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Editor’s Page

This year the National Communication Association (NCA) celebrates its centennial. NCA began over a dispute between speech teachers and English teachers over the perception of oral communication receiving less instructional attention, and for the last century communication experts have been the primary party responsible for communication instruction of college students. Over the years the basic course has largely been focused on public speaking as the course to deliver this instruction, though we developed, and still teach, interpersonal communication and hybrid courses that also include small group communication. There have been several different venues in which the basic communication course has received attention during these hundred years. For just over half of them the annual Basic Course Director’s Conference has convened to discuss administrative issues pertaining to the implementation of the basic course, and for twenty-six years the pages of this journal, *The Basic Communication Course Annual*, have served as a platform for those who conduct research into the pedagogy and performance in this important course. This issue of the journal is no different, but it does contain two changes to the traditional format of the Annual.

First, I will provide a brief synopsis of this year’s Basic Course Director’s Conference, held in Dayton, OH
and hosted by the University of Dayton on January 23-25, 2014. This brief summary will help to record the events and issues raised at the conference in a more durable form so that people can continue to reflect and consider what was discussed at this important gathering. Second, and perhaps more significantly, this issue contains the first ever “Basic Course Forum,” a collection of peer-reviewed essays that present arguments on a specific question related to the basic course. The first question addressed by the Forum is “What are the central student learning outcomes for the basic course, regardless of format?” These essays are short, insightful and meant to spark a continued conversation about what we aim to do in the basic course. Before I highlight the contents of this year’s essays, however, let me highlight some elements from the program from the 52nd annual Basic Course Director’s Conference.

The theme of the conference was “A Basic Course Flyover,” and the conference hosted panels designed to provide a needs assessment from the constituencies served by the basic course. The First panel consisted of executives from corporations such as Proctor & Gamble, Altran Solutions, Lowe’s Home Improvement, the Dayton Art Institute, and Midmark Corporation. These executives gave brief presentations on what they saw as the communication needs of their organizations and the communication skills they felt should be taught to the college students they eventually hire. Among the skills they mentioned were listening, civility and respect, purpose driven communication, assertiveness and dialogue. Surprisingly, they did not mention public speaking specifically, but instead focused much more on context independent skills.
The second panel contained representatives from three different institutions who came from non-communication disciplines. These disciplines included Landscape Architecture, Sociology, Engineering, and Philosophy. One other member was also the Director of Assessment at a large Western university. These panelists were asked the same question, and they discussed again, the need for students to learn how to listen and also be civil. One of the panelists actually supplied the conference attendees with a grid of student learning outcomes he found for the basic course and pointed out how diverse they were.

A final third panel addressed the implementation of the K-12 Common Core adopted by 46 states and the impact this may have on the basic course in colleges and universities. The new speaking and listening standards in the Common Core guarantee instruction in these skills for students before they even reach college, and thus the students who will come to us in the future will be more prepared in these skills than those traditionally entering college. This panel consisted of a K-12 teacher, former Ohio Governor Bob Taft who helped develop the Common Core while in office, Susan Bodary who was Governor Taft’s Education Policy Advisor, Char Shryock who is a member of PAARC the body developing assessment for the Common Core, and Anna Wright the Director of Communication Education at Illinois State University. This panel engendered a robust discussion about areas where communication faculty could help K-12 develop assignments and assessments for communication and listening competencies, as well as ways the K-12 instructors could help college faculty better understand student preparedness as a result of the Common
Core. All three of these panels highlighted the need for collaboration and cooperation between the various constituencies served by the basic communication course.

In this volume of the basic course we extend the discussion of the conference through both the Forum and the research articles contained herein. The Forum essays all take unique approaches toward addressing central learning outcomes in the basic course. Samuel Wallace proposes a mission-driven approach to determining student learning outcomes for the basic course, or any course for that matter. Rodney Troester’s argument presages the discussions that took place at the Basic Course Director’s Conference by arguing for civility as a central learning outcome. William Upchurch then makes the case for a public address centered basic course, while David Kahl argues for a critical approach to the basic course. Finally, Andrea Patterson and Omar Swartz propose making social justice a central aim of basic course pedagogy. Each of these brief essays make clear, albeit different, arguments for the main focus of the basic course and give readers a lot to consider when developing their basic communication course.

The lead article, by Melissa Broeckelman-Post and Angela Hosek, explores the use of in-class and out-of-class peer workshops on a variety of student performance measures. They found students preferred in-class workshops and also speculated that doing these types of workshops first could help students develop skills and trust when working out-of-class workshops. The second essay in the Annual, by Kathleen Denker, examines the impact of classroom response systems on student communication apprehension. She found that “clickers” can help mitigate communication apprehension in classroom
settings and may facilitate more participation by students in peer evaluations.

Luke and Leah Lefebvre offer a descriptive analysis of communication centers that assist and augment basic communication course instruction. They cover the institutional context, structure, services, resources, impact and curriculum of these centers. This piece also serves as a strong reference tool for departments and directors seeking to develop such centers on their campuses by provided data and models of effective centers across the country. In the fourth article of the Annual Melissa Broeckelmann-Post and colleagues explore whether frequent quizzing in the basic course can lead to greater student preparation and leaning. The findings of their work provide a variety of assignments and ways to structure the basic course that can help increase student performance and learning in the course.

The final essay in this volume by Emily Paskewitz reports a comparative analysis of hybrid and public speaking textbooks and their coverage of communication apprehension. Her work determined there has been little change in the way this key concept has been taught in popular basic course textbooks, perhaps illustrating a need to consider updating this area of pedagogy in the basic course. Taken together, all of these research articles illustrate the complexity of approaches in the basic course today, and demonstrate how far the course has come in the century since the inception of NCA. There are still many important issues the basic course faces today, and many different ways in which we can explore how the discipline approaches those challenges. The articles in this volume of the Annual highlight some of the
best work being done to advance and strengthen the quality of the basic course.

In closing, I wish to extend my sincere thanks to all of those who served as the editorial board for volume 26. Your dedication, collegiality, thoughtfulness and insight helped bring this volume to print.

Sincerely,
Joseph M. Valenzano III (Editor)
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The Basic Course Forum

Student Learning Outcomes: Primary Drivers of Course Design

Samuel P. Wallace

Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) should be the core around which every college course is centered. As a result of taking this course: What should students know? What should they be able to do or to demonstrate? What should students value? Perhaps most important, How should students be changed or affected by taking this course? Effective course planning is made possible when these outcomes are focused and specific, and when the outcomes themselves are a high priority of the course. In spite of this maxim, student learning outcomes have not always been the primary driver of the design(s) of the basic course in Communication.

One of the questions on the table, then, is "What forces have typically driven basic course designs?" A primary driver is likely found in the traditions in the field of Speech or Speech Communication. The basic course, much like the modern field of Communication itself, began nearly a century ago with its focus on public speaking. That tradition endures to the present, and it still merits our attention. Course designs are also driven by department traditions. That is, the course is taught in a particular way because that is the way the course has always been taught at a particular institution. Sometimes the shape of the course is based on the
preferences or the particular expertise of the faculty member who directs the course. In those schools in which the basic course is service oriented or is part of the general education curriculum, the design is frequently influenced by the expressed needs of other departments whose majors take the course. Finally, to some extent, mandates from legislatures, boards of regents, or other governing bodies influence basic course content.

Few of the drivers mentioned above constitute a strong rationale or validation for a particular design. This lack of justification and clear focus has placed many programs in jeopardy when budget cuts loom, when turf conflicts crop up, or when questions of centrality to institutional mission arise. To combat these and other threats, the basic course program should have a solid rationale and a strong connection to the mission of the institution and the general education curriculum.

The other question on the table, and the focus of this essay, is: "What should drive the design of the basic course in Communication?" Instead of being driven by traditions, or preference, or mandates, the design must be driven by student learning outcomes. What specifically do we want our students to know and be able to do, and how do we want them to change as a result of taking this course? This is easy to state in a strong way, but determining those student learning outcomes is a much larger and more complex task. Where do these SLOs come from? Following are some suggested primary and secondary sources.

Source: The traditions of the field of Communication certainly need to be considered. One of the central objectives of NCA and its membership is, and has al-
ways been, engaged citizenship. Even since the time of the ancient Greeks, participation in civic affairs has been made possible by competent speaking in public and the ability to move others with words. So the knowledge and skill necessary to move others should be considered for inclusion on our list.

**Source:** The environment in which the basic course lives should have some influence on the student learning outcomes. The institution housing the department of Communication has a mission to accomplish, as does the general education curriculum in which many basic courses operate. As such, the basic course should recognize its obligation to support those missions, even if it is in some small way. Many institutions want its graduates to be good citizens, or leaders, or ethical communicators. The basic course can certainly make a contribution to the support of those goals. In addition, if the course is part of general education (or if other departments require the course for their majors), the faculty members of those departments and the professions that they represent should be regularly consulted to determine what kinds of oral communication knowledge and skills can benefit their students. This does not mean, as many basic course directors have said, that Communication professionals should allow the content of their courses to be determined by others. It does mean that, once those oral communication needs have been identified by consultation with the mission, general education, and representatives of constituent departments and professions, that Communication professionals will deliver the course design to achieve those outcomes. Fulfilling needs and supporting the mission will establish a strong
rationale for the course as well as position it as central to supporting the institutional mission.

**Source:** Although this might be considered a temporary problem, course designers should consider remediation for the current generation of students, often identified as "digital natives" (Prensky, 2001), who have been drawn into text and other digital media based means of interacting with others. As Carr (2011) and McLuhan (1964) have pointed out, the tools that people use shape the way their brains work. One result of this reshaping phenomenon, according to Mullen (2011), is that the digital natives are becoming less skilled at empathy and social interaction, have lower acuity of perception of nonverbal behaviors, and they have a reluctance to interact socially. This decline in face-to-face communication skill is resulting in a reduction of the repertoire of situation or context appropriate communication behavioral strategies that we customarily build up from childhood well into adulthood. A focus on oral communication in interpersonal settings should be considered by the basic course.

**Source:** Counteraction of the influence of media on the nature of discussion and civic communication. Somehow, the United States and some other countries have developed a culture of shouting that has replaced reasoned discussion and debate. Much media attention is given to "civic discussions" of this type, and an apparent result is the perception by our citizens that this is how it should be done. Listening either does not exist, or it is done simply to find an opening to express one's own point of view. As conversation becomes more "competitive," there is little attempt to consider or understand the point of view of any other person. A lack of civility
has evolved from the shouting matches that masquerade as "town meetings" to the point that many politicians and average citizens see no use in this type of forum. The basic course should consider student learning outcomes that encourage listening and dialogue. This civil dialogue should be aimed at open minded consideration of the point of view of others with the goal of understanding, and not necessarily agreeing with, that point of view.

It is unlikely that this list is exhaustive; but it is a starting place to get us thinking about the possibilities. This brief list also illustrates two issues. The first is that it’s probably not productive to try to standardize the basic course across institutions. As mentioned earlier, basic course designers should be trying to adapt the course to the mission of the institution and to the needs of constituent departments and professions. As every institution has a different approach to missions and specific constituent needs, to apply a standard course to all situations weakens the value of the course as well as weakens its position in the institution. This would be equivalent to the dark ages physicians who prescribed a customary "blood-letting" as a cure of every disease and injury (For a silly but meaningful illustration of this point, see the YouTube replay of "Theodoric of York: Medieval Barber" from the 1970's Saturday Night Live series.). The second issue is that we should consider student learning outcomes to be somewhat "fluid" or transient in nature. The digital natives issue would not have existed 25 years ago, so there would have been no reason to treat it. While civic communication has nearly always had a contentious nature, we still might be hard pressed to find many examples in recent history where
the political communication climate is as uncivilized and non productive as it currently seems to be. There might be times when the need to learn lessons of civility is not as acute, so it might take a lower priority. Even so, the lesson seems to be that basic course designers and instructors should always be looking out for potential problem areas related to oral communication. Finally, in the event that the institutional or general education mission is modified, the student learning outcomes of the basic course should be revisited and perhaps adjusted to continue to support that mission and allow the basic course to maintain its central position in the institution.

Following is an example of the application of the SLOs that have been discussed in this essay. Based on the university and general education mission, feedback from professionals, consultation with faculty members of constituent departments, recognizing the idiosyncratic needs of the current generation of students, and recognizing the nature of the current trend of non-productive "civic" communication, a medium sized Midwestern University adopted the following student learning outcomes:

* **Explanation**: Students will be able to explain abstract, complex, or specialized concepts to listeners who are not specialists but who have a need to understand the concepts being explained.

* **Advocacy**: Students will be able to advocate a position based on sound logic and credible evidence.

* **Civil Dialogue**: Students will be able to engage in true dialogue, using open minded listening, using civil attitudes and behaviors, in the attempt to understand
the points of view of others and to express their own points of view.

*Critical Analysis of Messages:* Students will be able to attend to, accurately interpret information and intentions, and craft appropriate responses.

The course design resulting from these student learning outcomes is not the focus of this essay. However, it should be clearly noted that the design of this course was the result of and flowed from the student learning outcomes. The student learning outcomes were not the result of the course design. In addition, it was determined that the SLOs identified for this particular course could be achieved in a "context agnostic" design. All of the SLOs mentioned above could be achieved in a variety of communication contexts. None of the SLOs absolutely demand to be taught in a public speaking, group, interpersonal, or other setting.

To be sure that the course design is achieving the student learning outcomes, a regular and systematic program of assessment should be implemented. Along with allowing clear and sharply focused course design, the use of student learning outcomes can be used to develop equally clear and focused assessment tools. The process is made more efficient if the measures are directly based on achievement of the student learning outcomes rather than trying to measure the effect of specific assignments. Designed in this way, a single rubric or other assessment tool can measure the effect of any number of assignments or types of assignments designed to achieve the outcome. By extension, it allows changing the design or specific assignments as needed without an overhaul of assessment procedures.
The design process described in this essay should not be considered a "one-time" activity. It is essential for the designers of the basic course at any institution to regularly examine the mission, the needs of constituent departments and professions, and the transient needs of the times.
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Civility as a Central Student Learning Outcome in the Basic and Introductory Communication Courses

Rod Troester

A recent edition of Spectra includes a collection of four thought-pieces focusing on the issue of civility. Former NCA President Lynn Turner observes “We need to come to the public stage now to offer what we do best; helping others develop the social glue that is attained through civil interactions at every level of human interaction. We can respond to these calls for civil behavior and we need to begin now” (2011, p. 2). Interestingly, several years earlier Sypher (2004) issued a similar call to action for communication scholars to “reclaim” civility and civil discourse in organizations, arguing that we must “remoralize what it means to be competent communicators” (p. 257). The purpose of this essay is to briefly explore why and how civility ought to become a central learning outcome in our various basic courses and introductory communication courses.¹ We as a community of communication teachers and scholars are uniquely positioned to address Turner and Sypher’s challenges. Moreover, there is existing literature to inform the development of what Turner calls “the social glue” necessary at every level of human interaction and

¹ I understand the focus of this annual is on the basic course. Depending on format, basic courses might include elements of interpersonal communication, public speaking, and business and professional/organizational communication. These common contexts are often also offered as introductory level courses available to communication majors and non-majors.
emphasize or re-emphasize civility as an essential aspect of communication competence across the discipline.

The basic argument being advanced is that civility ought to be a fundamental or central concern and guiding principle in our basic and introductory courses. Like the more common standards of effectiveness and appropriateness, civility ought to become one of the key standards by which we judge the quality of communication, and consequently ought to become a central learning outcome and a more significant focus in our teaching and research. Specifically, students should leave our basic interpersonal, public speaking, and business and professional speaking courses with an understanding of and appreciation for how an attitude of civility can positively influence their communication effectiveness, and gain context-specific experience in translating civil attitudes into communication behaviors. Examples of more specific learning outcomes will be describe for interpersonal, business and professional, and public speaking contexts. Therefore the first part of this essay will briefly outline the “case” for civility as a central learning outcome, while the second part will provide a very selective look at the available literature that can inform the inclusion and infusion of civility into our courses followed by sample student learning outcomes for each course.

**The Case and Need for Civility in Basic Courses**

Imagine someone trying to make the argument that incivility and rudeness ought to characterize effective and appropriate communication among people. It would be difficult to advocate that communicators be rude, dis-
respectful, and dismissive of their intended audience. The alternative position, at least at first glance, seems an easier and more reasonable position to advocate. Whether civility ought to join effective and appropriate as standards of communication quality will likely depend on how we chose to define our terms.

Dictionary definitions generally suggest courtesy and politeness in act and utterance as being important defining characteristics of civility. Popular writers like Carter (1998), argue that civility “...is the sum of the many sacrifices we are called to make for the sake of living together” (p. 11). Civility “guru” P.M. Forni, offered the following definition of incivility as “actions or verbal exchanges you would consider rude, disrespectful, dismissive, threatening, demeaning, or inappropriate” (Forni, 2003). Forni suggests “Civility allows us to connect successfully with others” (2002, p. 6). Troester and Mester (2007) suggest civility is “a set of verbal and nonverbal behaviors reflecting fundamental respect for others and generating harmonious and productive relationships” (pp. 9-10).

What do these varying definitions suggest? Civil behavior clearly involves our attitudes toward others and perhaps a degree of self-sacrifice. They focus on behavioral expressions that convey courtesy and arguably result in more positive relationships. Civility can be thought of as an attitude-value-belief we hold toward others, a way of behaving--communicating based on that attitude-value-belief, as well as, a conscious choice we can make in terms of how we perceive and behave--communicate with others. Clearly our verbal and nonverbal communication behavior can manifest and reflect civility—if we so choose.
The next reasonable question to pose is whether there exists a need for including civility as an element in evaluating the quality of communication. The research would suggest we are trending toward increased incivility. An often cited survey conducted by the Pew Charitable Trusts a decade ago found that 8 in 10 Americans report that a lack of respect (civility) is a serious problem, with 6 in 10 stating that civility had become worse in recent years (Farkas & Johnson, 2002). The Pew Study concluded “…most human enterprises proceed more smoothly if people are respectful and considerate of one another, and they easily become poisoned if people are unpleasant and rude” (p. 7).

Turning to the workplace (where most of us and our students will spend one-third of our waking hours) Forni’s 2003 “Baltimore Workplace Civility Study” found that 25% of workplace respondents felt their workplace had become less civil in the preceding year, 36% felt they had experienced either occasional or frequent uncivil workplace behavior in the past year, and 83% agreed that civility was “very important” to the work environment (Forni, 2003).

In a finding similar, though less significant than that of the Pew survey, eleven percent of Forni’s respondents admitted to being the perpetrator of occasional or frequent uncivil behavior at the workplace. It should come as no surprise that a recent Gallup poll found that strong co-worker and boss-work relationships and increased satisfaction from personal recognition—marks of civility—will potentially benefit the U.S. economy (Saad, 2009). Clearly civility is an important societal and organizational issue.
If we consider the survey research, we can conclude that standards of civility and acceptable behavior are slipping. If it is reasonable to assume that communication behavior can manifest attitudes of civility, how can and should we guide our students toward more civil interaction in our basic and introductory communication courses?

**Civility and Interpersonal Communication**

Traditionally when we speak of interpersonal communication we are focusing our attention on one-on-one situations usually of a personal nature. In an era where the “smart, instant, and digital” seem to dominate, how we regard the other person in a relationship should remain an essential consideration. If we look at one of the earliest interpersonal communication texts/readers, *Bridges Not Walls* (Stewart, 1973), the readings are thick with concern for “the other” in a way similar to that suggested by Carter. One classic article in *Bridges Not Walls* is Buber’s “Elements of the Inter-human” (Stewart, 2009) which lays out the “I and Thou” of effective interpersonal relationships. The work of Buber informs the writing of Arnett and Arneson (1999) in their book *Dialogic civility in a cynical age: Community, hope, and interpersonal relationships*. This work seeks to focus attention on the critical role civility can play in establishing positive relationships and keeping conversations going.

