) later describes content analysis as a form of inquiry into the “symbolic meaning of messages” (p. 22). By using content analysis as a form of coding, the researcher will be able to find similarities and differences between the textbooks based on how they cover CA.

In order to analyze each textbook, the author developed a coding sheet and coding book based on each research question. Coders identified the presence of key topics and themes related to CA within the text on the code sheet. The key topics and themes for each research question were developed by the author. For example, for the first research question, the author identified terms present in the literature used to refer to CA by looking at literature reviews and through searches in databases and on the internet. The author also talked to long term basic communication course instructors about what
terms they had encountered in teaching. The most prevalent terms were included on the code sheet, along with spaces for coders to indicate other terms they found in the textbooks. The author used the same process for developing key topics and themes for each research question. The code sheet also had spots to indicate the presence of key topics and themes previously identified by the author, or a space to indicate other topics or themes not previously identified for the code sheet.

After developing the code sheet and codebook, the author and a trained graduate student coder coded 10% of the textbooks (one hybrid and one public speaking) for inter-coder reliability tests. During coder training, the graduate student coder was introduced to the codebook and code sheet in a one hour training session. Coders were to read the entire section and/or chapter of the textbook that discussed CA and recorded their findings on the code sheet. During the training session, the author and the trained coder read a sample public speaking textbook and a sample hybrid textbook section regarding CA from an outside textbook, and discussed codebook issues and coding questions. As issues emerged, the coding sheet and codebook were clarified before moving into inter-coder reliability testing. Cohen’s Kappa was satisfactory for both hybrid textbooks, (.77) and for public speaking textbooks (.82). Any disagreements were resolved before the author coded the remaining textbooks.
RESULTS

Research question one sought to explore if there was a difference between public speaking and hybrid textbooks in the terminology they use to discuss CA. In order to answer this question, five chi-square tests of independence were conducted based on the terms that were identified in the textbooks (see Table 2). A chi-square was calculated comparing the frequency in usage of the term CA in public speaking and hybrid textbooks.¹ A significant interaction was found, \( \chi^2 (1, N = 20) = 5.05, p < .03, FET = .07 \). Hybrid textbooks used the

¹ One of the basic assumptions for using the chi-square test is to have at least 80% of expected frequencies of cells to be greater than five. If this assumption is not met, alternate tests have been developed to test for differences. In this study, Fisher’s Exact Test’s were used to detect differences between textbooks, but were not significant. However, other researchers have questioned the expected frequency assumption calling it too conservative (Howell, 1992), and found the chi-square test is still applicable even when a large proportion of the expected frequencies are between one and five (Everitt, 1993). The expected values are likely to fall below five when you have small sample sizes, as in this case. However, this does not necessarily mean the chi-square test is inaccurate. As noted by Howell (1992), “with small sample sizes, power is more likely to be a problem than inflated Type I error rates” (p. 41). Additionally, looking at the frequency counts themselves, it is possible to see differences between the two types of textbooks. Because of the nature of the sample, the textbooks selected represent a large portion of the population of textbooks available to instructors. With the large portion of the population being represented in this project, it is possible to see differences between the two types of textbooks by looking at the frequencies themselves.
term CA more than public speaking textbooks. Chi-squares were all insignificant for other terms: speech anxiety, $\chi^2 (1, N = 20) = .20, p = .65, FET = 1.00$; stage fright, $\chi^2 (1, N = 20) = 2.40, p = .12, FET = .30$; fear, $\chi^2 (1, N = 20) = .00, p = 1.00, FET = 1.00$; and nervousness, $\chi^2 (1, N = 20) = 3.33, p = .07, FET = .17$. Public speaking textbooks used nervousness and stage fright more often and hybrid textbooks used speech anxiety more.