Teachers and scholars interested in infusing civility into an interpersonal classroom could also look to the early work of Hart and Burks (1972) and their concept of rhetorical sensitivity. They suggest that there are two
fundamental questions that must be asked in order to shape and construct a communicative response in any given situation: 1) what is to be said (content), and 2) how should it be said (process). The “how” focuses on civility’s role in shaping communication behavior. This work can be combined with the perspective of Rosenfield, Hayes, & Frentz (1976) who suggest people are at their best when they are thoughtful, careful, and of good humor. Taken together, this body of early interpersonal work would suggest that people are at their best when they are (a) truly civil—i.e., thoughtful, careful and filled with good humor, and (b) willing and able to construct messages that adapt the content that must be presented to the unique demands of the situation. Deetz and Stevenson (1986) provide a more complete development of this approach. Civil interpersonal communicators fully take into account the other and the situation to be addressed and are thereby willing and able to craft and construct messages that are adapted to and appropriate for the other and the relationship.

An example of a specific learning outcome would be for an interpersonal communication student to be able to appropriately paraphrase comments from peers in a way that demonstrates civility and respect for the other. Such an outcome would be developed following the presentation of class material on perspective taking and listening skills. A simple means for incorporating this learning outcome would be for students (individually or as a group, in class or in writing) to first identify a recent problematic personal interaction, and second to be guided by the instructor in seeing the situation from the other’s perspective, and finally demonstrate and/or facilitate students in identifying and practicing listening
and paraphrasing skills—which are already a part of any interpersonal course—that could shape a more positive outcome. Measurement could take the form of a graded written summary of the class discussion/reflection by students.

**Civility and Public Speaking**

If we move from the interpersonal to the world of public speaking, the lessons of civility should become no less important in shaping how we teach our students to interact with each other and audiences in the public sphere. Introductory level public speaking courses are reportedly the most common format for the basic course on many college and university campuses (Morreale, Worley, & Hugenberg, 2010). We have the opportunity to advocate, or at least suggest, to thousands of students that civility—respect for the audience—is essential. Interestingly, in two most recent national surveys on the state of the basic communication course, the issue of classroom civility first emerged as a problem in the course in the 2006 survey (Morreale, Hugenberg, & Worley, 2006), and moved toward the top of the list of concerns in teaching and supervising the basic course in the 40th anniversary 2010 survey (Morreale, Worley, & Hugenberg, 2010). The time seems ripe to seize the opportunity to advocate for civility. We need only recall and review recent political campaigns for examples demonstrating the need for civility in public address.

Public speaking texts routinely advise speakers to analyze and adapt to their audience, suggesting they treat the audience in a civil and respectful manner. Barrett (1991) takes a classical rhetorical approach to civil-
ity arguing that we, as a nation, have become more narcissistic and self-absorbed and therefore less concerned with others. He suggests incivility is a form of rhetorical dysfunction caused by narcissism and curable by employing rhetoric skills noting “Any decrease in the level of civility threatens the fundamental social structures and individual happiness” (p. x).

An example of a specific learning outcome for the public speaking student would be the development of a set of basic standards or guidelines for civil public communication behavior, and to integrate these behaviors into their classroom speeches. To initiate the development of such guidelines, student would first be asked to research recent instances in the media of “people behaving badly” in public. Likely, they will identify examples from the political, entertainment, and celebrity spheres. Then it is relatively easy for instructors to guide students in identifying public speaking situations involving specific uncivil verbal and nonverbal communicative behaviors of these public figures (e.g. the use of profane, vulgar, and coarse language and/or inappropriate gestures). Part of the desired outcome would be for students to realize and recognize how such actions help to shape our negative or embarrassing perceptions of these public figures. Finally, the follow up discussion would focus on students identifying more civil and appropriate language, gestures, and ideas that can shape more positive perceptions. Measurement of this outcome would take the form of encouraging and rewarded students for incorporating and demonstrating similar civil attitudes and behaviors in their classroom speeches.
Decades of research suggests that the quality of the organization and organizational life depends largely upon the quality of the organization’s communication. There is a growing body of research both within and outside of the communication field that suggests civility can make a significant positive contribution not only to the organization’s climate or environment, but can also make positive contributions and impact the organizational bottom line. Stated more concisely, civility is smart business. Earlier in this essay survey results were presented suggesting that, in general, people perceive that public life has become increasing uncivil. Uncivil behavior does not cease at the organizational door. For example, Pearson, Andersson, and Porath (2005) compile the results of several different surveys and found between 30% and 50% of workers polled reported acts of mistreatment or verbal abuse. Specifically, they suggest: “At work, people treat each other rudely by using demeaning language or gestures, “flaming” network colleagues, slinging innuendoes, or merely perching impatiently over the desk of someone engaged in a telephone conversation.” Cortina, Magley, Williams, and Langhout (2001) found that 71% of their survey respondents had experienced some type of workplace incivility in the past 5 years.

Pearson and Porath (2009) in their book The Cost of Bad Behavior report years of research with over 9000 respondents nationwide and conclude that “Far from a minor inconvenience, workplace incivility is one of today’s most substantial economic drains on American business” (p. 4). As noted in the introduction to this es-
say, Sypher (2004) essentially throws down the gauntlet to business and organizational communication scholars and teachers to “reclaim” the civility high-ground arguing that “What is called for is nothing short of a war of words grounded in re-moralized behaviors that model and demand civility” (p. 257). Clearly the call here is to share what we know about message behavior in organizations in an effort to address the growing problem of civility in organizations. Much work has been done both in and out of the communication field. Communication scholars and teachers like Arnett (2006) argue for the concept of professional civility and suggests “…the importance of a third party, a sense of the neighbor that keeps our organizational communicative lives tempered with concern beyond our own individual demands” (p. 239). Management communication scholars Fox and Spector (2005) argue that there is an “explosion of research interest in behaviors at work that harm employees and organizations” (p. 177).

Among the most prolific communication scholars in the area civility in general and bully in particular are Tracy and Lutgen-Sandvik and colleagues associated with the Project for Wellness and Work-life at Arizona State University. The work of this group is highlighted in the publication of the edited volume *Destructive organizational communication: Processes, consequences, and constructive ways of organizing* (2009). Others like Harden-Fritz (2013) advocate for civility as a key professional value in the workplace.

A specific learning outcome in the business and professional speaking course would be for students to generate a typology of civil and uncivil communication behaviors they have experienced in or while interacting
with organizations. Then individually or in groups, students would be guided in developing more positive-civil communication alternatives. Assigning students to identify and generate lists of uncivil behaviors they have encountered enables students to realize the impact this issue has on organizational life. There is ample evidence and almost daily examples of how uncivil and bullying behaviors influence organizational life. Assigning students to research the topic of civility in organizations can point out to then that their lists and experience are confirmed by the existing literature. Measurement would take the form of an evaluation of the civil communication strategies students generated as alternatives to their lists of uncivil behaviors. Ultimately we want to encourage students to practice and incorporate these civil alternatives into their professional communication repertoire.

**CONCLUSION**

As communication scholars and teachers in the basic course and introductory communication courses, we are uniquely positioned to positively influence the communication behavior of our students, and by extension, the communication behavior of the broader society. If we are bold enough to taking up the challenges of Turner and Sypher, we should not be timid about advocating civility “rights and wrongs.” This essay is a brief and modest attempt to address the challenges and possibilities of civility.

For instructors seeking to include civility as a focus or unit in their interpersonal communication, public
speaking or business and professional basic course, the literature provides many options. While most introductory or basic course texts do not explicitly include a treatment of civility, the following do provide some focus on civility: *Interpersonal Communication: Competence and Context* (2010) by Lane makes mention of civility as an important aspect of the appropriateness criterion of interpersonal competence; *Invitation to Public Speaking* (2012) by Griffin draws the attention of students to the issue of civility within the context of furthering the public dialogue; and in *Civility in Business and Professional Communication* (2007) Troester and Mester explore the dynamics of various communication contexts in organizations with special attention to issues of civility. In addition, books or parts of books from the popular press like Forni’s *Choosing Civility* (2002), Carter’s *Civility* (1998), or Pearson and Porath’s *The Cost of Bad Behavior* (2009) provide a non-textbook introduction to the topic of civility in personal, public, and business settings. Finally, a simple Google search using the term civility will yield more than 2 million “hits.”

As the technologies of communication rapidly evolve to the point where face-to-face interaction—traditional interpersonal communication, is eclipsed by various mediated forms of interaction, the topic of civility will become more important. As we teach our students to craft messages intended for the public sphere, reminding them to be civil and respectful and considerate of the audience will increase their effectiveness and success. We should remind our students that how they treat each other in organizations will not only make the workplace more appealing, but will also contribute the organizational bottom line. When we communicate, we
make choices. We can choose the verbal and nonverbal cues we use to craft the message we want to send. Whether communicating interpersonally, publically, or organizationally, these choices can be informed by our shared civility. We, as scholars of the communication arts are uniquely qualified, and by virtue of the teaching we do, uniquely positioned, to address the challenges of civility—if we choose to rise to the challenge.
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Public Address as the Basic Communication Course

William R. Upchurch

Public speaking has been at the heart of our discipline from its conceptual foundations in the ancient world to the founding of the National Council of Academic Teachers of Public Speaking in 1914. According to a longitudinal series of studies surveying the basic course in communication, the vast majority of such courses are either wholly or partially devoted to public speaking skill acquisition (Morreale, Worley, & Hugenberg, 2010). Though the field has fractured into an interdisciplinary mélange over the last century, public speaking has held onto its primacy, at least as the visible face of most departments. In fact, its status may have increased over the past three decades in response to shifts in the mission and public understanding of institutes of higher learning (as part of communication across the curriculum (CXC) initiatives, partnerships with business and medical programs, and other vocational concerns). Unfortunately, this increased visibility and reach has come at the expense of losing focus on the historical impetus for learning such skills. A perfectly rational focus on economic uplift followed the broadening of university education to a more diverse student body, but this was accompanied by an unnecessary cultural shift away from the humanities and the public responsibilities of educated citizens. The skills of citizenship are the most important skills we can teach our stu
dents in a time of increasing economic disparity and political disengagement. To this end, I will suggest in this essay that reorienting the basic course toward a public address perspective should be an important part of our conversation over its content and character.

I am indebted to the many scholars who in the past few years have echoed this call in one form or another. Recollecting on the 50th anniversary of the Speech Teacher, Dance (2002) argued for reclaiming the connection between public speaking and “conceptual acuity,” or the co-developmental synergy between speech and thought. Hunt, Simonds, & Simonds (2009) called political engagement one of the three “21st century skills” we should be inculcating through the basic course (the other two being critical thinking and information literacy). Finally, and most significantly, I appreciate J. Michael Hogan’s excellent efforts to link public speaking to the ethics of public address and democratic deliberation. According to Hogan (2010), a public speaking basic course geared toward public address and all its attendant values must teach a form of public deliberation that has four characteristics. It must,

1. Be authentic and meaningful; that is, [it] must involve issues that genuinely matter to the participants, and the participants must have reason to believe that they can make a difference.

2. Include a diversity of views, testing those differing perspectives in the give-and-take of open debate. Deliberations among like-minded people...are not really deliberations at all.

3. [Teach citizens] how to deliberate; they not only need to learn about the issues to be discussed,
but also how to communicate effectively and ‘work through’ an issue.

4. Require at least some basic level of historical and civic literacy (Hogan, 2010, pp. 430-431).

That conception of public speaking as a basic course is far preferable to one whose aim is to teach theories that are not only disconnected from everyday practices through the mediation of the clinical trial but also reinforce our students’ withdrawal from the democratic public sphere by failing to teach them that their actions can have an impact on the world. But I am not here to argue for public speaking against social science or theory as the basic course. The debate over content has been fruitful and engaging, to be sure, but it always threatens to sweep objectives to the side as a site of meaningful dialogue. If we begin with the objective of teaching what I call the skills of citizenship then we can honor the unique history and legacy of our discipline while embracing new forms of research, new media technologies, and the shifting communication landscape of the 21st century.

**THE SKILLS OF CITIZENSHIP**

The practice of communication that occurs in the public speaking classroom has little value if it is not ethically transferred outside of it. The value of cognitive learning outcomes should be subordinate to behavioral and higher order affective outcomes, particularly those measuring affect toward behaviors recommended in the course and the likelihood of engaging in those behaviors.
The difference between a public speaking and a public address classroom is the assumed nature of those behaviors. As I said, teaching public speaking skills as vocational training to an increasingly diverse population of college students was a rational and well meaning enterprise. As the university got more diverse, jobs and individual economic improvement became paramount. It is time, however, for the pendulum to swing back toward civic participation and the roots of rhetoric in the basic course. As economic disparity grows in the U.S. and collective action becomes more imperative, we should be training speakers to participate politically rather than merely to get a better job. The Occupy encampments, the increasing social awareness demonstrated by online activist networks, and the slow erosion of the ideology of individualism point to an environment in which (particularly) young people feel a desire to organize and improve their world, but poll after poll shows that they are disconnected from the political process, feel little agency, and have little hope for a bright future, for themselves or their country. (Mark Leibovich’s recent book Our Town suggests that the feeling is mutual—Washington is becoming increasingly disconnected from the rest of the country.) I would argue that our basic course has the historical impetus and content specialties to reverse the latter trends in service of the aforementioned goals.

Let us consider Occupy for a moment as an exemplar of both the opportunities and the challenges that face us as communication educators. I am unaware of any great speeches to emerge from the events, despite public speaking being one of their core components. While the protests (especially in Zuccotti Park) managed to get fa-
vorable media coverage at the beginning, and with it favorable opinion ratings amongst the American people, the lack of leadership, clearly articulated goals, and rhetorical touchstones soon saw both of these reversed. With nothing solid to grab hold of, both the viewers at home and the crowds in the streets dispersed. Occupy taught us many lessons about the uses of media for political organization in the 21st century, however. The organizers used social media such as email, Facebook, and blogs to spread information and influence. Twitter hashtags and Facebook memes were used to form a virtual participatory audience, which is fast becoming perhaps the most influential rhetorical environment in U.S. culture (the 2012 Obama campaign invested significant resources to the creation and exploitation of these environments). It is in looking beyond the podium and the boardroom that modern public address instructors will find the significant rhetorical spaces in which most of our students live and interact with others, and in doing so will allow us to demonstrate how communication concepts can be put to use right away to change their world for the better.

Occupy is also a stark example of the reality that training marginalized people in the public speaking tradition may provide them with some personal benefits but it does not automatically confer agency in the deliberative public sphere. Teaching public speaking as one-to-many persuasion embeds students in structures of power that may lead to frustration and alienation rather than empowerment. Students that feel disenfranchised from the political and social system will not suddenly gain a voice by mastering the mechanics of speaking publicly, but we can teach them how to use the
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voice they have and to make use of the many channels available these days for addressing publics. This will require us to take into account all of the possibilities that communication technologies afford students, and also to pay attention to the ways that they prefer to be addressed. The assumption that our students communicate in public can no longer be taken for granted, but they can address publics even from the privacy of their home (or through a screen while seated at a coffee shop in which most people are keeping to themselves). This approach would reflect the reality that many of our students are or will be telecommuting, freelancing, or living at home well into their twenties, and may not be mingling in the informal social circles in which political power is formed, shaped, and consolidated. As a result, we should be teaching them how to access those circles rather than being distracted on the fringe by things like online petitions, radical partisanship, and sloganeering.

Encouraging Public Address

Our job in the basic course should be to marshal the historical insights of our discipline in service of contemporary public address. As guardians of the tradition of public deliberation, we should train our students in the ways of participatory democracy and encourage them to involve themselves in the machinations of power, whether by supporting political parties, rallying the public to a cause, or communicating interpersonally and through technology in a sustained and purposeful way. We should update our examples and understanding of fallacies and persuasion to include modern social technologies, which we hope connect the underrepresented
and marginalized but which we know can exacerbate the dark side of communication. We know that students use technology to communicate constantly, but there are increasing concerns that they are passive consumers of data rather than agents of creation and change. In fact, the kind of data collection and exploitation used by the Obama campaign during the 2012 election demonstrates some of the disturbing implications of this trend. We should teach students to recognize opportunities to address publics, but also to be aware of when they themselves are being addressed as part of a public and to what purposes that address is made.

Social sharing on Facebook, Twitter, and the like can replace deep deliberation with ephemera and glib stereotyping of positions and people. The fear is not that young people will cease being politically active, but that they will mistake certain aesthetic forms and everyday practices as meaningful participation, and that the back and forth of civil debate will be lost in a culture of sharing, re-tweeting, and “liking.” Perhaps this nonstop flow of identification behaviors demonstrates a limitation of a Burkean perspective on rhetoric, which, like those who argue for theory as the basic course, sometimes elides the ethical concerns of our field for the purely descriptive or cognitive. I wish to be clear that I am not arguing against cognitive outcomes, scientific inquiry, or even the introduction of theory in the basic course. My concern is more that we are being shaped by outside forces in ways that diminish our rich intellectual and professional history. I would prefer that our one and only interaction with many general education students showcases the accumulated knowledge and judgment of our field. No doubt business leaders wish us
to teach future employees how to better pitch their products, but such skills, if a student chooses to employ them, will come as a byproduct of their learning to articulate positions with higher stakes.

Finally, none of this would be useful if we do not teach our students how to practice it beyond the classroom. Service learning, a noble addition to the undergraduate education (and it should be a part of our graduate programs as well), has been shown to improve learning outcomes and student perceptions of course value (for a review of service learning in the communication discipline, see Warren & Sellnow, 2010). We should take this to heart in our basic course and give our students the opportunity to fully participate in society, often at an age at which they are expected to start voting but rarely given the tools to fully embrace their roles as public addresser and addressee. We should design assignments that link their coursework, and their bodies, to the world of politics that bustles along beside them unseen and unwelcoming but penetrable by a properly educated and motivated populace. To see our students consistently out in the world questioning, challenging, and addressing their fellow citizens will be to forcefully reclaim our heritage, mission, and greatest strengths from the vocational, administrative, and other forces that have become barriers to the development of a strong citizenry able to challenge the political and economic elites that threaten the core of our nation and the world at large.
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A primary goal of the basic course in communication is learning to communicate effectively. The National Communication Association explains the importance of effective communication: “Competence in oral communication—in speaking and listening—is prerequisite to students’ personal and academic success in life” (Morreale & Backlund, 2007, p. 1). Because most college students are only required to take one communication class, it is imperative that students reap the benefits of instruction in the basic course in communication. One way to ensure that this occurs is by providing students with well-developed learning outcomes that help students meet the overall goal of becoming competent communicators.

Effective learning outcomes are important because they “state the specific skills, abilities, knowledge, beliefs, attitudes, or dispositions that students are expected to develop as a result of completing a class” (McConnell & Doolittle, 2012, p. 19). Well-developed learning outcomes are beneficial for both instructors and students. First, instructors benefit because the learning outcomes help them to organize the basic course, plan assignments, and develop assessment procedures (Sellnow & Martin, 2010; Suskie, 2009). Second, students benefit because outcomes explain the course
requirements and expectations for the basic course, which make students aware of the skills and knowledge they will gain by the conclusion of the semester (McConnell & Doolittle, 2012).

Given that well-developed outcomes are crucial for instructor and student success, it is necessary to delineate the central learning outcomes for the basic course in communication. Therefore, I will first articulate four traditional outcomes that I believe are necessary for students to become effective public speakers. Second, after discussing the benefits of integrating a critical approach in the basic course, I will present a fifth, critical, learning outcome. After doing so, I will discuss how this additional critical learning outcome can enhance the course by expanding upon each of the traditional outcomes.

**TRADITIONAL LEARNING OUTCOMES**

I believe that students should gain proficiency in four areas in order to become competent communicators in their academic and personal lives. To do so, basic course outcomes should articulate for students the speech-development process from idea generation to speech delivery. The outcomes should elucidate for students that they need to develop proficiency in speech delivery, speech structure, types of speeches, and their connections to effective communication in their lives.

The outcomes necessary for student success can be articulated as follows: 1) Students will develop effective formal and speaking outlines, 2) Students will present a variety of types of speeches (informative, persuasive,
Critical Learning Outcome

The traditional learning outcomes are important in aiding students to develop speaking proficiency. However, the basic course in communication, specifically when its focus is on public speaking, has been criticized because of its narrow focus and its “how-to” formulaic approach to speaking (Emanuel, 2005). Although I see value in the basic course in communication and its traditional learning outcomes, I argue that the inclusion of a fifth, overarching outcome is necessary that embraces the goals of critical communication pedagogy. A critical learning outcome moves the basic course beyond a “how to” course by challenging students to examine hegemony and marginalization that occur in their communities. By applying a critical lens to the basic course, a critical outcome can guide the content of the speeches that students produce, can enhance the learning of the traditional four outcomes, and can affect change in students’ lives beyond the classroom. To explain the background of this learning outcome, a brief description of critical communication pedagogy is necessary.
Critical communication pedagogy. Critical communication pedagogy examines power in terms of its effect on communication practices (Simpson, 2010). This pedagogical approach serves to heighten students’ awareness of hegemony in the classroom and in the community (Fassett & Warren, 2007; Kahl, 2013). I believe that the inclusion of a critical outcome to the basic course will enhance students’ communicative abilities by challenging them to apply their knowledge of communication by confronting hegemony and marginalization that exist in their communities.

The roots of critical communication pedagogy derive from Freire. Giroux (2010) explains Freire’s critical approach to education:

What Freire made clear is that pedagogy at its best is not about training in techniques and methods... Education ... provides the knowledge, skills and social relations that enable students to explore for themselves the possibilities of what it means to be engaged citizens. (n.p.)

Freire advocates for pedagogy that strives for conscientization, which includes: developing a heightened awareness of hegemony, identifying avenues for praxis, and taking steps toward praxis. For Freire, praxis, or taking action based upon knowledge, is a necessary step to reach conscientization (1970). Thus, the learning outcome that meets the goals of critical communication pedagogy and conscientization should be as follows: 5) Students will become critically engaged with marginalized groups in society and, through their speeches, articulate steps toward praxis.
Facilitating a Critical Learning Outcome

Instructors can incorporate a critical perspective in the basic course assignments that assists students in achieving the critical learning outcome. For example, students may complete a series of informative and persuasive speeches in which they examine hegemony in their communities. A useful means to examine hegemony in the community is through programs such as service learning (Kahl, 2010). To do so, students may complete service-learning projects with local nonprofit agencies that assist marginalized groups in order to learn about marginalized groups’ experiences. This experience, along with research, can form the basis for public speeches. After completing the service-learning project, students could develop informative speeches that make the class aware of the problems they encountered. Next, students could develop persuasive speeches about the issue that go beyond simply providing information to suggesting detailed solutions that students can actually do in their own communities to begin to work toward praxis. Through these speeches, students move through Freire’s (1970) idea of conscientization as they become aware of hegemony and work toward ameliorating it.

Pragmatic Value of a Critical Learning Outcome

I believe that pragmatic value exists for the integration of a critical learning outcome into the basic course. A first pragmatic benefit is that when students are exposed to difficult questions of marginalization through hegemony in society, they become more engaged learn-
ers who are concerned with social justice, and, thus, they also become more engaged citizens who want to intervene in society. Bloom, Engelhart, Furst, Hill, & Krathwohl’s (1956) cognitive taxonomy explains that when students are asked to take course knowledge and apply, analyze, synthesize, and evaluate it, as they would do in the aforementioned service-learning project, they are able to take the knowledge and transfer it to other areas of study and internalize it for use in their own lives.

A second pragmatic benefit is that a critical learning outcome has the potential to make connections among each of the four traditional outcomes. Outcome 1 involves the development of effective formal and speaking outlines. A critical learning outcome can assist students in achieving outcome 1 because students will write from direct experience in addition to research they have conducted on the subject. Numerous public-speaking textbooks indicate that personal experience combined with research enhances speech development (e.g., Lucas, 2012; Nelson, Titsworth, & Pearson, 2014; O’Hair, Stewart, & Rubenstein, 2012; Verderber, Sellnow, & Verderber, 2012).

Outcome 2 states that students should develop the ability to prepare a variety of types of speeches (usually informative, persuasive, and impromptu). A critical learning outcome has the potential to improve students’ performance in speech preparation because students are able to make clearer connections among speech topics. For example, as noted earlier, when students prepare informative speeches about their experiences with knowledge of hegemony, they can more easily transition to actuation persuasive speeches in which they offer
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solutions to work toward praxis. Additionally, students can develop impromptu speeches about hegemonic issues relating to their direct experience in the community.

Outcome 3, the acquisition of knowledge and application of effective delivery techniques, has the potential to be improved as well. Because students will speak about real-world problems that they have directly experienced and that can impact our society, students are more likely to use verbal and nonverbal cues because they are more interested in the material about which they speak. Using such immediacy behaviors may increase listeners’ affect for the speaker and the subject (Ozmen, 2011).

Finally, students’ experiences strengthen their knowledge of the way that communication functions in society. These experiences enhance the learning of outcome 4, the comprehension of the role of communication in everyday life. Working in the community to learn about hegemony and marginalization not only assists students in developing and presenting effective speeches, but also allows students to gain a greater understanding of how communication can serve to both empower and marginalize others in everyday life. A critical learning outcome provides students with the direct experience of communicating with community members informally and with classmates formally.

In sum, I believe that the addition of a critical learning outcome will enhance the traditional focus of the basic course. By moving beyond a “how to” model to one that encourages the application of communicative abilities, students are challenged to apply their public speaking skills to work toward praxis in responding to
hegemonic forces that affect the lives of others in the community. Thus, a critical learning outcome gives students the opportunity to make a difference in society by becoming more engaged citizens. I contend that a critical learning outcome, combined with the four traditional learning outcomes for the basic course in communication, will assist students in becoming better public speakers, communicators, and engaged members of society.
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Social Justice and the Basic Course:
A Central Student Learning Outcome

Andrea Patterson
Omar Swartz

The economic, social, political, cultural, and environmental dimensions of globalization impacting our society demand new ways of thinking, acting, and teaching the Basic Communication Course (BCC). By emphasizing the learning outcomes of intellectual and practical skills and acceptance of personal and social responsibility, students will experience a new central learning outcome: what we are calling a social justice sensibility. In this essay we will emphasize the need to integrate the intellectual and practical skills of oral communication and personal and social justice in the BCC. We will discuss how the BCC can help students learn habits of citizenship and the art of parrhesia by incorporating service learning for social justice advocacy. Importantly, we discuss how faculty can modify their grading rubric to assess this new outcome.

The BCC is included in the majority of two-and four-colleges and universities and assists institutions in meeting its general education requirement. The Association of American Colleges and Universities (AACU) reports that 56% of the institutions surveyed showed that

---

1 This work is derived from the first author’s PhD dissertation: Revisioning Communication Context of Globalization. The second author was a reader on this project.
general education has become an increasing priority among institutions, while only 3% says that it is diminishing in importance (Glenn, 2009). The survey also indicated that 89% reported that colleges were either re-evaluating or making modifications to their general education requirements. Carol Schneider, AACU president, argued that a general education should produce graduates with “a deep and flexible set of skills” and not rely too heavily on a narrow, technical, pre-professional model of education (Glenn, 2009). Furthermore, Schneider, citing a 2006 survey conducted by employers, noted that businesses also wanted colleges to emphasize written and oral communication, cross-cultural communication skills, and other skills not directly related to a specialized field of study (Glenn, 2009).

Schools and businesses realize that students need a different way of learning. In response, The National Leadership Council for Liberal Education and America’s Promise (LEAP) recommended learning outcomes that can be accomplished utilizing different programs of study, noting that the “world in which today’s students will make choices and compose lives is one of disruption rather than certainty and interdependence rather than ‘insularity.’” This volatility also applies to careers (AACU, 2007, p. 2)

The Council recommended that schools prepare students for the twenty-first century by gaining the following essential learning outcomes: knowledge of human culture and the physical natural world, intellectual and practical skills, and acceptance of personal and social responsibilities. The National Communication Association (NCA) acknowledges and supports the AACU’s position that “communication skills are critical to the
citizenry and workforces of the 21st century” (Simonds, Buckrop, Redmond, & Quianthy, 2012, ¶1).

According to a revised resolution on the role of communication in general education (adopted by the NCA Legislative Assembly), two of the four learning outcomes—Intellectual and Practical Skills and Personal and Social Responsibility—align with the BCC in general education (Simonds, Buckrop, Redmond, & Quianthy, 2012). The NCA resolution also acknowledges that innovative pedagogy is being incorporated in the classroom, including learning communities. Moreover, the resolution also confirms a growing consensus among employers that these outcomes consist of the skills employers seek in their college graduates.

In today’s society it is important to not only teach students to be competent oral communicators, but to be individuals who can use dialogue to advocate for peace and social change. In other words, the important skill sets that we provide our students should not be taught in isolation but from a holistic critical perspective (Swartz, 1997). Merging theory and practice in this manner leads to a more substantive and meaningful praxis, and ultimately serves all of the various stakeholders within and outside of the university.

Collectively, we have taught over 124 sections of the BCC over the past two decades. We have taught the course using a variety of formats, including honors, hyresponsible brid, and online. We have taught at a minimum of nine different colleges or universities on the West Coast, Midwest, and South. Through our experiences we have learned that the basic course provides an excellent opportunity to incorporate not only the intellectual and practical skills outcomes that
our discipline has provided students for nearly 100 years, but also the outcomes of personal and social responsibility. The integration of these outcomes into our courses can also help our students become global citizens and responsible leaders.

**CITIZENSHIP IS A LEARNED HABIT AND PRACTICE**

As taught by Aristotle in ancient times and by John Dewey in our modern era, we understand that citizenship is a habit and practice that must be learned. Aristotle and Dewey argued that citizens must be involved in their government, motivated to deliberate debate, and be involved in decisions that impact their lives. Their interpretation of participatory democracy advocates for all citizens to share in the well-being of their government and in their communities. Simply, citizens in a democracy need to learn the habit of citizenship in order to contribute to the state and to the common good. They must also cultivate the skills and intellect to critique and change their government and society.

Michael Lerner (2000) contends that effective citizenship education should challenge students to think critically and that pedagogy itself must change. He contends that pedagogy “must be directed at engaging the student in asking critical questions and learning to see the possibilities in every given actuality” (p. 261). West contends that Socratic questioning is the “enactment of parrhesia—frank and fearless speech is the lifeblood of any democracy” (p. 209). Critique, however, requires more than skills and intellect. It requires a commitment to truth speaking. In 1983 at the University of Califor-
nia at Berkley, Michel Foucault delivered six lectures in a seminar entitled “Discourse and Truth.” In this seminar Foucault (2001) discussed the Greek concept of parrhesia, or “frankness in speaking the truth” (p. 7). Foucault describes how parrhesia appears in Euripides (c. 484–407) and is subsequently used in the Greek world until approximately the close of the fifth century BCE. More recently, the word has been translated into English as “free speech” and parrhesiastic—the individual who uses parrhesia—is the person who speaks the truth. Foucault depicted parrhesia as “verbal activity in which a speaker expresses his [or her] personal relationship to the truth, and risks his [or her] life because he recognized truth-telling as a duty to improve or help other people as well as himself” (p. 19). Foucault viewed parrhesiastes as a moral and ethical virtue connected with truth (as cited in Peters, 2003).

In our classroom we directly address in the beginning of the semester that controversial topics may be addressed in the classroom and we encourage a frank and bold discussion (for example, the concept of intersectionality and privilege). Foucault contends that frank discussion indicates a special relationship between the speaker and the audience and that the speaker engages in forthright discussion on matters of social consequence.

We argue that Aristotle and Dewey’s emphasis on individual involvement and desire are critical traits in their models of citizenship education and that, combined with parrhesia, citizens must and can be engaged in speaking for and against what they consider to be the common good. Aristotle and Dewey’s belief in individual engagement and drive are critical aspects in their citi-
zenship model that can serve as a foundation for redesigning the BCC in the twenty-first century. Rather than the “good person speaking well” (in Quintilian’s classical model), we educate for the engaged citizen speaking critically and civically.

The concept of *parrhesia* can be operationalized as topic selection during persuasive presentations. Students can be encouraged or assigned to develop a persuasive speech dealing with questions of policy. Sample topics from our courses have included the affordable health care act, marriage equality, the wars on terror, social spending for organizations such as the United Way, or local campus issues such as gender violence or rape culture on campus.

A foreign exchange student from Brazil practiced the art of *parrhesia* in one of our courses. The student’s informative presentation focused on the mandatory voting laws in Brazil and compared these laws to voting practices in the United States. The student delivered for her final speech a parrhesiastic speech challenging the American students to participate more in campus, state, and national elections. Her presentation sparked a discussion and debate on what freedom means in our society and the role of the citizen in the democratic process. Following her presentation, many classmates enthusiastically congratulated her on such a bold speech. The exchange student, who was hesitant and shy at the beginning of the semester, blushed and beamed. In this cultural space we became teacher-students and students in the spirit of Paulo Freire. We learned that we must strive harder to instill this type of parrhesiastic enthusiasm in each student if we want them to become pas-
sionate about using their public speaking skills to communicate for social justice, advocacy and peace.

One place where this development has already been undertaken is the movement toward embedding a service learning component in the BCC. The integration of service learning into the basic course crystallizes Dewey’s vision of the transformational role that education can play in a democratic society (Swartz, Campbell, & Pestana, 2009). We as communication educators must continually reflect upon how we can help create, in the words of educational theorist Svi Shapiro, a “pedagogy of peace” to better reinforce democratic institutions (2010, p. 70). We have a moral and professional responsibility to teach our students the basic communication skills that are needed to critique, challenge, and address what Zygmunt Bauman (2000) calls “the kind of social order responsible for unhappiness, human suffering, and the [duty] to help those in danger” (p. 215).

Due to globalization and the interconnectivity among all peoples of the planet, it is imperative that college students in the United States “develop and internalize a global perspective into her [or his] thinking, sense of identity, and relationships with others” (Chickering & Braskamp, 2009, p. 27). This is easier said than done. It is important to realize that to develop this critical habit in our students to become global citizens takes intentionality on the part of communication educators. This is something that we have to deliberatively focus on doing, which is not always easy given the demands placed on our time as overburdened teacher/scholars.

The goal of this central learning outcome for developing a social justice sensibility, along with the integration of service learning in the basic course, helps stu-
Students experience another central learning outcome of integrative and applied learning. This outcome is situated in involvement and with opportunities and challenges. It is grounded in immediate life problems and application relevant to our students’ lives. Thus, our proposal of social justice helps the BCC incorporate those essential learning outcomes of intellectual and practical skills (i.e., oral communication, personal, and social responsibility) while highlighting the importance of voice in our multicultural democracy. The merging of social justice responsibility with service learning in the BCC helps our students realize the power of their voice in a real world setting. In our view, the BCC could, in practice, fulfill three of the four essential learning outcomes in the general education curriculum. This type of flexibility in the general education curriculum may be critical in a political environment where one may have to defend the viability of the basic course itself.

We acknowledge and realize that not every section of the BCC may allow instructors to integrate the element of service learning due to time, class size, location of university, constraints of transportation, etc. However, students can still experience this idea of civic engagement through developing informative speeches enlightening their audiences about issues of social justice in our communities; for example, a topic as food banks and food kitchens introduces them to the concept of food justice (Dougherty, 2011). Students may also develop informative speeches about nonprofit organizations in their community to which their peers have little exposure (i.e., a local civil rights organization). This idea may also be extended to the persuasive speech; in one of our classes, for instance, a student gave a persuasive
speech on how she could support a new nonprofit organization for victims of domestic violence in the community. In some courses, we require each student to develop a presentation for a non-profit agency. As part of this assignment, students must interview a staff member for an organization they select and ask that person what areas they would like to raise more public awareness. One student developed presentations for Habitat for Humanity (HH). Her informative speech outlined the process of how to qualify for a Habitat home. The special occasion speech focused on the home dedication ceremony. Her final presentation emphasized the importance of fulfilling one’s financial obligations with HH and other creditors. The student also persuaded a student organization she is a member of to adopt HH as their service learning project for the school year. This student developed not only her intellectual and practical skills of oral communication, but developed an acceptance of personal and social responsibility. This example embodies our new envisioned central learning outcome: Social Justice Sensibility. Such sensibility demonstrates the type of integrative learning that the AACU’s essential learning outcomes were intended to address.

A social justice approach requires a different way of assessing oral presentations when integrating the learning outcomes for intellectual and practical skills and for social and personal responsibility. This new approach, entitled Valid Assessment of Learning in Undergraduate Education or (VALUE), was created by the AACU in 2007. These rubrics represent the fifteen areas of learning directly related to these outcomes including: civic engagement, creative thinking, ethical reasoning,
foundation and skills for life-long learning, intercultural knowledge and competence, oral communication, problem solving, quantitative literacy, reading, teamwork, and written communication. A more recent rubric—global learning—was released in 2013. These rubrics were not designed as grading rubrics; rather, these rubrics were intended to assess learning over time at the institutional or programmatic level. However, “the rubrics can be translated into grading rubrics for a specific course, using the same criteria or dimensions for learning, but the performance descriptors would need to be modified to reflect the course content and assignments being examined” (Rhodes & Finley, 2013, p. 6). For instance, instructors can review the VALUE rubric for Civic Engagement and change the criteria to reflect the environment of a particular course or campus. Rhodes and Finley, in their discussion of rubric modification, report how one university modified the VALUE rubric of Civic Engagement and added criteria. One suggestion is that an instructor may add the criteria of civic responsibility to the grading rubric used in his/her individual course. The descriptor for this criterion specifically links it to its demonstrative “ability and commitment to collaboratively work across and within community contexts and structures to achieve a civic aim” (p. 20).

In addressing how we can, as educators, help students develop their oral communication skills to effect change and foster a sense of personal and social responsibility, it is our contention that integrating the essential learning outcomes of oral communication and personal and social responsibility in the BCC can help us move our students further down the path of becoming
global citizens who understand the possibilities that public speaking can offer to change our world.

**CONCLUSION**

Effective citizenship education should encourage Americans to think more globally, realizing that our actions, language, and deeds impact not only the United States, but the rest of the world. Communication educators who teach the BCC have an excellent opportunity to promote the concept of citizenship education in connection with public speaking. Doing so reinvests in our tradition of speech a modern critical sensibility. As Cornel West (2004) observes,

> the Socratic love of wisdom holds not only that the unexamined life is not worth living, but also that to be human and a democratic citizen requires that one must have the courage to think critically for oneself. Socratic questioning yields intellectual integrity, philosophic humility, and personal sincerity—all the essential elements of our democratic armor for the fight against corrupt elite power. (pp. 208–209)

Along with West we contend that Socratic questioning is the “enactment of parrhesia—and frank and fearless speech is the lifeblood of any democracy” (p. 209). In no small sense, we are on the front lines of our great national effort to reinvigorate the American spirit.
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Using In-Class Versus Out-of-Class Peer Workshops to Improve Presentational Speaking

Melissa A. Broeckelman-Post
Angela M. Hosek

Even though conversations at communication conferences suggest that peer workshops are a commonly used pedagogical strategy in public speaking classrooms, very little research has been conducted to establish best practices for using peer workshops in public speaking classes. Broeckelman (2005) first wrote about a structured way to utilize peer workshops in public speaking classes, and detailed instructions for implementing these in other public speaking classrooms were later published (Broeckelman, Brazeal, & Titsworth, 2007). Broeckelman-Post, Titsworth, and Brazeal (2011) later found that students who used peer workshops improved the quality of their speeches significantly more over the course of an academic term than students who did not use workshops, but found that there were minimal or no differences for other variables, depending on the university. However, there is no research investigating what type or format of peer workshop is most effective for enhancing student learning and public speaking performances. The goal of this paper is to begin to fill this gap by comparing the effects of in-class and out-of-class peer workshops in the public speaking classroom.


**Literature Review**

*Peer Workshops*

Peer workshops are sessions in which students work in small groups to provide feedback to one another on writing, speeches, or other class projects. In public speaking classes, peer workshops are typically conducted a class period or two before students perform their speeches for a grade, and are an opportunity for students to provide and receive constructive feedback on their speech outlines. When there is time, some instructors are able to include a second peer workshop that allows students to provide constructive feedback on practice speech performances. The first time that peer workshops are done in class, Broeckelman et al. (2007) recommend doing a brief role-playing exercise to train students to engage effectively and provide constructive feedback, followed by a class conversation about what types of feedback are and are not most helpful, before breaking students into groups of three. Once students are in groups, they are asked to identify at least three areas in which they would like feedback from their peers before giving their speech outlines and a peer workshop form with guided questions to their peers. Students then do a careful reading and provide written feedback on each other's speeches. Afterward, they have a conversation about their speech outlines and offer additional suggestions. Broeckelman-Post et al. (2011) found that using this structured format for peer workshops improved the quality of student speeches significantly more over the course of an academic term compared to students who did not have an opportunity to engage in such workshops, though there were mixed
findings for whether peer workshops had any significant impact on Public Speaking Anxiety and Connected Classroom Climate. However, on all variables, students who engaged in structured peer workshops had the same or greater benefits in the public speaking course.