### Table 2

*Frequency Counts for CA Terminology in Textbooks*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Textbook</th>
<th>Public Speaking</th>
<th>Hybrid</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speech Anxiety</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage Fright</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nervousness</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fear</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Research question two focused on figuring out what types of diagnosis are discussed in public speaking and hybrid textbooks. Of the existing diagnosing methods that exist in communication literature today, three types of diagnosis were present in the twenty textbooks coded for this study: PRCA-24, PRPSA, and self-diagnosis (see Table 3). No significant differences on the chi-square test were found: PRCA-24, $\chi^2 (1, N = 20) = .00, p = 1.00, FET = 1.00$; PRPSA, $\chi^2 (1, N = 20) = 1.05, p = .31, FET = 1.00$; and self-diagnosis, $\chi^2 (1, N = 20) = .39, p = 1.00$, $FET = 1.00$. Public speaking textbooks used nervousness and stage fright more often and hybrid textbooks used speech anxiety more.
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=.53, *FET* = 1.00. In the twenty textbooks analyzed, the primary method for diagnosis was self-diagnosis (see Table 3).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Frequency Counts for Types of Diagnosis**
<p>| <strong>Present in Textbooks</strong> |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Textbook</th>
<th>Public Speaking</th>
<th>Hybrid</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PRCA-24</td>
<td>2 Yes 8 No</td>
<td>2 Yes 8 No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRPSA</td>
<td>1 Yes 9 No</td>
<td>0 Yes 10 No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Diagnosis</td>
<td>8 Yes 2 No</td>
<td>9 Yes 1 No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Research question three sought to discover what types of treatment are most commonly described in public speaking and hybrid textbooks. Table 4 shows the types of treatments identified in the textbook analysis. Nine chi-square tests were calculated for each type of treatment identified during coding, along with the different types of textbook. Visualization, $\chi^2 (1, N = 20) = 5.50, p = .02, FET = .06$; and movement, $\chi^2 (1, N = 20) = 5.50, p = .02, FET = .06$; were the only significant chi-square statistics, with public speaking textbooks recommending visualization and movement more than hybrid textbooks. All of the other chi-square tests were insignificant: deep breathing, $\chi^2 (1, N = 20) = .22, p = .64, FET = 1.00$; practice, $\chi^2 (1, N = 20) = 3.59, p = .06, FET = .21$; skills training, $\chi^2 (1, N = 20) = 3.33, p = .07, FET = .17$; cognitive restructuring, $\chi^2 (1, N = 20) = .83, p = .36, FET = .65$; audience focus, $\chi^2 (1, N = 20) = .27, p = .61, FET = 1.00$; positive imagery, $\chi^2 (1, N = 20) = .22, p = .64$. 
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Table 4  
*Frequency Counts for Treatment Methods Present in Textbooks*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Textbook</th>
<th>Public Speaking</th>
<th>Hybrid</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deep Breathing</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practice</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skills Training</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cognitive Restructuring</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audience Focus</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive Imagery</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Systematic Desensitization</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visualization</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Movement</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ \chi^2 (1, N = 20) = 1.82, p = .18, \text{FET} = .37. \]

Finally, to answer research question four, a t-test was calculated to determine whether there was a difference between public speaking and hybrid textbooks in the amount of pages they dedicate to CA, \( t(18) = 3.83, p = .001 \), indicating a significant difference between the two types of textbooks. Public speaking textbooks (\( M = 10.85, SD = 3.86 \)) dedicate more pages to discussing CA than hybrid textbooks (\( M = 5.6, SD = 1.98 \)).
DISCUSSION

The first research question explored any differences between public speaking and hybrid textbooks in the terminology they use to discuss CA. Analysis of the textbooks showed very few differences, other than CA being used more in hybrid textbooks than public speaking textbooks. Richmond and McCroskey (1998) highlight context based CA in four categories, and all four are a part of hybrid communication textbooks (Pearson & West, 1991). Using the term CA is important in hybrid textbooks since the various contexts are discussed, and could explain why public speaking textbooks use other terms. Discussing apprehension in a variety of communication situations matches the content of the hybrid textbooks. Frequency counts for the remaining terms show many hybrid and public speaking textbooks use the term speech anxiety. Since basic communication courses all have a public speaking element, it makes sense for both types of textbooks to mention speech anxiety as an issue for students.