To date, no research has been published on peer workshops conducted outside of class in public speaking classes, so for the purposes of this study, out-of-class workshops will be conducted using the same guided workshop form developed by Broeckelman et al. (2007), but students will take each other’s outlines and workshop forms home to provide written feedback, and then give those written comments to their peers during the next class period. No class time will be used to conduct the role playing exercise or to give verbal feedback.

Though no other research has been conducted on the use of peer workshops in public speaking courses, empirical research does exist on the benefits of peer workshops and peer feedback in other classroom contexts. Sellnow and Trienen (2004) point out that peer critiques are now commonplace in public speaking classes and Reynolds (2009) indicates that these workshops stimulate the kinds of feedback that students will need to eventually give and receive in the workplace. Writing courses have used workshops for some time, and the practices and benefits of such workshops are well-documented (e.g., Atwell, 1998; DiPardo & Freedman, 1988; Spear, 1993). Other researchers have built a strong case for the benefits of cooperative and collaborative learning when it is structured well (e.g., Johnson, Johnson, & Smith, 1998; Lee & Smagorinsky, 2000), and peer workshops are a very structured type of cooperative or collaborative learning. Public speeches that
are developed through such collaborative workshops become multi-authored, but this reflects the dialogic nature of all communication (Bakhtin, 1929/2001).

Previous research suggests that there are two primary reasons that peer workshops help students improve performance. The first is that receiving feedback and justifications for that feedback from multiple peers helps students make better revisions that include more complex repairs than when they receive feedback from a single expert (i.e., an instructor), especially when justifications for the suggestions are given (Cho & MacArthur, 2010; Gielen, Peeters, Dochy, Ohghena, & Struyven, 2009). The second reason that peer workshops improve student performance is that students have the opportunity to practice providing critical feedback to others, which might be more beneficial than receiving feedback (Li, Liu, & Steckelberg, 2010). Lundstrom and Baker (2009) found that students who gave feedback to others but never received feedback made more significant gains in the quality of their writing across the semester than students who received feedback but never had the opportunity to give feedback to others.

In-class workshops provide students with an opportunity to engage in face-to-face in-class communication while giving mostly oral feedback within a constrained time frame, while out-of-class workshops provide students with an opportunity to provide primarily written feedback that is not limited by the constraints of the class period and is delivered later. Thus, there are different potential benefits and drawbacks for each format. While a great deal of research has been conducted on out-of-class communication between instructors and students (e.g., Aylor & Opplinger, 2003; Dobransky &
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Frymier, 2004; Myers, Martin, & Knapp, 2005; Williams & Frymier, 2007), little research has been conducted on the effects out-of-class communication between students as it relates to specific class assignments. Furthermore, while in-class workshops offer the opportunity for face-to-face communication, they take time that could otherwise be devoted to other classroom learning activities. Thus, it is important to find out whether there is a significant difference in the relative benefits that each type of workshop offers students in communication courses in which students engage in public speaking.

Student Learning

Scholars note that it can be difficult to measuring student learning (Frymier & Houser, 1999; Richmond, Lane, & McCroskey, 2006). For this reason, student learning is typically measured by examining students’ engagement behaviors, affective learning, and performance. In regard to student engagement, Frymier and Houser (1999) argued that there are numerous activities or behaviors that demonstrate student engagement with course content. These behaviors can include asking question in class, explaining ideas to other students, participating in class discussions, and integrating new course content to previously learned ideas.

Given that peer workshops, when viewed as a form of cooperative learning, offer important gains for student learning such as higher-level reasoning, increased knowledge transfer across learning contexts, and higher achievement and productivity (Johnson & Johnson, 1999), we expect that the ways in which students engage in peer workshops (i.e., in-class versus out-of-class)
will impact their engagement with learning course content. In order to examine this prediction, the following hypothesis was tested:

H1: There is a difference in student learning over an academic term between students who participate in in-class versus out-of-class peer workshops.

In regard to affective learning, Krathwohl, Bloom, and Masia (1964) defined the affective domain of learning as those objectives that emphasize emotions or degrees of acceptance or rejection of learning material. Working cooperatively with peers helps students build and maintain relationships, improves productivity, morale, feelings of commitment, and well-being. Therefore, we expect that the ways in which students engage in peer workshops (i.e., in-class versus out-of-class) will impact their affective learning. In order to test this relationship, the following research question was asked:

RQ1: Is there a difference in affective learning over an academic term between students who participate in in-class versus out-of-class peer workshops?

The psychomotor domain of learning is concerned with performing behavioral skills (Bloom et al., 1956). As such, being able to develop and deliver an effective presentation would be illustrative of competency in this domain in performance-based courses (McCroskey, 1982). Because in-class peer workshops have been shown to impact the quality of speech performances (Broeckelman-Post et al., 2011), and because all types of workshops provide a structure for scaffolding learning experiences (Vygotsky, 1986), we think that it is possible that the ways in which students engage in peer workshops (i.e., in-class versus out-of-class) will impact
the quality of their speeches differently over the academic term. In order to explore this relationship, we ask the following research question:

RQ2: Is there a difference in the quality of student speeches between students who participate in in-class versus out-of-class peer workshops?

**Public Speaking Anxiety**

Public Speaking Anxiety (PSA) is defined as “situation-specific social anxiety that arises from the real or anticipated enactment of an oral presentation” (Bodie, 2010, p. 72) and generally fits into one of two categories: trait PSA, which is anxiety experienced across communication contexts regardless of the specific situation, and state PSA, which is anxiety experienced in a particular setting and time (Spielberger, 1966). PSA is a specific type of Communication Apprehension (CA), which is a broader construct defined as “an individual’s level of fear or anxiety associated with either real or anticipated communication with another person or persons” and includes a range of communication contexts including dyads, small groups, and meetings (McCroskey, 1970; McCroskey, 1982; McCroskey & Richmond, 2006, p. 55). Trait CA is primarily biological and influenced by genetics, so it cannot be easily overcome (McCroskey, 2009). Because State CA and State PSA are heavily influenced by Trait CA, they cannot be completely mitigated, but researchers have found ways to reduce State PSA some using methods such as habituation, cognitive modification, systematic desensitization, visualization, performance feedback, communication-orientation modi-
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fication therapy (COM therapy), skills training, and specially designed courses (Bodie, 2010; Finn, Sawyer, & Schrodt, 2009; McCroskey, 2009). Since peer workshops give basic communication course students an opportunity to practice their speeches (habituation), receive feedback from others, and since students are given skills training throughout the class, we expect that students will reduce their PSA somewhat in both conditions, but we also think it is likely that in-class and out-of-class workshops will impact PSA differently. In order to explore this prediction, we ask the following research question:

RQ3: Is there a difference in the change in Public Speaking Anxiety over the course of an academic term between students who participate in in-class peer workshops versus out-of-class peer workshops?

Connected Classroom Climate

Connected classroom climate is defined as “student-to-student perceptions of a supportive and cooperative communication environment in the classroom” (Dwyer et al., 2004, p. 267), and is characterized by a sense of belongingness, social support, and connection within a classroom community that allows students to feel free to express themselves. Previous research has shown that classroom climate is influenced by teacher’s use of slang (Mazer & Hunt, 2008), student motivation to communicate with their instructor (Myers & Claus, 2012), instructor verbal aggressiveness (Myers & Rocca, 2001), and affinity-seeking strategies used by instructors (My-
ers, 1995). Research has also shown that classroom climate is positively related to nonverbal immediacy and student affective learning (Johnson, 2009) as well as students’ willingness to talk in class and preparedness for class (Sidelinger & Booth-Butterfield, 2010). Additionally, sense of belonging is positively associated with academic progress and student retention/intention to persist, though these factors also appear to be influenced heavily by student motivation (Meeuwisse, Severiens, & Born, 2010; Morrow & Ackermann, 2012). Because peer workshops provide students with several opportunities to build relationships and interact with classmates and have previously been shown to influence connected classroom climate (Broeckelman-Post et al., 2011), we want to find out whether in-class and out-of-class peer workshops have the same impact on classroom climate over the course of the term. To explore this relationship, we ask the following research question:

RQ4: Is there a difference in Connected Classroom Climate between students who participate in in-class versus out-of-class peer workshops?

Finally, because in and out-of-class workshops differ in the amount of face-to-face communication, written communication, and time restrictions, it is possible that students will perceive that one type of workshop is more useful or valuable than the other. In order explore this possibility, we ask the following research question:

RQ5: Is there a difference in perceived workshop value between in-class and out-of-class peer workshops.
**Method**

The purpose of this study was to find out whether there is a difference in the effectiveness of in-class and out-of-class peer workshops in a public speaking class. This study used a modified switching replications repeated measures design with workshop group serving as the independent variable (between-subjects factor), and speech grade, communication apprehension, connected classroom climate, learning indicators, affective learning for the workshop, and perceived workshop value serving as the six dependent variables (within-subjects factors). Switching replications allowed us to examine the potential benefits of both kinds of workshops to all students who participated in the study and find out whether changes in the dependent variable were due to manipulation of the independent variable (Wrench et al., 2008). Furthermore, the repeated measures design reduces the number of subjects needed by removing variability due to individual differences from the error term, which is statistically “much more powerful than completely randomized designs” (Stevens, 2002, p. 492).

**Participants**

A total of 96 students enrolled in four sections of public speaking at a public western university were selected to participate in this study. Students did not know about the study prior to enrolling in these sections of the course, so the sections should have been equivalent groups that would have been similar to the groups that would have resulted from random assignment. These sections were taught by two instructors, and each instructor was asked to teach one section using each of...
our two treatment conditions to equalize any instructor effects between the two conditions. This assumption of equivalent groups is further confirmed in the results, which show that there were no statistically significant differences between groups on any of the dependent variables at the first measurement time.

All 96 students participated in at least part of this study, but because data was collected at three different times, only the 56 students who completed all three surveys were included in this analysis, which far exceeds the minimum of ten subjects for a two group repeated measures design (Stevens, 2002, p. 493). These participants included 37 females (66.1%) and 19 males (33.9%) and had a mean age of 18.68 years ($SD = .716$). Students were asked to self-report their ethnicity; 35 (62.5%) were Hispanic, 8 (14.3%) were Asian, 1 (1.8%) was Pacific Islander, 1 (1.8%) was Native American, 1 (1.8%) was White, 6 (7.1%) reported “Other,” and 4 (7.1%) preferred not to respond. This course is a required general education course, and the distribution of participants by major was as follows: 7 (12.5%) in the College of Arts and Letters; 5 (8.9%) in the College of Business and Economics; 0 in the Charter College of Education; 2 (3.6%) in the College of Engineering, Computer Science and Technology; 25 (44.6%) in the College of Health and Human Services; 14 (25%) in the College of Natural and Social Sciences; and 3 (5.4%) were undeclared.

**Procedures and Instrumentation**

Students were assigned to one of two groups based on which sections of public speaking they were enrolled
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group 1</th>
<th>T₁</th>
<th>X₁</th>
<th>T₂</th>
<th>X₂</th>
<th>T₃</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SG₁, PSA₁, CCM₁, LI₁</td>
<td>In-Class</td>
<td>SG₂, PSA₂, CCM₂, LI₂, AL₂-In, WV₂-In</td>
<td>Out-of-Class Speech Workshop</td>
<td>SG₃, PSA₃, CCM₃, LI₃, AL₃-Out, WV₃-Out</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SG₁, PSA₁, CCM₁, LI₁</td>
<td>Speech Workshop</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group 2</th>
<th>T₁</th>
<th>X₁</th>
<th>T₂</th>
<th>X₂</th>
<th>T₃</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SG₁, PSA₁, CCM₁, LI₁</td>
<td>Out-of-Class Speech Workshop</td>
<td>SG₂, PSA₂, CCM₂, LI₂, AL₂-Out, WV₂-Out</td>
<td>In-Class Speech Workshop</td>
<td>SG₃, PSA₃, CCM₃, LI₃, AL₃-In, WV₃-In</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SG₁, PSA₁, CCM₁, LI₁</td>
<td>Speech Workshop</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: T = time of observation or measurement, X = intervention type, SG = Speech Grade, PSA = Public Speaking Anxiety, CCM = Connected Classroom Climate, LI = Learning Indicators, AL = Affective Learning for Workshop, WV = Perceived Workshop Value
Both groups did two peer workshops, one before their informative speeches, and one before their persuasive speeches. Group 1 did an in-class workshop before their informative speech and an out-of-class workshop before their persuasive speech; Group 2 did an out-of-class workshop before their informative speech and an in-class workshop before their persuasive speech.

Except for speech grade, all data was collected using an online survey. Students received course credit for completing the surveys (5 points per survey; the maximum 15 survey points was 3% of the course total). A survey link was sent to students following each of their three speeches, and they were given a week to complete the online survey. Speech grades were collected from the instructors’ grade books at the end of the quarter. Table 1 shows the timeline for all measurements and treatments for both groups.

Student learning was measured in three ways. First, we used Frymier and Houser’s (1999) Revised Learning Indicators scale (LI), which includes nine items measured with a 5-point scale ranging from Never (1) to Very Often (5). The authors report an overall reliability of $\alpha = .83$ for this scale and include items such as “I actively participate in class discussion” and “I think about the course content outside of class” (p. 8). For our study, the reliability for this scale was $\alpha = .89$ at T1, $\alpha = .89$ at T2, and $\alpha = .93$ at T3.

The second way we measured student learning was by examining students’ Affective Learning for Workshop (AL) was measured using a slightly modified version of McCroskey’s (1994) Affective Learning Measure. The Affective Learning Measure uses a 7-point bi-polar semantic differential that includes pairs such as “Bad—
Good” and “Valuable—Worthless.” For our study, the four affect toward content measure items were included, but the prompt was changed from “Content/subject matter of the course” to “I feel that the peer workshop experience was” to measure students’ affective learning in the peer workshop that they just completed. McCroskey (1994) reports that the reliability for this measure has ranged from .85 to well above .90. For our study, the reliability for this scale was $\alpha = .84$ at $T_2$ and $\alpha = .84$ at $T_3$.

Finally, student learning was measured by students’ speech grades (SG), which serves as a proxy for speech quality. All three speeches were graded by the course instructors using standardized grading rubrics, and all speech grades were converted into a 100-point scale for the purposes of this analysis. All instructors go through several grade-norming exercises that include several rounds of training and grading to establish high inter-rater reliability, ensuring that grades are a fair representation of quality across all sections of the course. The three speeches that students gave included a narrative speech (SG1), an informative speech (SG2), and a persuasive speech (SG3).

Public Speaking Anxiety (PSA) was measured using Booth-Butterfield and Gould’s (1986) State Communication Anxiety Inventory, which includes 20 items measured with a four-point Likert-type scale. The authors report an overall reliability of $\alpha = .91$ for this scale and include items such as, “I felt tense and nervous,” and “My words became confused and jumbled when I was speaking” (p. 199). For our study, the reliability for this scale was $\alpha = .86$ at $T_1$, $\alpha = .89$ at $T_2$, and $\alpha = .83$ at $T_3$.

Connected Classroom Climate (CCC) was measured using Dwyer et al.’s (2004) Connected Classroom Cli-
mate Inventory, which includes eighteen items measured with a five-point Likert scale. The authors report an overall reliability of $\alpha = .94$ for this scale and include items such as, “I feel a strong bond with my classmates,” and “The students in my class are supportive of one another” (p. 268). For our study, the reliability for this scale was $\alpha = .93$ at $T_1$, $\alpha = .97$ at $T_2$, and $\alpha = .99$ at $T_3$.

Perceived Workshop Value (WV) was measured using six items using a five-point Likert scale. These items were developed specifically for this study and included the following items: “I received valuable feedback from my peers during our peer workshop,” “I enjoyed the peer workshop,” “My peers did not provide helpful comments” (reverse-coded), “The peer workshop enhanced my understanding of public speaking,” “I was able to use the feedback from my peers to improve my speech,” and “The peer workshop was a waste of time” (reverse-coded). For our study, the reliability for this scale was $\alpha = .86$ at $T_2$ and $\alpha = .88$ at $T_3$.

**RESULTS**

Split-plot within-subjects repeated measures analyses were conducted to find out whether there was a difference between the two treatment groups in SG, PSA, CCC, and LI across the quarter. Means for these variables are included in Table 2. Independent samples $t$-tests were used to find out whether there was a difference between groups in AL and WV for each speech. Alpha was set at .05 for all tests.
Table 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Group 1</th>
<th>Group 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>O1</td>
<td>O2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speech Grade</td>
<td>M=84.12</td>
<td>M=84.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SD=4.89</td>
<td>SD=6.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Speaking Anxiety</td>
<td>M=44.00</td>
<td>M=41.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SD=8.27</td>
<td>SD=9.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connected Classroom</td>
<td>M=72.08</td>
<td>M=71.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Climate</td>
<td>SD=8.44</td>
<td>SD=9.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning Indicators</td>
<td>M=30.96</td>
<td>M=30.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SD=6.13</td>
<td>SD=6.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affective Learning</td>
<td>M=22.96</td>
<td>M=22.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SD=4.76</td>
<td>SD=4.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshop Value</td>
<td>M=23.71</td>
<td>M=22.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SD=4.43</td>
<td>SD=5.29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Student Learning

A within-subjects split plot analysis was conducted to determine whether LI changed differently between the two groups. Wilk’s Lambda was not significant for LI, $\lambda = .903$, $F(2, 53) = 2.847$, $p = .067$, $\eta^2 = .097$, nor for LI by group, $\lambda = .991$, $F(2, 53) = .241$, $p = .786$, $\eta^2 = .009$. Tests of between-subjects effects, within-subjects contrasts, and all pairwise contrasts were also insignificant, indicating that there were no changes in LI between or within groups throughout the quarter. An interaction graph depicting the results is shown in Figure 1. Hypothesis 1 was not supported.

Figure 1: Learning Indicators by Group by Time
In-Class and Out-of-Class Workshops

Affective Learning

A within-subjects split plot analysis was conducted to determine whether there were any differences in AL between groups or between workshop types. Means and standard deviations are shown in Table 3. Wilk’s Lambda was not significant for AL, $\lambda = .964$, $F(1, 54) = 2.017$, $p = .161$, $\eta^2_p = .036$, nor for AL by group, $\lambda = .986$, $F(1, 54) = .773$, $p = .383$, $\eta^2_p = .014$. Tests of between-subjects effects were also not significant, $F(1, 54) = .073$, $p = .788$, $\eta^2_p = .001$. Research Question 1 revealed that there was no difference in AL for students who participate in in- and out-of-class peer workshops.

Table 3
Affective Learning

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Group 1 (N=24)</th>
<th>Group 2 (N=32)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AL for In-Class Workshop</td>
<td>$M=22.96$, $SD=4.75$</td>
<td>$M=23.00$, $SD=5.74$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AL for Out-of Class Workshop</td>
<td>$M=22.71$, SD 4.61</td>
<td>$M=21.94$, SD 5.65</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Speech Grade

A within-subjects split plot analysis was conducted to determine whether SG changed differently between the two groups. Wilks’ Lambda was significant for SG, $\lambda = .840$, $F(2, 53) = 5.057$, $p = .010$, $\eta^2_p = .160$, but not for SG by group, $\lambda = .971$, $F(2, 53) = .781$, $p = .463$, $\eta^2_p = .029$. Tests of within-subjects effects were significant for SG, $F(1.989, 205.470) = 4.98$, $p = .009$, $\eta^2_p = .084$. Between-subjects effects were not significant. Within-sub-
jects contrasts for SG showed a significant linear trend, $F(1, 54) = 1.531, p = .014, \eta_p^2 = .108$, but did not show a significant quadratic trend, $F(1, 54) = 1.531, p = .061, \eta_p^2 = .063$. Pairwise comparisons for Group 1 showed no significant difference in grades for speeches 1 and 2 ($p = .948$), but did show a significant difference in grades for speeches 2 and 3 ($p = .018$) and for speeches 1 and 3 ($p = .015$). There were no significant differences in SG for Group 2. This means that, while there was no significant difference between the groups for the SG or for the overall growth in speech performances, students who did the in-class workshop first and the out-of-class workshop second had greater gains in SG between their second and third speech. Ultimately, Research Question

![Figure 2: Speech Grades by Group by Time](image)
2 revealed that there is no difference in student SG for each speech depending on which kind of peer workshop is done, but students who do an in-class workshop followed by an out-of-class workshop did experience a significant gain. While these results are not conclusive, they point towards a potential trend; it is beneficial to do the first peer workshop in-class so that students are better prepared to give and receive quality feedback in later out-of-class workshops, whether they are held in- or out-of-class. An interaction graph depicting the results is shown in Figure 2.

**Public Speaking Anxiety**

A within-subjects split plot analysis was conducted to determine PSA changed differently between the two groups. Wilk’s Lambda was significant for PSA, \( \lambda = .724 \), \( F(2, 53) = 10.126, p < .001, \eta_p^2 = .276 \), but not for PSA by group, \( \lambda = .998 \), \( F(2, 53) = .059, p = .943, \eta_p^2 = .002 \). Tests of within-subjects effects were significant for PSA, \( F(2, 108) = 10.608, p < .001, \eta_p^2 = .164 \). Between-subjects effects were not significant. Within-subjects contrasts for PSA showed a significant linear trend, \( F(1, 54) = 20.443, p < .001, \eta_p^2 = .275 \), but did not show a significant quadratic trend, \( F(1, 54) = .953, p = .877, \eta_p^2 < .001 \). Pairwise comparisons for Group 1 showed no significant difference in PSA between measurements 1 and 2 (\( p = .203 \)) or between measurements 2 and 3 (\( p = .063 \)), but did show a significant decrease between measurements 1 and 3 (\( p = .003 \)). Likewise, pairwise comparisons for Group 2 showed no significant difference in PSA between measurements 1 and 2 (\( p = .082 \)) or between measurements 2 and 3 (\( p = .102 \)), but did show a signifi-
Research Question 3 revealed that, while there was no significant difference between groups, all students reduced their PSA by the end of the quarter. An interaction graph depicting the results is shown in Figure 3.

**Figure 3: Public Speaking Anxiety by Group by Time**

**Connected Classroom Climate**

To explore Research Question 4, a within-subjects split plot analysis was conducted to determine whether CCC changed differently between the two groups. Wilk’s Lambda was not significant for CCC, $\lambda = .909$, $F(2, 53) = 2.640$, $p = .081$, $\eta^2_p = .091$, nor for CCC by group, $\lambda = .955$, $F(2, 53) = 1.239$, $p = .298$, $\eta^2_p = .045$. Between-sub-
objects effects were not significant. There was no significant quadratic trend, but there was a slight but significant linear trend, $F(1, 54) = 4.160, p = .046, \eta_p^2 = .072$. There were no significant differences in CCC for Group 1 among the three data collection times, but for Group 2, CCC was significantly higher at measurement 3 than it was at either measurement 1 ($p = .009$) or measurement 2 ($p = .016$). This means that the second group has a significant increase in CCC after doing the in-class workshop. However, it is noteworthy that CCC levels were already fairly high by the time that students gave their first speech, so it is likely that the classroom interactions during the first few weeks of class do more to influence CCC than do either kind of peer workshop. An

![Figure 4: Connected Classroom Climate](https://ecommons.udayton.edu/bcca/vol26/iss1/19)
interaction graph depicting the results is shown in Figure 4.

**Perceived Workshop Value**

Next, to answer Research Question 5, a within-subjects split plot analysis was conducted to determine whether there were any differences in WV between groups or between workshop types. Wilk’s Lambda was not significant for WV, \( \lambda = .946, F(1, 54) = 3.065, p = .086, \eta^2_p = .054 \), nor for WV by group, \( \lambda = .994, F(1, 54) = .303, p = .584, \eta^2_p = .006 \). Tests of between-subjects effects were also not significant, \( F(1, 54) = .225, p = .638, \eta^2_p = .004 \). This means that there is no significant difference in the perceived value of the in-class and out-of-class peer workshops.

Table 4 summarizes the means, standard deviations, and student preferences for the workshops. Together, these tests indicate that there is no clear difference be-

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Group 1 (N=24)</th>
<th>Group 2 (N=32)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Workshop Value for In-Class Workshop</td>
<td>( M=23.71, SD=4.43 )</td>
<td>( M=23.47, SD=5.37 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshop Value for Out-of-Class Workshop</td>
<td>( M=22.96, SD=5.29 )</td>
<td>( M=22.03, SD=5.19 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent that Prefer In-Class Workshops</td>
<td>58.3% (N=14)</td>
<td>78.1% (N=25)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent that Prefer Out-of-Class Workshops</td>
<td>41.7% (N=10)</td>
<td>21.9% (N=7)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In-Class and Out-of-Class Workshops

tween in-class and out-of-class workshops in terms of how much students enjoy them or how much benefit students believe they obtain from the workshops. However, when students were directly asked which type of workshop they prefer, both groups preferred an in-class peer workshop to an out-of-class peer workshop. This preference was even stronger for the group that did the out-of-class workshop first. It is possible that this is an indication that those who did an in-class workshop first felt better prepared and were able to give and receive helpful feedback during the subsequent out-of-class workshop.

**DISCUSSION**

The goal for this study was to determine the effectiveness of peer workshops towards helping students prepare for public speaking presentations. Specifically, it examined if students’ SG, PSA, CCC, LI, and WV differed depending on whether students engaged in out-of-class or in-class peer workshops. The findings from this study offer several implications for students, teachers, and administrators involved in the basic communication course and courses with a presentational speaking component.

First, the results revealed that conducting peer workshops, regardless of context, can benefit students as they prepare for presentations. This finding reinforces Broeckelman-Post et al.’s (2011) research which found that those students who participated in peer workshops saw improvements in the quality of their speeches over the course of semester. Further, results suggest a trend towards conducting in-class workshops.
before out-of-class workshops because students have greater gains on presentation grades. Upon examining the data, it appears that students’ grades improved between the second and third presentations and from the first presentation to the third when they participated in in-class workshops and then out-of-class workshops. A possible explanation for that may be that conducting the first peer workshop in-class allowed students to more fully engage in the workshop modeling exercise and, as a result, they were able to give and receive effective peer feedback. Then later in the term, when students were ready to do an out-of-class workshop, they had experience and were more confident in their own and their peers’ ability to give trustworthy and constructive feedback. These findings echo previous research which suggests that when students receive feedback and rationales for suggested improvements from multiple sources, they are able to integrate and apply it towards their work (Cho & MacArthur, 2010; Gielen, et al., 2009). It is also possible that students who had participated in in-class workshops earlier in the term had stronger relationships with their peers and trusted each other (and each other’s feedback) more since they had already had an opportunity to engage in face-to-face conversations about previous presentations. This finding makes sense given other research that points to a positive peer climate improving student outcomes (Frisby & Martin, 2010) and in turn this positive climate predicts academic success, efficacy, and connectedness (Nelson & DeBacker, 2008).

From these findings, it appears that workshops have a greater impact after students have given their first major presentation in a course (in this case, the In-
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Formative Speech, which is the first time that external sources, structured outlines, and clear transitions are incorporated. In part, this finding can be explained through Bloom’s (1971) mastery learning approach. When using a mastery learning approach, students are provided instruction on course content, assessed on the knowledge and skills they have learned, and given specific feedback on areas they must master in order to meet the learning outcomes for the targeted task. Students are then reassessed using a similar activity to determine whether the feedback successfully helped student improve their performance. In a similar vein, students in the current study acquired knowledge about the speech making process through course instruction, delivered their first major presentation, and received feedback on their performance. The students then engaged in subsequent presentations in the course. In terms of the workshop timing, the second round of in-class then out-of-class workshops may have been more beneficial towards grade gains because students’ understood the workshop purpose and structure and had targeted suggestions for areas of improvement from their previous presentations to reference during the workshop. Ultimately, teachers should find these results encouraging and reinforce their choice to allocate days in the curriculum for structured presentation workshops.

Second, PSA was reduced for all students in the study by the end of the course. This finding is consistent with previous literature that highlights the important role oral communication courses play in reducing students speaking anxiety (Hancock, Stone, Brundage, & Zeigler, 2010). In the current study, it appears that the reduction in speech anxiety can be traced to involve-
ment in the course over time rather than participation in the peer workshops. Although peer workshops did not reduce speaking anxiety, the workshop approach remains an important pedagogical method because they serve as another tool to improve students’ presentational speaking competence (Falchikov, 2000; Smith, 2002) and engage in habituation, performance feedback, and skills-based training, which have been shown to reduce state PSA (Finn et al., 2009; McCroskey, 2009).

Third, results suggest no significant differences for workshop type and student learning or workshop value, but speech quality appears to improve as a result of peer workshops. Ultimately, this may illustrate the ways in which peer workshops are uniquely suited for basic courses and courses with a presentational speaking component. To implement these findings in their basic courses, instructors should discuss with students how the peer workshop demonstrates, reinforces, and extends course content. In doing so, students will build schematic relationships between and among course content they have or will learn throughout the course and potentially increase the perceived value of the workshop.

Finally, students who did the out-of-class workshops first reported greater growth in CCC than students who participated in in-class workshops first. However, it is noteworthy that there was no significant difference between the groups in CCC at any point time, which suggests that other elements of the class are probably influencing the classroom climate more than the peer workshops. CCC was at a fairly high level at the first data collection point and increased for both groups, showing that students felt closer to and more supported
by one another as the course progressed in both groups. Students in the current study had positive feelings of rapport with their classmates at the end point in the academic term, which has been shown to increase participation, student-student interaction, and reduce anxiety (Coupland, 2003; Frisby & Myers, 2008). For these students, CCC may have been cultivated throughout the course by the instructor and students. In this sense, the peer workshops may have only served to reinforce existing feelings of connection, or it is possible that both kinds of workshops are impacting classroom climate to the same degree.

Practical Implications

The results of this study give rise to several important implications for faculty, staff, and students involved in courses that have a presentational speaking component. Perhaps most importantly, the findings suggest that conducting peer workshops can increase the quality of students’ speeches and presentational competencies. This finding should be encouraging to faculty whose courses involve oral presentations. In all, our research provides a rationale and support for allocating time in the curriculum for peer workshops because they improve students’ presentation grades and increase perceptions of connected classroom climate. To increase the value of these peer workshops and increase student learning, faculty should provide students with a list of tasks that should be completed during the workshop and explain (or have students explain) during a debriefing exercise how the workshop experience demonstrated previously learned course content. Likewise,
students should leave the workshop experience with feedback that will help them improve their presentation skills.

Limitations and Future Research

As with all research, it is important to examine the results of this study within the context of its limitations. First, although 56 students successfully completed all three sets of assessments, this sample size was relatively small. Despite the fact that the current sample size did exceed expectations for repeated measures designs (Stevens, 2002), a larger sample size would further increase confidence in the research findings. Second, two-thirds of the participants were female and the age of the participants was rather homogeneous. While this is fairly representative of the age and sex demographics on most college campuses, it might be valuable to find out whether the workshop experience has different effects depending on the age and sex of the students. Third, the study did not include a control group since previous research (Broeckelman-Post et al., 2011) found that students who participated in peer workshops had stronger gains in speech quality than those that did not participate in peer workshops, nor did this study include students who participated in two in-class workshops or two out-of-class workshops. Future research should consider incorporating all of these elements into a single design. The Perceived Workshop value measure was created for this study, and future researchers should continue to use this measure to further test its reliability and validity. Future studies should examine the kinds of feedback that students give
and receive during in and out-of-class workshops to find out whether there is a qualitative difference in comments shared amongst peers. Additionally, the present study did not examine the structure and process of the in-class and out-of-class workshops; future researchers will want to explore this to determine what impact, if any, it has on student learning, classroom climate, and speech anxiety.

**CONCLUSION**

Ultimately, this study suggests that there are benefits for including peer workshops in communication courses. In- and out-of-class workshops offer similar benefits for students, so instructors who are pressed for time should be confident that either type of workshop will be helpful. However, students prefer in-class workshops, and previous literature suggests that the training that can more easily accompany in-class workshops might have benefits for helping students learn to provide more constructive feedback. Because of this, we suggest including an in-class workshop early in the academic term if possible to give students a chance to build relationships and feedback skills before conducting out-of-class workshops.
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Clicking Instead of Speaking: The Impact of Students’ Communication Apprehension on Their Evaluation of Mediated Participation and Learning in the Basic Course

Katherine J. Denker

INTRODUCTION

Calls from every source, from students to national agencies, focus on the need to transform college classrooms into spaces of engagement and participation including the basic communication course. Researchers have noted that across the board, participation in college classrooms is limited and a cause for concern (Petress, 2001). However, for students regulated to large lecture lab sections of the basic course this lack of participation is “exacerbated in the large lecture sections, as the distance between the instructor and students is increased both physically and interpersonally” (Denker, 2013, p.51). Though the number of large lecture lab sections is not as high as in past decades (Morreale, Worely, & Hugenberg, 2010), with the current state of higher education, the possibility for expansion and return to this format is clear (Tierney, 2011). Large lecture sections have been noted for leaving students as passive observers rather than engaged participants, as they watch a faculty member who seems removed both physically and affectively (Mayer et al, 2009).

Limited participation in large lecture sections of the basic course is even more problematic considering stu-
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dents who experience communication apprehension. In working to engage students and help them develop as speakers, one of the largest roadblocks in the basic public speaking courses is limited participation, which is often tied to students’ communication apprehension (McCroskey, 1976), and a profound impact on classroom interactions (Bippus & Young, 2000). Reticent students often work on “making themselves inconspicuous,” and even withdraw from required courses (Bowers, 1986). One easy venue for students to become inconspicuous is the large lecture sections of the basic course where participation makes individuals stand out.

As participation is central to the basic communication course, it is imperative that instructors work to engage all students and one possibility for increasing interaction is through the use of Student Response Systems. Researchers have argued that Student Response Systems (SRS) or clickers are one of the most promising technologies in transforming the classroom (Roschelle, Penuel, & Abrahamson, 2004) and have linked SRS to strong outcomes like increased learning, engagement, and students’ perceptions of educational value (e.g., Hall, Colier, Thomas, & Hilgers, 2005; Preszler, Dawe, Schuster, & Shuster, 2007). Though researchers have started to examine the use of these systems in communication classrooms (Denker, 2013), what we know about SRS in the basic course is limited.

Students comment that the anonymity of clicker responses encourages their participation and removes some of the pressure inherent in other forms of response (e.g., Bruff, 2009; Guthrie & Carlin, 2004). Additionally, SRS protect against silencing, as marginal opinions are easier to express (Bruff, 2009). Further, shy students
report both more negative affect in classrooms that require verbal responses or hand raising and higher preference for the use of SRS (Stowell, Oldham, & Bennett, 2010). However, in measuring the impact of clicker use on “shy” students, researchers have used measures linked to shyness such as anxiety and shame (Stowell et al., 2010) rather than more direct measures. Though helpful, indirect measures do not allow for an accurate of a picture of the relationships at play. As technology continues to develop as an important opportunity for augmenting basic course instruction, researchers need to understand how the dynamic of the basic communication course shapes participation, students’ willingness to engage in interactions based on their communication apprehension, and how these relationships impact learning.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Student Participation in the Basic Communication Course Classroom

Morreale, Worley, and Hugenberg, (2010) noted that ten percent of basic communication courses are still run through large lecture lab formats. As concerns have been linked to large lecture class format, like the large lecture lab set up of many basic course classes (e.g., Draper & Brown, 2004; Mollborn & Hoekstra, 2010), one common issue is the question of engagement, and as an extension of this, participation. From feeling affectively distant to periods of passivity (Denker, 2013; Mayer et al., 2009), leaving large lecture sections of the basic
course unexamined can create harmful outcomes for students.

Student engagement is tied to student success (Kuh, 2007). Further engagement, often conceptualized through participation in the basic course, is one of the best predictors of learning (Carini, Kuh, & Klein, 2006; Davies & Graff, 2005). Moreover, participation offers many advantages beyond cognitive gains, including enhanced classroom climate, improved students’ self-esteem, and increased motivation (McKeachie, 1970; Meyer & Hunt, 2011). Psychomotor learning, such as developing communication skills, has also been associated with participation (Dallimore, Hertenstein, & Platt, 2008). Although more limited in large lecture sections of the basic course due to student perceptions and time constraints, interaction provided in discussion is the most prevalent and useful approach for fostering critical reflection (Wade, 1994). One concerning finding is how infrequently students participate in class (Rocca, 2010). Researchers have noted that only around 25% of students participate in class, especially in larger classrooms (Karp & Yoels, 1976; Nunn, 1996). Though this limited participation might have a variety of causes beyond the student, it is important for researchers to examine variables that impact participation and look for ways to further engage students in the basic course classroom.

Given the clear importance of participation, it is imperative to note that some variables impact students’ willingness to engage in the classroom and participate. Multiple scholars have noted that students’ self-perceptions also impact their classroom interactions (Fassinger, 1995a, 1995b; Karp & Yoels, 1976; Wade, 1994;
Weaver & Qi, 2005). Additionally, students’ traits such as communication apprehension (Bippus & Young, 2000), have a profound impact on classroom interactions as some students are motivated to engage whereas others work to be inconspicuous (Bowers, 1986). Students can easily become inconspicuous especially in the large lecture sections of the basic course classroom where participation makes individuals stand out.

Participation is also limited by classroom-based factors, such as class size, seating arrangements, and timing (Fassinger, 1995b; Myers et al., 2009). Furthermore, students’ perceptions of a comfortable classroom, based on prior experiences and environmental factors, impact their willingness to communicate (Auster & MacRone, 1994). This suggests that students with previous lecture experience will participate more in lecture settings (Rocca, 2010). Additionally, having talkative peers in the class can create a “consolidation of responsibility;” and thus remove individual responsibility, allowing some students to remain silent (Fassinger, 1995a; Howard, Short, & Clark, 1996; Karp & Yoels, 1976). Course policies also impact participation (Junn, 1994), such as graded participation, the quality of class discussions (Dallimore, Hertenstein, & Platt, 2004), and active learning strategies (Shaver, 2010). With the limitations in participation linked to both student and classroom traits, researchers must continue explore solutions. One option for increasing participation in the basic communication course is SRS.
Student Response Systems

As communication scholars have suggested, limiting our understanding of participation to spoken interactions alone is problematic (Meyer, 2007, 2010). Moreover, as communication apprehension impacts participation, instructors need new tools to include all voices (Bippus & Young, 2000). Instructional technology can be one of those tools. One form of technology, SRS, have grown in popularity through recent technological advancements and increased media exposure (Karaman, 2011; Winograd & Cheesman, 2007). Student response systems, or SRS, are classroom polling systems that use individual remotes or “clickers” that send infrared or radio frequencies to the instructors’ receiver. These allow instructors to both record and assess students’ responses in the classroom in real time (see Denker, 2013). Though SRS use is still largely limited to “early adopters,” researchers have started to examine these systems (Emenike & Holme, 2012). There is an abundance of literature reviews that offer a current understanding of SRS\(^1\) (e.g., Fies & Marshall, 2006; White, Syncox, & Alters, 2011; Winograd & Cheesman, 2007). However, the majority of the scholarship on SRS still only offers implementation advice, be it framed from pedagogical theory or simply a discussion of the process (e.g., King, 2011) rather than evaluation. As we move to incorporate tools to build learning centered classrooms, engagements should increase, however those in charge

\(^1\) As past articles have already established the history of student response systems, this will not be presented here. Rather, the reader should return to these sources for more information.
of the basic course have a responsibility to assess the tools incorporated into their pedagogy.

In reviewing the benefits of SRS, the incorporation of SRS has been linked to students' cognitive gains. Researchers started to examine the impact on students' cognitive gains through self reports and noted students report that clickers enhance their learning (Ioannou & Artino, 2010). Moreover, Denker (2013) found that clickers impact perceptions of both cognitive and affective learning in the basic communication course classroom. In exploring actual instructional outcomes, Gauci, Dantas, Williams, and Kemm (2009) found clicker technologies significantly impacted both midterm and final exam score; however, these result were limited to the psychology classroom. As the basic communication course has uniquely different goals, it is important to test for these same impacts on instructional outcomes.