Research question two looked at what types of diagnostic tools are included for students within textbooks, with only three (PRCA-24, PRPSA, and self-diagnosis) being present in the textbooks surveyed. Of the 20 textbooks analyzed, only five included some sort of survey for measuring CA or anxiety. Overwhelmingly, self-diagnosis is the predominant method provided for students to diagnose their CA, allowing students to select techniques based on their own needs. Pelias (1989) also noted the trend of self-diagnosis, but expressed concern about having students self-diagnosing CA, especially when the treatment options provided were very complex.
and scientifically presented. However, instructors and departments may offer other diagnosis methods in class as supplements to the textbook material. Additionally, instructor’s materials and online textbook content may include diagnostic surveys which are not present in the textbooks.

Research question three identified what types of treatments are most commonly presented in public speaking and hybrid textbooks. Visualization and movement are common treatment methods suggested in public speaking textbooks, while other methods varied in their occurrence. Robinson (1997) also found visualization was commonly used by basic communication course instructors, but not as commonly as skills training or cognitive modification. Both hybrid and public speaking textbooks discuss the importance of practice and positive imagery for students, with the more complex treatment methods (systematic desensitization and cognitive restructuring) rarely appearing in any type of textbook. Since the textbooks primarily focused on presenting practical solutions for students (Robinson, 1997), it is not surprising to see basic treatment techniques given the primary diagnostic tool is self-diagnosis. Presenting students with very practical and simple ways to deal with their anxiety allows students to take action themselves in addressing their CA.

Finally, research question four found that public speaking textbooks dedicate more pages to discussing CA than hybrid textbooks, with a range of pages from two and a half up to 19. This range is quite smaller than the range Pelias (1989) noted (three to 51) and shows some change in textbooks over the past 23 years. Public speaking textbooks in this study dedicated an average of...
10.5 pages to discussing apprehension, while Pelias (1989) found an average of nine, and Hess and Pearson (1992) found an average of five. Public speaking textbooks likely spend more time discussing CA because the course is heavily geared towards public speaking and is more salient for students. However, hybrid textbooks also tend to focus on the public speaking setting. Of the textbooks surveyed, most hybrid textbooks defined CA then quickly move to discuss the public speaking context (speech anxiety). Only four hybrid textbooks mentioned other specific contexts for CA (primarily interpersonally and group), while most exclusively talked about public speaking.

**Implications**

Overall, the results from this study are very similar to the study completed by Pelias (1989). This study provides an overview of what information students have access to regarding CA in their textbooks. There are very few differences between public speaking and hybrid textbooks in how they address CA. Though public speaking textbooks have more pages dedicated to discussing CA, the diagnosis tools and treatment methods are similar to the content included in hybrid textbooks. For students enrolled in the basic course, whether it is a hybrid or public speaking only course, they are receiving very similar information about CA.

Secondly, hybrid and public speaking textbooks are very similar in their basic overview of CA for students. Both types of textbook rely on self-diagnosis for students to identify CA, and rely on very basic treatment methods students are able to incorporate themselves.
all, students are made responsible for determining how much CA they have and what to do about it. It is beneficial for students to self-select treatments based on their need (see Dwyer’s 2000 discussion of the multidimensional model); however, since students use their textbooks as a primary source for information about CA (Robinson, 1997), this basic approach makes CA approachable and manageable for students.

These results also provide information for departments and instructors to consider when selecting basic communication textbooks. Courses primarily working with higher CA students may want to select a textbook with more information dedicated to the topic, while courses working with lower CA students may find other textbooks a better choice. As institutions incorporate special sections of the basic course for high apprehensive students (Dwyer, 1995; Robinson, 1997), instructors may want to consider different textbooks for these sections. Every textbook provides different interpretations and perspectives about CA, and understanding what information is presented across multiple textbooks assists in deciding what content and textbook is the best match for the high CA students.