Other benefits of SRS have been noted including: feedback, engagement, anonymity, and increased meta-cognitive awareness (e.g., Bruff, 2009; Denker, 2013; Hoekstra, 2008; Ioannou & Artino, 2010; Preszler et al., 2007). Students comment that the anonymity of clicker responses encourages participation and removes group-think or peer pressure inherent in other forms of response (e.g., Bruff, 2009; Guthrie & Carlin, 2004). Additionally, SRS guard against silencing in the classroom, as marginal opinions are easier to express (Bruff, 2009), leading to a more supportive climate (Winograd & Cheesman, 2007). These findings are further supported by research noting that shy students both report more negative affect in classrooms that require hand raising and greater preference for SRS (Stowell et al., 2010), which can decrease “performance avoidance goals”
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(Roschelle et al., 2004, p. 5). These findings echo the work of Beckert, Fauth, and Olsen (2009) who noted that students who self-reported a lower likelihood of engaging in verbal comments also reported high satisfaction with clickers. This satisfaction might be due to the option for mediated rather than direct communication. However, in exploring the needs of students that are engaging more with clickers, our understanding is limited if we focus only on roughly constructed concepts like Stowell et al., (2010) measure of shyness, evaluated through measures of anxiety and shame, which they argue are overlapping. Some of the limitations in measuring shyness could be linked to the lack of a clear conceptual definition (McCroskey & Richmond, 1982). As imprecise measures can limit our understanding, researchers examining the basic communication course should work to build a greater understanding of “shy” students through more established means.

Further, it is concerning to note that the understanding of SRS in the basic course and the field of instructional communication is very limited. Only two published pieces encourage the use of this technology in the classroom (Barrett, Bornsen, Erickson, Markey, & Spiering, 2005; Winograd & Cheesman, 2007), and two papers explore the positive impact of SRS on perceived learning and engagement in the classroom (Denker, 2013; Trees & Jackson, 2007). In exploring basic communication courses, Morreale et al. (2010) acknowledged that the use of technology is one of the most significant changes over time; however, communication research fails to offer a full understanding of how one important technology—SRS—is utilized in our classrooms, and further how these technologies offer assistance for...
meeting our students’ needs, such as those who are shy or those with high communication apprehension.

**Communication Apprehension**

Reconceptualizing shyness from a communicative standpoint leads us to the construct of trait—based communication apprehension (CA). CA is one of the most researched phenomena in the field of instructional communication (Honeycutt, Choi, & DeBerry, 2009). McCroskey and Richmond (1982) noted that shyness and CA are correlated constructs that can be understood as forming a “genus-species relationship” (p. 460). The genus is shyness, and CA exists as the species, the “tendency to behave in a shy manner because of fear or anxiety” (p. 461). However, with the noted problems in measuring shyness (McCroskey & Richmond, 1982), and the limitations in measures apparent in Stowell et al., (2010), it is appropriate to move this exploration to the species’ level and see how students’ traits of CA impact individuals’ reception of mediated communication in the classroom via clickers, and if this form of mediated communication improves learning outcomes in the basic course.

Communication apprehension has strong implications on students’ communication in the basic course. As McCroskey, Richmond, and McCroskey (2002) noted:

Students who do not talk much in the classroom (are apprehensive, shy, less willing to communicate, and/or see themselves as less communicatively competent) are evaluated less positively by their teachers, achieve less on teacher made and standardized tests, and develop less positive affect toward the content of
classes, their teachers (particularly those who demand participation or formal presentations), and school in general (p. 386).

As early research has noted, students with high trait CA will often avoid interactions in the classroom (McCroskey, 1977), which results in an overall decrease in both the amount and quality of interactions between teachers and students (Jordan & Powers, 2007). Apprehension also impacts how students with high CA react to in-class discussion, as they have more negative attitudes toward classes with oral discussions. Furthermore, high CA students devalued communication with peers or the instructor as important aspects of the course when asked about engagement (Bippus & Young, 2000). Additionally, offering tools for engagement is important as students with high CA had less motivation to participate, accomplish tasks, or build relationships with instructors (Jordan & Powers, 2007). One common decision for highly apprehensive students is to avoid classes that would increase anxiety, such as the basic public speaking course (McCroskey, 1977).

Communication apprehension also has significant implications for students' academic success. For students with high CA, they average a 20% decrease in recall when there was an anticipated communication interaction (Booth-Butterfield, 1988). This suggests that when students anticipate an instructor asking for oral responses, their ability greatly decreases. Early research noted highly apprehensive students report both lower test scores and lower GPAs (McCroskey, 1977). This same significant negative relationship between CA and cognitive learning was found in a meta-analysis (Bourhis & Allen, 1992). Additionally, students with
high CA reported lower affect for their instructor and perceived lower levels of learning, thus possibly impacting evaluations of affective learning (Allen, Long, O’Mara & Judd, 2008). As students with high CA possess lower amounts of motivation to participate in class (McCroskey, 1977), it is understandable that these students would be less inclined to verbally interact. As participation has evolved, extending an understanding of how CA impacts participation in the classroom via meditated means can help instructors better understand and assist students’ diverse needs.

**Summary and Research Questions**

Researchers have established classroom participation as important, and further, as problematic when working to engage students with high levels of communication apprehension (Bippus & Young, 2000). As Meyer (2010) argues, “given pedagogical trends in education that emphasize a student-centered classroom environment in which participation is highly encouraged and even tied to a student’s grade, the relationship between speech and silence in the classroom ought to be more carefully examined” (p. 5). Moreover, instructors have an ethical obligation to help students become more comfortable with participating (Petress, 2001), especially in the basic communication course. Researchers have long noted that many students sit in classrooms unengaged (Karp & Yoels, 1976; Nunn, 1996). Moreover, individuals with high CA, approximately 20% of students (Honeycutt et al., 2009), are less likely to take or enjoy communication courses (McCroskey, 1977). SRS have been noted as one of the most promising tech-
technologies for transforming classrooms (Roschelle et al., 2004) and are linked to learning and increased educational value (Preszler et al., 2007). Yet, what we know about SRS is limited, specifically how they can assist shy (Stowell et al., 2010) or apprehensive students, and we must justify the technology that we require our students to use (Hwang & Wolfe, 2010). This study assesses how communication apprehension and SRS impact learning and engagement through the following research questions:

RQ1: How does students’ communication apprehension impact their evaluation of student response systems?

RQ2: How do student response systems impact learning?

RQ3a: How does students’ communication apprehension impact participation in the classroom?

RQ3b: How is the relationship between communication apprehension and participation mediated by clickers?

RQ4a: How does students’ communication apprehension impact their evaluation of learning?

RQ4b: How is the relationship between communication apprehension and learning mediated by clickers?

**METHODS**

**Participants**

Participants were recruited from three sections of a required large lecture and lab-based basic public speak-
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ing course at a mid-sized Midwest state university, all facilitated by the same instructor. As this class is required of all students at the university, it is thus representative of the university population. Students listened to an IRB-approved recruitment script and were directed to a website containing the consent information and survey. In this class, SRS were utilized every period for formative assessment of topics just covered, review of prior topics from both the large lecture and lab sections, to allow students to express their opinions, and also as a starting point for discussion.

In total, 684 students completed the survey. Of those, 68% were freshman (467), 21% sophomores (145), 7% juniors (49), and 3% seniors (20). Three students declined to report. The majority of the participants were traditional college-aged students, between 18 and 22 years old (98% or 671). Ten others were between 23-30 years old, and one was 41+ years old. Two declined to report. 456 students were female (67%), 225 male (33%), and three declined to report. In terms of class performance, 111 students reported that their grade in the class was lower than that in other classes, 428 stated that it was similar, and 142 reported higher grades. Three declined to report. When asked about their experience with clickers, only slightly over a third reported not having other classes that utilized the technology (35% or 240). For students who had taken other classes utilizing SRS, 30% (n=203) of the participants reported taking one other class with clickers, 21% two classes (n=144), 10% three classes (n=70), and 3% four to six courses (n=24).
Procedures and Data Collection

Over halfway through the semester, a recruitment script was read to all large lecture sections of the basic communication course, informing students of the voluntary nature of the assessment research, the minimal extra credit points offered, and the website at which they could find both more information and a link to the online survey. Data was gathered well into the semester as past researchers have noted that students’ perceptions of technology significantly change over time (Lin & Rivera-Sanchez, 2012). When accessing the online survey, participants first encountered the IRB-approved consent information, which included consenting to the use of their SRS scores, exam scores (both multiple choice midterm and final exams), scores on pre- and post-term assessment of CA, and their responses to survey questions. The SurveyMonkey website was utilized for data collection, as it has been shown to be effective in eliminating the chance of data entry error (Henson & Denker, 2009; Morreale et al., 2010). Surveys were stripped of identifying data before they were entered into SPSS to protect participants.

Students completed the personal report of communication apprehension (PRCA-24) during the first two weeks of class and also during the last two weeks of class as part of the ongoing course assessment. Both assessments were completed via Survey Monkey.com. As students complete these measures, they reported both their name and their lab instructor’s to aid in data matching. CA was evaluated based on McCroskey’s (1982) PRCA-24, which has reported an overall alpha ranging from .93 to .95, with “reliability estimates for the individual composites are only slightly lower” (Ru-
Items in this scale include “I dislike participating in group discussions,” “I am afraid to express myself in meetings,” “While participating in a conversation with a new acquaintance, I feel very nervous,” and “My thoughts become confused and jumbled when I am giving a speech.”

CA was examined via sub scale scores in the research questions as communication apprehension may vary across contexts (Richmond & McCroskey, 1998). In this study, reliabilities ranged for the scales and subscales in the pre and post measures from .85 to .95 and the average scores for the PRCA-24 was 65.64, suggesting that the sample included those with marginally higher CA, as McCroskey suggests a mean of around 65.6. Looking at the assessment scores on the PRCA-24 completed by all students in the class that semester, the mean was 65.19 but was not significantly different from the mean of the sample group, which suggests that those that chose to complete the study were average students. The PRCA-24 was selected as McCroskey (1984) argued it is a trait measure, which should most closely link to stable personality traits like shyness.

Additionally, SRS were used in every large lecture class as a means of reviewing past material and also assessing students’ understanding. SRS questions are multiple choice questions that reflect course content both for evaluating students’ understanding of the material as well as starting discussions on course topics. Students received points each week for their responses to questions asked. Additionally, students were able to earn more points during review sessions for correct responses. This data was then matched with students who voluntarily consented to participate in the research.
study. Clicker scores were evaluated by a sum score of the students’ points earned through the semester.

The first portion of the online survey asked questions about students’ use and perceptions of SRS developed by Jackson and Trees (2003), Trees and Jackson (2007), Draper and Brown (2004), and the present researcher. These questions included not only evaluations of the SRS, but also how students preferred to participate in classes. Trees and Jackson’s (2007) Desirable Learning Process (DLP) scale was originally composed of five items focusing on students’ perceptions of learning processes with a reliability of $\alpha = .86$. Trees and Jackson’s (2007) Classroom Involvement/Engagement (CIE) scale was originally composed of six items focusing on students’ perceptions of their ability to be an active, engaged participant and their feelings about the classroom (e.g., it felt more like a small class), with a reliability of $\alpha = .78$. The current study reconstructed these two scales in order to achieve acceptable reliability. The clicker learning scale was comprised of the original items as Trees and Jackson (2007) intended (reliability in the current study was $\alpha = .801$). Questions asked students to agree or disagree on a continuum with statements including “By using my clicker in this class I got feedback on my understanding of classroom material.” The clicker engagement scale was composed of four items from the CIE scale and four additional questions (reliability in the current study was $\alpha = .759$). Questions included statements like “The use of clickers in this class helped my experience in this class to be more like the experience of a small class.”

In addition to questions assessing students’ perceptions of clicker use, students completed other related
measures to examine the research questions. Participation was measured utilizing an abbreviated form of Fassinger's (1995b) participation scale to increase reliability; this scale has obtained a reliability coefficient of .92 (Goodboy & Myers, 2008). In this study, an alpha of .88 was obtained. Questions on this scale included items such as “I contribute to class.” and “I express personal opinions.” Next, given that Schmidt (2011) called future researchers to employ students’ own evaluations of learning, in addition to exam scores, this study assessed cognitive learning through Richmond, McCroskey, Kearney, and Plax’s (1987) learning loss scale, where students report their own learning by responding to two questions: how much they perceived that they learned in the class, and how much they would have learned with the ideal instructor. Though this scale has been not without criticism due to its dependence on students perceptions and lacking ecological validity (Metts, Sprecher, & Cupach, 1991; Hess, Smythe, & Com 451, 2001), the Learning Loss scores are the most prevalent measure of cognitive learning in communication education research since the construction of the scale (Chesebro & McCroskey, 2000). Further, Anderson’s (1979) affective learning scale was used to measure students’ affective learning in the classroom. Sub scales scores from this measure were used so that the individual impact of each area of affective learning would be apparent. This scale has previously reported alphas from .86 to .98 (Rubin et al., 1994), and in this study, the subscales resulted in alphas ranging from .81 to .92. Items on this scale rate the behaviors recommended in the class, the course content, course instructor, likelihood of enrolling in a similar course and engaging in the
behaviors recommended in the course on a series of semantic differentials. Finally, students completed demographic information including how many courses they had taken that used clickers and their perception of their current course performance. After removing all identifying information, the data were stored on a password protected computer.

**Data Analysis**

Correlations were run to examine the possible relationships. Once initial relationships were apparent and testing would be appropriate based on correlations and test for collinearity, RQ1, RQ2, RQ3a and RQ4a were explored with regressions. To best answer RQ3b and RQ4b, a path diagram was used as it allows researchers to examine direct and indirect effects of variables. Path analysis, a form of structural equation modeling that is used in instructional communication research, provides insight into direct relationship between a larger network of variables (see Finn & Schrod, 2012; Frymier, 1994; Weber, Martin, & Myers, 2011). Based on the reviewed literature and research questions, a diagram was hypothesized. From there, path coefficients, a form of regression, were calculated. Path coefficients were calculated using AMOS version 16 with missing data for a participant was estimated using the AMOS’s “estimate values and intercepts” option. Goodness of fit was tested using multiple test statistics including chi-square, root mean square error approximation (RMSEA), normed fit index (NFI), and the comparative fit index (CFI). After evaluating the hypothesized model, two subsequent models were tested to arrive at
the model that most accurately reflected the relationships present in the data.

**RESULTS**

The first research question examined how students’ CA impacts student evaluations of SRS. In examining the interactions between the clicker participation and learning scale, correlations were first run to establish initial relationships. CA scores were examined via subscale scores in the research questions as communication apprehension may vary across contexts (Richmond & McCroskey, 1998). As these relationships were significant, stepwise regressions were run. In exploring students’ perceptions of clicker engagement, PrePRCA-24 group and public speaking scores significantly predicted their views of clicker engagement, $F(2, 592) = 8.308, p < 0.001, R^2 = 0.027$, and adjusted $R^2 = 0.024$. Exploring the individual relationships between clicker engagement and CA, both the PrePRCA-24 Public Speaking scores ($t = 3.004, p = 0.003$, with a standardized coefficient $b = 0.132$) and the PrePRCA-24 Group scores ($t = -3.707, p < .001$, with a standardized coefficient $b = -0.163$) significantly predicted students’ perceptions of clicker engagement. Additionally, PrePRCA Public Speaking scores significantly predicted students’ perceptions of clicker learning, $F(1, 596) = 5.972, p = 0.015, R^2 = 0.010$, and adjusted $R^2 = 0.008$.

The second research question explored the relationship between SRS and learning. Both scores on the clicker engagement scale and clicker learning scale were correlated with all measures of affective learning and learning loss. Additionally, the clicker learning scale
was correlated with both scores on the final and midterm. Students’ iClicker scores for the semester were also correlated with both final exam scores and midterm exam scores. Based on the significant correlations, regression analyses were run. In exploring students’ midterm exam scores, both iClicker and Clicker Learning scores significantly predicted their midterm scores, $F(2, 655) = 26.831, p < 0.001$, $R^2 = 0.076$, and adjusted $R^2 = 0.073$. Exploring the individual relationships between the midterm and SRS, both the iClicker scores ($t = 6.281, p < .001$, with a standardized coefficient $b = 0.236$) and the Clicker Learning scores ($t = 3.360, p = .001$, with a standardized coefficient $b = 0.126$) significantly predicted students’ midterm scores. Likewise, the final exam scores were also significantly predicted by both iClicker and Clicker Learning scores, $F(2, 635) = 35.222, p < 0.001$, $R^2 = 0.100$, and adjusted $R^2 = 0.097$. Exploring the individual relationships between the final and SRS, both the iClicker scores ($t = 7.455, p < .001$, with a standardized coefficient $b = 0.281$) and the Clicker Learning scores ($t = 3.433, p = .001$, with a standardized coefficient $b = 0.129$) significantly predicted students’ final scores. The final measure of cognitive learning, learning loss was significantly predicted by both Clicker Learning and Clicker Engagement, $F(2, 644) = 19.194, p < 0.001$, $R^2 = 0.056$, and adjusted $R^2 = 0.053$. Exploring the individual relationships between learning loss and SRS, both the Clicker Engagement scores ($t = -3.130, p = .002$, with a standardized coefficient $b = -0.153$) and the Clicker Learning scores ($t = -2.230, p = .026$, with a standardized coefficient $b = -0.109$) significantly predicted students’ midterm scores.
In turning to measures of affective learning, all sub scores of the scale were significantly predicted by students’ perceptions of clicker engagement and clicker learning. The first measure of affective learning, perception of the recommended behaviors, was significantly predicted by both Clicker Learning and Engagement, $F(2, 639) = 73.834, p < 0.001, R^2 = 0.188$, and adjusted $R^2 = 0.185$. Individually, both the Clicker Engagement scores ($t = 7.053, p < 0.001$, with a standardized coefficient $b = 0.322$) and the Clicker Learning scores ($t = 3.318, p = 0.001$, with a standardized coefficient $b = 0.152$) significantly predicted students’ scores on the first affective learning scale. The second measure of affective learning, perceptions of course content, was significantly predicted by both Clicker Learning and Engagement, $F(2, 638) = 68.625, p < 0.001, R^2 = 0.177$, and adjusted $R^2 = 0.174$. Individually, both the Clicker Engagement scores ($t = 7.524, p < 0.001$, with a standardized coefficient $b = 0.346$) and the Clicker Learning scores ($t = 2.330, p = 0.020$, with a standardized coefficient $b = 0.107$) significantly predicted students’ scores on the second affective learning scale. The likelihood of taking a course with similar content, the third measure of affective learning, was significantly predicted by both Clicker Learning and Engagement, $F(2, 638) = 35.379, p < 0.001, R^2 = 0.099$, and adjusted $R^2 = 0.096$. Individually, both the Clicker Engagement scores ($t = 7.942, p < 0.001$, with a standardized coefficient $b = 0.380$) and the Clicker Learning scores ($t = 2.763, p = 0.006$, with a standardized coefficient $b = -0.132$) significantly predicted students’ scores on the third affective learning scale. The fourth measure of affective learning, perception of the course instructor, was significantly predicted by both Clicker
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Learning and Engagement, $F (2, 643) = 61.672$, $p < 0.001$, $R^2 = 0.161$, and adjusted $R^2 = 0.158$. Individually, both the Clicker Engagement scores ($t = 5.432$, $p < .001$, with a standardized coefficient $b = 0.251$) and the Clicker Learning scores ($t = 4.174$, $p < .001$, with a standardized coefficient $b = 0.193$) significantly predicted students' scores on the fourth affective learning scale. Finally, the fifth measure of affective learning, likelihood of engaging in recommended behaviors, was significantly predicted by both Clicker Learning and Engagement, $F (2, 641) = 59.906$, $p < 0.001$, $R^2 = 0.151$, and adjusted $R^2 = 0.148$. Individually, only the Clicker Engagement scores ($t = 7.408$, $p < .001$, with a standardized coefficient $b = 0.344$) significantly predicted students' scores on the fifth affective learning scale.

Research question 3a addressed the impact of students’ CA on participation in the classroom. To explore this relationship, a correlation between the measures of CA and participation was calculated, resulting in a significant correlation between the meeting subscale of CA and student’s participation scores. As this relationship was significant, a stepwise regression was run. Pre-PRCA meeting scores significantly predicted participation, $F (1, 604) = 34.230$, $p <0.001$, $R^2 = 0.054$, and adjusted $R^2 = 0.052$.

Research question 4a addressed how students’ CA impacts their evaluation of learning. Perceptions of learning loss were significantly correlated with the interpersonal subscale of communication apprehension. PrePRCA Interpersonal Communication scores significantly predicted students’ perceptions of learning loss, $F (1, 606) = 4.463$, $p =0.035$, $R^2 = 0.007$, and adjusted $R^2 = 0.006$. Looking to affective learning, there were no sig-
significant correlations between any of the measures of CA and the first affective learning subscale (perception of the recommended behaviors), the second affective learning subscale (perceptions of course content), the fourth affective learning subscale (perception of the course instructor), or the fifth affective learning subscale (likelihood of engaging in recommended behaviors). Students’ evaluation of the third affective learning subscale (likelihood of taking a course with similar content) was correlated with the Pre term scores on the PRCA, as well as the subscales of Group and Public Speaking.

Based on the correlations, a regression was run showing that the third affective learning subscale was significantly predicted by PrePRCA-24 public speaking and group scores, $F(2, 627) = 8.435, p < .001, R^2 = 0.026$, and adjusted $R^2 = 0.023$. Exploring the individual relationships between the third affective learning subscale and CA, both the PrePRCA-24 Public Speaking scores ($t = -2.587, p = 0.010$, with a standardized coefficient $b = -0.110$) and the PrePRCA-24 Group scores ($t = -1.974, p = .049$, with a standardized coefficient $b = -0.084$) significantly predicted students’ perceptions of recommended behaviors. Additionally, exploring beyond students’ evaluations of their learning, turning to exam scores, there were no significant relationships between CA and the midterm or final scores.

Finally, to answer RQ 3b and RQ 4b, a path diagram was run with a sample of 684 using the “estimate values and intercepts” option in AMOS. This model was improved in terms of goodness of fit ($\chi^2(89) = 3216.167$, NFI=.223, CFI=.219, RMSEA=.227), but was ultimately not a good fit. This suggests that variables need to be included in this path diagram that were not explored in
this study. Though the model may have lacked overall fit, it is worthwhile to discuss the significant paths as the model is representative of the most appropriate path diagram for this data. Additionally, the significant paths illustrate the conclusions drawn for both RQ2b and RQ3b. The appendix table includes the regression weights, standard error and $p$ values for the paths.

The table also shows significant relationships for both RQ3b and RQ4b. Examining the first portion of the model, a variety of relationships illustrated the impact of CA on clickers. Students actual iClicker scores for the course were significantly predicted by Pre PRCA Interpersonal Scores (.355, $p < .001$) and Pre PRCA Public Speaking Scores (-.179, $p = .048$). The measure of Clicker Engagement was significantly predicted by both Pre PRCA Meeting scores (.137, $p < .001$) and the Pre PRCA Group scores (-.205, $p < .001$). Additionally, scores on the Clicker Learning measure were significantly predicted by multiple sub scores on the Pre PRCA-24, including Meeting (.067, $p = .010$), Interpersonal (-.068, $p = .013$), and Public Speaking (.055, $p = .031$).

In exploring the path from communication apprehension, to participation mediated by clickers, both the measure of Clicker Learning (-.144, $p = .005$) and the measure of Clicker Engagement (.403, $p < .001$) significantly predicted students perceptions of participation.

In examining the path from communication apprehension to learning mediated by clickers, there was an abundant number of significant relationships (see Appendix B). Turning first to cognitive learning, evaluated through learning loss, both Clicker Learning (-.047, $p = .006$) and Clicker Engagement (-.054, $p < .001$) significantly predicted scores on learning loss. Affective learn-
ing was examined through the sub scales associated with the Affective Learning scale which resulted in significant relationships (but directionally different) for all of the subscales. Looking at students' evaluations of the behaviors suggested in the class, the first sub scale, these scores were significantly predicted by the measures of Clicker Learning (.266, \( p < .001 \)), Clicker Engagement (.336, \( p < .001 \)) and students' actual iClicker scores for the semester (-.032, \( p = .029 \)). Students evaluations of course content, the second sub scale, was significantly predicted by the measures of Clicker Learning (.157, \( p = .002 \)), Clicker Engagement (.367, \( p < .001 \)) and students actual iClicker scores for the semester (-.034, \( p = .017 \)). The third sub scale, likelihood of taking a course with similar content, was significantly predicted by the measures of Clicker Learning (-.270, \( p < .001 \)), and Clicker Engagement (.542, \( p < .001 \)). Students' evaluations of the instructor, the fourth sub scale, was significantly predicted by the measures of Clicker Learning (.300, \( p < .001 \)), Clicker Engagement (.227, \( p < .001 \)) and students actual iClicker scores for the semester (-.031, \( p = .037 \)). The fifth sub scale, students reported likelihood of engaging in behaviors suggested in the class, was significantly predicted by the measures of Clicker Learning (.116, \( p = .036 \)), Clicker Engagement (.390, \( p < .001 \)) and students actual iClicker scores for the semester (.031, \( p = .042 \)).

Finally, the last useful makers of learning in the class, the midterm and final exam scores, were significantly predicted by clicker scores. Student scores on the midterm exam could be predicted by the measures of Clicker Learning (.835, \( p < .001 \)), Clicker Engagement (.519, \( p < .001 \)) and students actual iClicker scores for the
semester (.200, p<.001). Student scores on the final exam likewise could be predicted by the measures of Clicker Learning (.792, p<.001), Clicker Engagement (-.424, p<.001) and students actual iClicker scores (.252, p<.001).

**DISCUSSION**

The first research question looked at the impact of CA on students’ evaluations of SRS. Supporting past research (Stowell et al., 2010), students with higher group CA reported greater perceptions of engagement through clickers, via the measure of clicker engagement, though the variance accounted for was minimal. Additionally, students with higher CA were more likely to report high scores on measures of clicker learning. However, it is important to note that the variance accounted for is minimal, suggesting a relationship supported by sample size rather than a true interaction. Students in the large lecture classroom might not evaluate the option of participating by, and thus the clickers themselves, as more rewarding. Honeycutt et al. (2009) argued that “experiencing CA does not automatically mean that the communication will suffer” (p. 229). It is possible that as many of the students with high CA do not feel much increased apprehension in large lectures as the norm is not participating or, as in the current study, these students get to maintain their anonymity while participating through SRS. As McCroskey, Richmond and Davis (1986) noted, situational contexts are stronger predictors of CA than trait predispositions, so it might be that the situation of participating in the
large lecture is not that anxiety-provoking as the likelihood of getting called on in a class of 300 to 600 is low.

The second research question illustrated the strong impact that clicker can have on learning. One of the most interesting results is that clicker technologies can shape actual cognitive learning outcomes, thus lending further support to findings like Gauci et al. (2009), only within the contact of the basic communication course. Not only do we see about seven percent of the variance in the midterm and ten percent of the variance on the final accounted for by students perceptions of clicker learning and actual clicker scores, but these same results were noted with perceptions of learning. Together both perceptions of clicker engagement and learning accounted for five percent of the variance in students learning loss scores, suggesting that as students felt more involved and felt they were learning more through using clickers, this shaped how they felt about their overall learning in the classroom. Moreover, both perceptions of clicker engagement and learning accounted for between approximately ten to nineteen percent of the variance in affective learning scores, again illustrating the impact that engagement and perceived learning can have on student enjoyment of the course. These findings echo Denker (2013) results suggesting that clickers impact perceptions of learning in the communication classroom, and early work speaking to perceptions of learning in college courses (Ioannou & Artino, 2010).

Research question 3a examined how students’ communication apprehension impacts participation in the classroom. Results suggest that CA has a significant but very small impact on students’ participation in the
classroom. With CA accounting for just five percent of the variance at most, it is important to note that these are statistically significant, however not as practically significant as past research (e.g., Stowell et al., 2010) would suggest. Participation may not truly be impacted by communication apprehension in the same way that other scholars would assume. Part of this limited relationship might be explained by the ways students engage in participation in the classroom setting. In looking at why this limited impact on participation was seen, it could be due to the size of the class, as it was a large lecture. McCroskey et al., (2002) noted that high CA’s prefer large lecture classes (p. 131), which might be due to the lack of a perceived “requirement” to participate due to the perceived anonymity in a large lecture course. While the large lecture class examined in the current study required the students to participate with the SRS, as students received minimal participation points for each class, the perceived anonymity may have still been in place.

Research question 4a examined the impact of students’ communication apprehension on their evaluations of learning. Results suggest that there was a minimal impact on cognitive learning as evaluated by the learning loss scale, most likely an effect of sample size; however, students’ levels of CA impacted their affective learning in relation to taking a similar course. However, this prediction accounted again for very minimal variance, around three percent, in affective learning, which might be impacted by the limited student-teacher relationship in large lecture courses. These findings support past research which notes that students with higher levels of CA have less motivation to
build relationships with their instructors (Jordan & Powers, 2007).

As both past research and the other research questions suggested relationships between clickers, CA, learning, and participation, a more complex model was examined to offer a richer understanding of the interactions. Both research questions 3b and 4b were answered through the use of modeling procedures, which better illustrate the ways in which clickers can serve as a mediating variable that can explain the relationship between CA, participation, and learning. Though the final model did not have ideal statistics, it is still the best fitting model to explain the relationships between the variables that were examined. This means that there are a variety of other variables that impact students’ evaluations of clickers, participation, and learning, which makes sense as other larger proposed models, like the instructional beliefs model (Weber et al., 2011), typically offer more predictor variables to account for and explain greater variance.

When clickers were added in as a mediating variable to clarify the relationship between CA and participation, we see an interesting shift. Not only do both pre PRCA-24 scores in both the group and meeting context significantly predict students’ evaluations of clicker engagement, but then in examining the path to participation, we see nearly 17% of the variance accounted for by students’ evaluations of clickers. This difference in variance explained when adding in clickers suggests that the use of clickers creates a stronger impact on students’ participation in large lecture courses than students’ apprehension alone, as CA originally only explained 5% of the variance. These findings suggest that SRS allow for a
more student centered learning model, removing the barriers to participation. This change is noteworthy as it affirms past research that suggest that not only are SRS beneficial for participation (Bruff, 2009; Guthrie & Carlin, 2004), but also it is clear that they help mediate some of the impact that CA might otherwise have on participation as well as provide a venue to help more students engage in the large lecture classroom.

Similarly, student learning can be better explained when examined through the more complex model. In contrast to the limited results reported in RQ3a, by expanding the relationship between CA and learning mediated by clickers, the percentage of variance accounted for improves. Not only is there a clear and notable relationship between actual student scores on the clickers for the semester and exams in the class, which conceptually makes sense and echoes the results of Gauci et al. (2009), but that same strong relationship appears in examining students’ evaluations of Clicker Learning, with over 16% of the variance on the final and 19% of the variance on the midterm accounted for. This suggests that when students perceive gains in learning in the large lecture basic course classroom through the use of clicker systems, these gains will then translate into actual learning gains. Further, as both students’ pre PRCA-24 meeting and public speaking sub scale scores significantly predict Clicker Learning, it is imperative that instructors in the basic course examine the different contexts of students’ apprehension and work with these students so we can help all students have the same chance for success in our basic course.

Turning to students’ reports of learning in the basic course, both affective and cognitive learning also were
better explained through the models. Cognitive learning, as measured through the learning loss measure, was significantly predicted by both clicker learning and engagement; however, these percentages were low, which might be explained by the problematic nature of the measure (Hess et al., 2001). Yet, when turning to affective learning, it is clear that the impact of clickers is important, with variance shifting limited relationships and single digit numbers to scores in the 13 to 17% range through the model, especially when mediated by clicker engagement. Clearly, students that perceive that they are more engaged in the large lecture classroom through clickers will also report more affective learning, as engagement and participation have been linked to affective learning (Frisby & Myers, 2008). However, what is interesting is that we now see that this might especially be the case for students with higher levels of group and meeting CA as those scores significantly predicted scores on the Clicker Engagement scale. Conceptually, this makes sense as students who are less willing to speak out in class (or groups) might prefer engagement through other means. Thus, when these students are engaged, they report more favorable evaluations of the course, material, and instructor.

**Practical Implications**

With the knowledge that clickers can work to mediate the relationship between CA and participation as well as learning, instructors should work to incorporate student response systems into the large lecture classroom of the basic course. Moreover, in the basic course
there are some situations that might be silencing for all students, like providing peer evaluations of classmates’ presentations, which might be ameliorated by offering a mediated means of participating. Not only is this an important choice for students with high CA as we see the link with participation, but even more as there are clear implications for students’ learning both on performance measures and in their perceptions.

However, this advice must be offered with caution as past research has noted limited drawbacks to the SRS technology such as time and cost issues (e.g., Lundeberg et al., 2011; White et al., 2011). Moreover, as Denker (2013) noted clickers serve just as a tool in the classroom and are not the total solution. Instructors need to continue to work on both learning the technology and creating engaging and participatory classroom environments. Student response systems can provide a powerful tool for students in increasing participation and learning. Moreover, these tools can be particularly beneficial for students with high communication apprehension and at-risk populations in the large lecture sections of the basic course.

**Limitations and Future Research**

With the limited impact that communication apprehension had on a variety of variables, it is important to further explore this relationship and see if the results were impacted by the class in which they were collected. The public speaking class at this large Midwestern University is facilitated in a large lecture lab format, which is unique to less than ten percent of basic courses (Morreale et al., 2010). As research has noted that these very
large lectures create a unique classroom environment (Cleveland, 2002), it is possible that participants’ understanding of what it meant to engage in the communication classroom was impacted by this environment. Further, as relationships between students and teachers might reflect more of a para-social relationship as our reviewer suggests, the class size could also shape students' responses to affective learning. Future researchers should work to replicate this study in smaller classrooms so that a clearer understanding of CA’s impact on participation and mediated participation is built as well as how other variables like affective learning are impacted. Additionally, as clickers might shift the way that students interact in classrooms, future research should also look at the ways that these changes might impact broader learning outcomes, especially in the basic communication course.

As the model in this study was the best fit to explain the relationship between the variables in question, it was acceptable. However, it is clear that there are variables missing from this model that might offer a better fit overall. Communication apprehension is not the only factor that will impact and account for variance in student learning, participation, and even engagement via mediated means. Researchers need to replicate this process in subsequent semesters while including other variables that might speak to students' evaluations of participation and learning, such as communication competence, teacher immediacy (Mottet & Richmond, 1998), learner empowerment (Frymier, Shulman, & Houser, 1996), and motivation (Gorham & Millette, 1997).

Another limitation to the study, as noted by the reviewers, might be linked to the use of volunteer sample...
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for this research. Though analysis of the overall population of students in the course compared to participants in this research study suggested no significant differences in CA scores, it is possible that other unforeseen differences did exist between the two groups. Therefore, it is important to note the potential limitations of volunteer samples. Past research has documented that volunteer samples tend to be students who are more successful academically (Callahan, Hojat & Gonnella, 2007), however these results were limited to medical students. Additionally, earlier researchers have noted the impact of volunteer bias as volunteers are likely to have higher self-disclosure scores as well as high social desirability scores (Hood & Back, 1971) and greater external locus of control (Cash & Janda, 1977), all which could impact the ways in which individuals respond to surveys. Future research should work to track all variables to ensure that participants in the study do not deviate in any way from the larger population.

Student response systems continue to be incorporated in communication classrooms as a means to increase student engagement and learning. Numerous studies have documented the benefits of these systems; however, some of these claims, like those that argue the benefit to shy students, have been less substantiated. The current study worked to correct this limitation and added to our understanding of SRS in the large lecture section of the Basic Communication course classroom. Students’ CA was a significant predictor of their evaluation of clickers, learning, and classroom participation. However, these relationships were not as strong as expected, thus leading to limitations and suggestions for future research.
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APPENDIX A

Final Path Diagram
### APPENDIX B

**Standardized Regression Weights and P-Values**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Path</th>
<th>Estimate</th>
<th>p value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PrePRCA Group → Clicker Engagement</td>
<td>-0.205</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PrePRCA Meeting → Clicker Learning</td>
<td>0.067</td>
<td>0.010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PrePRCA Meeting → Clicker Engagement</td>
<td>0.137</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PrePRCA Interpersonal → iClicker Scores</td>
<td>0.355</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PrePRCA Interpersonal → Clicker Learning</td>
<td>-0.068</td>
<td>0.013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PrePRCA Public Speaking → iClicker Scores</td>
<td>-0.179</td>
<td>0.048</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PrePRCA Public Speaking → Clicker Learning</td>
<td>0.055</td>
<td>0.031</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iClicker Scores → Affective Learning1-Behaviors</td>
<td>-0.032</td>
<td>0.029</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iClicker Scores → Affective Learning2-Course Content</td>
<td>-0.034</td>
<td>0.017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iClicker Scores → Affective Learning4-Instructor</td>
<td>-0.031</td>
<td>0.037</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iClicker Scores → Affective Learning5-EngagingInBehav.</td>
<td>-0.031</td>
<td>0.042</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iClicker Scores → Final</td>
<td>0.252</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iClicker Scores → Midterm</td>
<td>0.200</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clicker Learning → Affective Learning1-Behaviors</td>
<td>0.266</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clicker Learning → Affective Learning2-Course Content</td>
<td>0.157</td>
<td>0.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clicker Learning → Affective Learning3-Similar Content</td>
<td>-0.270</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clicker Learning → Affective Learning4-Instructor</td>
<td>0.300</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clicker Learning → Affective Learning5-EngagingInBehav.</td>
<td>0.116</td>
<td>0.036</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clicker Learning → Learning Loss</td>
<td>-0.047</td>
<td>0.006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clicker Learning → Participation</td>
<td>-0.144</td>
<td>0.005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clicker Learning → Final</td>
<td>0.792</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clicker Learning → Midterm</td>
<td>0.835</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clicker Engagement → Affective Learning1-Behaviors</td>
<td>0.336</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clicker Engagement → Affective Learning2-Course Content</td>
<td>0.367</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clicker Engagement → Affective Learning3-Similar Content</td>
<td>0.542</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clicker Engagement → Affective Learning4-Instructor</td>
<td>0.277</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clicker Engagement → Affective Learning5-EngInBehav.</td>
<td>0.390</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clicker Engagement → Learning Loss</td>
<td>-0.054</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clicker Engagement → Participation</td>
<td>0.403</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clicker Engagement → Final</td>
<td>-0.424</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clicker Engagement → Midterm</td>
<td>-0.519</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Communication centers continue to develop and evolve at higher education institutions. Originally, communication centers (e.g., speech labs or speech centers) were designed “to assist students enrolled in basic public speaking and communication courses” (Jones, Hunt, Simonds, Comadena, & Baldwin, 2004, p. 105-106). Essentially, centers were an outgrowth of the basic communication course, created to augment instruction by providing students an additional resource to obtain assistance for developing competent public speaking skills (e.g., Dwyer & Davidson, 2012; Nelson, Whitfield, & Moreau, 2012; Sellnow & Martin, 2010). Today, the National Association of Communication Centers (NACC) currently lists over 70 higher education institutions with communication centers (Yook & Atkins-Sayre, 2012). The steady growth of centers (Helsel & Hogg, 2006; Yook & Atkins-Sayre, 2012) has propelled the necessity to disseminate practices, research, and a sense of community among communication center, basic course, and communication professionals. The number of centers is expected to increase, especially as the results of effectiveness continue to become better known.

Many previous communication center pioneers failed to institutionalize their centers with the Communicatio-
tion department and basic communication course (Sellnow & Martin, 2010). Centers are part of the basic communication course and yet separate from the course making it difficult to fully capture what each and every center provides to an academic institution (Yook & Atkins-Sayre, 2012). Ambiguity exists around communication centers’ conceptualization and practical functionality.

Thus, the disciplinary associates in the Basic Course and Communication Center areas have begun to explore and expand communication center awareness. For instance, the National Communication Association’s webpage for the Communication Center Section (2012) defines centers as serving students, faculty, staff, and members of the local community. This unspecified definition highlights communication centers as complicated multifaceted structures and organizations varying from institution to institution. Operating under different administrative and educational missions, it is exceptionally difficult to identify commonalities among communication centers (Emery, 2006). Yet, many communication centers’ primary function is to supplement the basic communication course. With the ambiguous description and variability of centers, it is imperative to understand the function of centers as an effective and efficient educational resource. Communication center professionals and related basic communication course practitioners have been calling for more research to inform center instruction, pedagogy, and organization (Nelson et al., 2012).