Though researchers have continued to explore and expand the literature on CA, much of the recent research is not present in the discussions of CA within the textbooks. There are three possible reasons for this. First, the majority of these textbooks are in their third or higher edition (14 textbooks). Most textbooks make few changes between editions, meaning the original CA content from edition one may rarely change across editions. Secondly, textbook authors may be under pressure from editors to keep content similar. As noted in
Hess and Pearson (1992), pressure from publishers keeps the textbook authors from making major changes in their content in order to stay competitive with other textbooks on the market. Thirdly, textbook authors may keep content at a very basic level since, as noted earlier, students are responsible for diagnosing and managing their own CA. With 61% of students reporting having some fear or anxiety with public speaking (Dwyer & Davidson, 2012), giving students basic and easily applicable information seems like an easy way to help students deal with their CA.

However, this does raise questions on what should be included in textbooks for students about CA. Pelias (1989) noted the safe and basic information can help students, but also may be ineffective or impractical for students. High apprehensive students may not find relief in thinking positively, would have a hard time trying to relax with little to no explanation of how, and would rarely take opportunities to speak outside of the classroom (Pelias, 1989). Where does this leave textbook authors when writing about CA? Recent research provides new and effective ideas and methods for managing CA (Dwyer, 2000; Finn, Sawyer, & Behnke, 2009; Finn, Sawyer, & Schrodt, 2009), but right now the onus is on instructors to read the literature and incorporate these newer or complex methods into the course for students as they see fit. With textbooks as the main source of information about CA, textbook authors should consider what new research and information could help students manage their CA. Introducing the multidimensional model (Dwyer, 2000) could give students more options for managing their CA, or greater explanation of the management techniques present in texts would allow
students to better address and manage their CA in the basic course. Additionally, with the increase of websites and online materials with textbooks, including more information about CA in these settings for students would provide the information which textbook space may limit.

Limitations and Future Research

A primary limitation to this study was the small sample size. Only using ten of each type of textbook limits the amount of generalizations that can be made about how CA is addressed. This study provides a foundation for further research into the different aspects of CA that are discussed in textbooks. Repeating this study in the future with a larger sample of textbooks may generate different results, and may provide different information about the differences between public speaking and hybrid textbooks. Additionally, this sample included a mixture of public speaking handbooks and textbooks. Since these were the top selling texts from the publishers, the handbooks were included. Future studies may want to clarify what counts as a public speaking textbook and focus on the differences available in textbooks compared to handbooks.

Secondly, there are questions about the use of a chi-square. In this study, some chi-squares had expected values below five, which violates the assumption of the test. However, the descriptive statistics in this study do highlight the differences which were pointed out with the chi-square tests. Looking at the frequency counts and the basic descriptive statistics can provide a clear picture of the differences between hybrid and public speaking textbooks, and are a great supplement to the
chi-square tests. Additionally, since this study is using textbooks, the procedures for sampling are different than with population sampling. Future studies using a larger sample may avoid some of the issues with the chi-square tests.

Future research should look at how instructors are teaching about CA in the classroom. Textbooks can provide a base knowledge for students regarding CA, but the different individual teaching methods may be added, changing the information students have available to them regarding CA. Looking at what additional materials are used by instructors can help highlight important concepts and themes for textbook authors to add to their textbooks. It is also important to look at the instructional materials accompanying each textbooks.

CONCLUSION

This study fills a gap in the literature regarding CA. Providing information regarding how CA is discussed in both hybrid and public speaking textbooks helps instructors and department leaders understand what differences exist between these textbooks. Though the research regarding CA continues to expand our understanding of what factors impact CA, the content included in textbooks regarding CA has changed very little over the past 50 years. As communication instructors, it becomes our responsibility to find ways to help our students deal with their CA. Though the current research continues to explore what factors can help students, the research is not reaching the textbooks. Publishers and authors should take note of the entire body...
of research regarding CA, and bring it into their textbooks. It also becomes the job of instructors and departments to find a book that addresses department needs, and can help students become more confident speakers.
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