It is therefore appropriate to begin to systematically gather data to enrich collective knowledge as to how these centers are created, organized, and maintained.
To assist in the forward movement of the communication center conversation, it is important that we assess who and what we are to aid the larger conversation of where we are headed as members of this communication subfield. The growing visibility and responsibility acknowledges the need to communicate to others within our discipline the offerings communication centers have for the departments and institutions. This study consolidates descriptive data across current communication centers. It reports and discusses communication center information: institutional context, structure and configuration, services, resources, institution and community impact, and curriculum.

**THE COMMUNICATION CENTERS MOVEMENT**

The communication centers movement has gained momentum as a grassroots movement—growing from necessity by the late 1980s. Centers emerged to facilitate students with support outside the classroom for the basic communication course (Preston, 2006). As the necessity grew into a movement in the early 2000s, center directors came together and formed several organizational memberships—the NACC and the Communication Centers Section of the National Communication Association (NCA). The trend for communication centers continues to develop a national presence.

Approximately 1.3 million students take a basic communication course at a U.S. college or university each year (Beebe, 2013). Essentially, the basic communication course is where students are introduced to communication skills and theories (Morreale, Hugenberg, &
The basic communication course is foundational to the discipline of communication and communication centers. Universities and colleges choose to create communication centers to provide places for students to practice their public speaking skills (e.g., Nelson et al., 2012). Centers historically were established to improve public speaking skills in conjunction with basic communication courses (McCracken, 2006). Most centers began operations as an outgrowth of the basic course (Nelson et al., 2012). There is an inherent relationship between both basic communication course and communication center personnel. Because many basic communication course directors work closely with communication center directors, faculty, and students it is important to identify commonalities among centers. It is hard to imagine communication centers would exist without the basic course.

These on-site facilities assist basic communication course instructors with additional instruction for students, speaking practice, and tutoring services (Sellnow & Martin, 2010). Centers have been successful in assisting students’ improvement in oral communication competencies and associated with reducing public speaking anxiety and building confidence (e.g., Dwyer, Carlson, & Kahre, 2002; Dwyer & Davidson, 2012; Hunt & Simonds, 2002). Furthermore, communication centers allow students to receive peer feedback from other students (i.e., peer tutors), access to video recording equipment for self-reflection, and assistance with basic communication course assignments.

Presently practitioners have dedicated minimal time to study their communication centers movement that would enable scholarship to support and challenge practice.
tices (Preston, 2006). Two prior studies (e.g., Helsel & Hogg, 2006; Preston, 2006) conducted summative reviews about the communication centers movement in order to ascertain generalizable information on centers’ practices. These studies had limited samples constrained by low response rates. Thereby, in order to continue exploring common practices and gain credibility surrounding communication centers within the broader discipline, it is important to gather information from more centers and disseminate communication research more widely. Our study’s purpose is to continue communication centers exploration providing more depth and breadth that previous scholarship lacked about trends and tendencies of centers. Additionally, this descriptive overview updates communication centers information and extends communication center knowledge and its movement.

Although many centers’ missions are largely organized around a similar aim—to provide an opportunity for learners to develop competent communicative behaviors (Jones et al., 2004) and support basic communication course or communication across the curriculum programs (Von Till, 2012)—there is still variation among practices. The increasing visibility of communication centers as an auxiliary student resource outside the classroom suggests that this is an ideal time to investigate communication centers common and diverse purposes. Clearly communication centers are designed to primarily augment basic communication course instruction. Professionals have been calling for further investigation of center services to better understand what additional functions centers provide (e.g., Morreale et al., 2006; Preston, 2006).
Beyond common missions, the functionality of communication centers has only received limited investigation. In one early study the National Communication Association surveyed ten communication center supervisors about their perceptions of the centers on their campuses (Morreale, 2001). The information gathered from this informal survey described the advantages and disadvantages of having a center. Thus demands require more research on communication centers for supervisors as well as for increasing students’ access. As Dwyer and Davidson (2012) reported many students do not take full advantage of all center’s resources; therefore, more research must examine current practices. Currently, scholarship about centers is in short supply but continues to grow. In response, recently an edited book (e.g., Yook & Atkins-Sayre, 2012) completely dedicated to communication centers was published. However, in order to better direct basic course and center practitioners and offer insight into center’s contributions to the communication discipline and higher education at large, additional resources and information are needed.

**Exploration of Centers**

Examination of these centers will be useful to: understand the place of these centers, explain their function from a generalizable perspective, and ascertain the trends and tendencies of these centers overall. As a valuable asset to the basic communication course and communication across-the-curriculum programs at higher education institutions, additional communication center exploration has potential for assisting in the develop-
ment of common practices and general approaches for current and future centers. This study presumes the explicit and implicit value centers have to the aims of the basic communication course and undergraduate learning; it is expressly designed to provide descriptions as a means of identifying current practices. The data included in this article outlines trends across communication centers and serves as a potential next step towards growing respect for communication center services and professionals.

**METHOD**

This study of communication centers surveyed directors or individuals who oversee the centers at two- and four-year institutions of higher education. The survey design replicates rationale from the basic communication course survey (e.g., Morreale et al., 2010) in an effort to generalize and characterize the current state of communication centers in the United States.

**Instrumentation**

The survey sought responses regarding (a) institutional context of the center (e.g., enrollment or type of institution); (b) center structure and configuration (e.g., managerial duties); (c) center services (e.g., popular services or catalogue student consultations); (d) center resources (e.g., technology access); (e) center at the institution and in the community (e.g., accessibility to department); and (f) center and curriculum (e.g., standardized curriculum). The survey included 80 items con-
sisting of 57 closed and 23 open questions. The survey was posted online and administered through Qualtrics to facilitate accessibility and responsiveness. This study received approval from the university’s Institutional Review Board. Participation was completely voluntary and those who participated could opt to retain their anonymity. Total time required to complete the survey was approximately 15 to 20 minutes.

**Sampling**

Recruitment of the sample, communication center directors or individuals overseeing the center, was via an online survey link and was made available at the following locations: Communication, Research, and Theory Network (CRTNET), Communication Centers Listserv (commcenters@listserve.eku.edu), and Basic Communication Course Listserv (basiccc@lists.udayton.edu). Additionally, in order to reach other directors, solicitation to participate in the survey was also included in the Communication Centers Newsletter (LeFebvre, 2011) and a public announcement was made during Communication Centers Section Meeting at the 2011 National Communication Association conference in New Orleans, Louisiana.

The number of responses ($N = 40$) represents 57.79% response rate among the total recorded number of communication centers (NACC, 2012). According to Baxter and Babbie (2004), they suggest a 50% response rate is adequate and 60% satisfies opportunity for analysis and reporting of a population. Future investigations would hope to collect data from a greater number of respondents representing additional centers, since communica-
tion centers are a burgeoning area within the communication field.

**Analysis**

The descriptive results were comprised of quantitative and qualitative findings. The quantitative results used frequencies to calculate the summative experiences. The qualitative results emerge from open-ended questions using grounded theory. We employed a constant comparative method to make sense of the data by identifying themes across the answers (Glaser & Strauss, 1967). We used open and axial coding to identify categories and gain insight into the themes underlying the responses. To begin we read the answers several times to become familiar with the content. The first author was more familiar with communication centers, whereas the second author was less familiar operating as a naïve coder. Then the authors engaged in open coding by allowing the responses to speak about the experiences directors have with their communication centers. Open coding was first performed to specifically identify the central concepts to three open-ended questions (e.g., tutor training, marketing, and administrative/faculty challenges) and then compared the responses. Next, we utilized axial coding to map the relationship between and within the responses. The analysis was suspended when saturation was reached among the responses yielding no additional findings. Three overarching procedural phases (i.e., employment pre-requisites, pre-employment training, and employment training) for tutor training and four marketing strategies (i.e., direct, indirect, professional relationship, and
digital) emerged. Three administrative (director, staff, and center) and two faculty challenges (naïveté or misuse) were also indicated.

RESULTS

The following results were compiled from 40 respondents, 34 at four-year and six at two-year colleges and universities. The total response rate varies in the results; this is based on the respondent’s (i.e., directors) discretion and ability to answer questions related to the specific communication centers. We report frequencies because some directors did not answer some questions, which causes the numbers per question to vary. We chose to keep all responses because we were attempting to show any and all practices within centers. Frequencies indicate the number of directors to answer a particular question and are reflected as percentages. The findings are followed by a summative discussion of some of the more significant quantitative and qualitative findings and denoted interpretations by the authors of the meaningful current trends of communication centers.

Institutional Context of the Center

Size and type of institution. Respondents (N = 36) provided a description of the size of their institutions using student enrollment data. The enrollment across institutions ranged from 1,600 to 70,000 (M = 16,080.72). Regarding the type of institution responding (N = 40) 34 were four-year (85%) institutions and six
were two-year (15%). The types of institutions (Carnegie classification) represented in this survey ($N = 38$) were: 11 indicated Research I (28.9%), four indicated Research II (10.5%), five indicated a Master’s of Arts Level I (13.2%), two indicated a Master’s of Arts Level II (5.3%), eight indicated a Bachelor’s of Arts/Liberal Arts (20.1%), two indicated a Bachelor’s of Arts/General degree (5.3%), and six indicated an Associate’s degree (15.8%).

**Affiliation, size, and type of department.** Respondents ($N = 39$) were asked if their center had department affiliation. The majority of respondents ($N = 29$) indicated that their communication center was affiliated with a department (74.4%). The remaining respondents ($N = 10$), who indicated they do not have departmental affiliation, were asked if their center had institutional affiliation. Six of those respondents indicated they did have institutional affiliation. Communication centers reported affiliation with departments as follows: communication (82.8%), learning center (6.9%), business (3.4%), undergraduate studies (3.4%), and accounting (3.4%). Respondents ($N = 34$) indicated the membership of their department of affiliation ranged from zero to 43 ($M = 9.50, SD = 8.57$) tenure track faculty. Respondents ($N = 38$) indicated the membership of their department of affiliation ranged from zero to 50 ($M = 7.87, SD = 9.08$) non-tenure track faculty. Respondents ($N = 26$) indicated the membership of their department of affiliation ranged from zero to 41 ($M = 9.38, SD = 10.79$) graduate teaching assistants.

**Budget.** Respondent-reported data ($N = 37$) related to budget indicated that 56.8% of centers had financial support while 43.2% did not. Respondents whose centers received funding allocation ($N = 16$) indicated their cen-
Respondents received an annual budget that ranged from $1,000 to $135,000 ($M = 44,359.38, $Md = 30,000, $SD = 42,079.29).

**Logistics and operations.** Respondents ($N = 37$) provided a description of the logistics of their communication centers, specifically space allocation – 86.5% of respondents indicated their centers had distinct space, while 13.5% indicated they do not have space for their centers. According to respondents ($N = 25$), communication centers varied in space allocation with a range from 75 to 4000 square feet ($M = 895.20, Md = 500$). Respondents ($N = 33$) provided data on the weekly and daily hours of operation. The range of weekly hours of operation was 10 to 90 hours ($M = 30.7, SD = 15.46$). The range of daily hours of operation was two to 10 hours ($M = 5.79, SD = 2.33$).

**Center Structure and Configuration**

**Center title and existence.** Respondents ($N = 38$) indicated that the title of their communication centers varied from Speaking/Speech Center (35%), Communication Center (30%), Communication Lab (20%), to some other title (15%) (e.g., Presentation Practice Center, Public Speaking Resource Center, Leadership and Professional Development Center). The respondents ($N = 38$) also reported the length of their center’s existence from establishment to the present date of the survey ranged from 0 to 37 years ($M = 8.26, Md = 5.50$).

**Center management.** Respondents ($N = 35$) reported that their centers had a designated individual who oversaw the center’s operations. Titles of these individuals included director (80.6%), coordinator (9.7%),
Respondents (N = 31) were asked to list their years of experience managing a communication center. The range of communication center management experience reported ranged from zero to 16 years (M = 5.52, SD = 4.27). Center directors (N = 35) were comprised of 30 females (85.7%) and five males (14.3%). Ethnicity (N = 35) was 31 white, non-Hispanic (89.3%), two multiracial (5.7%), one Asian Pacific (2.5%), and one preferred not to answer (2.5%). Respondents' ages (N = 34) ranged from 27 to 61 (M = 42.82, SD = 10.24). The majority of these individuals (N = 35) indicated earning a doctoral degree (62.9%) or a master's degree (37.1%). The vast majority of center directors (N = 40) earned their degree in Communication (82.9%) while the remaining directors earned a degree in English (5.7%), Theatre (5.7%), Education (2.9%), or Cultural Studies (2.9%).

Center accountability. The respondents (N = 35) identified to whom in the administrative hierarchy the center director was accountable for the center's operations. Respondents indicated the dean (20%), departmental chair (20%), course director/program supervisor (17.1%), vice chancellor/vice president/provost (14.3%), chair and dean (11.5%), other (11.5%) (e.g., faculty, academic services), and uncertain (5.7%).

Staff and tutors. Respondents were asked to report the number of staff and tutors who compromised their communication center. From the respondents (N = 38) the total number of individuals employed as the center’s staff ranged from 3 to 179 (M = 30.97, Md = 18). A breakdown of staff and tutors that comprise communication centers’ staff as reported by respondents was: 114
underclass tutors, 136 upper-class tutors, 59 graduate students, six part-time faculty, and 14 full-time faculty.

**Tutor training.** Respondents (N = 37) indicated that communication center tutor training ranged from zero to 75 hours (M = 16.17). Open-ended responses indicated three overarching procedural phases – employment prerequisites, pre-employment training, and employment training. Respondents reported a variety of *employment prerequisites* that included completion and achievement in public speaking, professional communication or pedagogy training coursework, practicum or shadowing hours, employment skills examination and/or speech. Also, respondents indicated that a successful interview process and professor recommendations were utilized to screen in the training process. Various *pre-employment training procedures* were identified comprising brief to extensive trainings experienced in one-on-one and group settings that included tutorials, mock consultations, role-playing scenarios, and common practices. Lastly, respondents reported *employment training* procedures that involved more intense skill and knowledge development through peer mentoring and collaborative training initiated in the pre-employment phase. The most frequent responses noted face-to-face weekly or monthly training sessions. Other procedures involved online training, observation, seminars, guest speakers, and assigned readings in some combination with continual assessment from student feedback, peer evaluations, director’s evaluation, and staff meetings.

Additionally, respondents were asked to describe what ongoing training took place throughout the semester. Respondents (N = 29) indicated that ongoing training ranged from zero to 48 hours (M = 10.14). Open-
ended responses reported ongoing training time allocation and training activities. Respondents time allocation to ongoing training included: weekly individual discussions, experiential training courses, staff meetings; bi-monthly and monthly meetings; online training sessions; professional development seminars; periodic meetings; and minimal to no current ongoing training. Respondents identified comparable activities utilized in employment training. Additional activities included debriefing about the week’s consultations, speech evaluation, and feedback.

Also, respondents (N = 33) indicated whether a training manual was utilized at their communication center. Currently, there is no standardized training manual for communication centers. Therefore, directors are responsible for creating their own training manual. The majority of communication center directors (57.6%) did not use a tutorial training manual at their center.

**Center certification.** The National Association of Communication Centers (NACC) offers a tutor training and certification program for communication centers. The process for certification consists of a review by the NACC’s immediate past chair, chair, vice-chair, and vice-chair elect. Respondents (N = 35) were asked to indicate if they had received NACC tutor training and certification for their communication centers. The vast majority of respondents (91.4%) indicated their program was not certified by the NACC. A follow-up question asked respondents (N = 32) to indicate if they had intentions of pursuing NACC certification: 46.9% indicated they are interested in having their center’s tutor training program certified, while 51.5% indicated they were not interested in pursuing certification.
CENTER SERVICES

Consultations and tracking usage. Respondents (N = 34) unanimously indicated that the most popular service of their communication center was public speaking (100%). The respondents (N = 30) reported that an average of 32 course sections utilized the center in a given semester. Respondents (N = 33) indicated that both individual and group consultations were provided (100%). Total consultations in a given semester, according to respondents (N = 26), ranged from 25 to 3000 (M = 480.81, SD = 614.28). However, it should be noted that the individual who reported 3000 indicated this was an approximate estimation and that consultations were not calculated at their center. Respondents (N = 14) indicated that the average number of hours per semester spent consulting with students ranged from 20 to 18,000 hours (M = 1843.82, SD = 4823.06). Respondents (N = 33) were asked if e-tutoring was available at their centers, 81.8% indicated it was not available.

Consultation focus. Respondents were asked to identify the top three issues students seek assistance for at their communication center. These open-ended responses were compiled as a complete list of issues to identify the frequency of type and consultation focus that occurred at centers. The foremost client issue according to the respondents were: delivery (29.1%), followed by organization of speech (15.1%), outlining (15.1%), topic selection (12.8%), presentational technology (5.8%), speaking apprehension (5.8%), video feedback (4.7%), gathering support material (3.5%), specific course related assignments (3.5%), group presentations
Center Resources

Equipment and technology. Respondents ($N = 13$) estimated the cost of equipment for the communication center averaged $17,770. They were asked to identify what type of equipment was available at their centers. Responses indicated their communication centers included: tables (77.5%), chairs (77.5%), computers (77.5%), video recording equipment (77.5%), desks (72.5%), dry erase boards (65%), lecterns (62.5%), bookcase (57.5%), LCD projector (47.5%), printers (45%), practice rooms (42.7%), overhead projector (27.5%), and file cabinets (15%).

Center at the Institution and in the Community

Marketing. In open-ended responses ($N = 35$), respondents identified multi-level marketing strategies utilized to promote and strengthen awareness, increase service knowledge, and encourage use. Respondents indicated four key marketing strategies to target students—direct, indirect, professional relationship, and digital. First, respondents overwhelmingly indicated use of direct marketing, which encompassed face-to-face communication from current and previous students, tutors, interns, staff, and faculty members, and directors. These self-promotion strategies emphasized past testimonials, positive experiences, and/or direct engagement of students with tours, tutors, services, and the center. The second strategy utilized indirect techniques in-
cluding: distribution of promotion materials (e.g., newsletters, flyers, or highlighters) or sponsorships (e.g., brown bag lunches, special speaking events, or annual fora). Third, respondents reported professional relationship marketing that highlighted an instructional relationship with faculty curriculum including listing center information in their syllabi, offering time for classroom workshops, and promoting attendance as a classroom requirement or extra credit. Relationship marketing also included partnerships with classes or student organizations. Finally, respondents mentioned digital marketing as a widely utilized strategy. This involved publicizing the communication center on departmental and university websites as well as more mainstream universal outlets such as social media sites (e.g., Facebook, Twitter, and YouTube). Also, respondents noted promotion involved more traditional media for informational distribution: campus marquees, electronic bulletin boards, blogs, and email announcements.

Workshops. Respondents (N = 32) indicated their communication centers provided workshops for academic departments 46.9% of the time (time refers to how often this task occurs) during an academic year. The same respondents indicated their communication centers provided workshops for the academic institution 59.4% of the time during an academic year. Finally, respondents indicated their communication centers provided workshops for the community 12.5% of the time during an academic year.
Table 1
Directors' Perceptions of Communication Center Support

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very Supportive</th>
<th>Supportive</th>
<th>Neither Supportive or Unsupportive</th>
<th>Unsupportive</th>
<th>Very Unsupportive</th>
<th>Not Applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Full-time Faculty</td>
<td>42.4%</td>
<td>42.4%</td>
<td>12.1%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Department</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(N = 33)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part-time Faculty</td>
<td>28.1%</td>
<td>53.1%</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Department</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(N = 32)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Teaching</td>
<td>27.3%</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>54.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(N = 33)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Outside</td>
<td>9.3%</td>
<td>39.4%</td>
<td>27.3%</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>21.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(N = 33)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration</td>
<td>39.4%</td>
<td>48.5%</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(N = 33)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CENTER AND CURRICULUM

Syllabi and support. Respondents (N = 32) indicated that the communication center was not mentioned in course syllabi (68.8%). See Table 1 for the perceived support of full- and part-time faculty, graduate teaching assistants, faculty outside the department, and administration of their respective center. Overall the majority of full-time faculty within the department were perceived by directors as being very supportive and supportive (84.8%) of the communication center. Part-time faculty were perceived as being supportive and very supportive (81.2%). Most directors (54.5%) do not have graduate teaching assistants; however, those that do have communication centers with graduate teaching assistants reported that the majority is very supportive of the center. When comparing faculty within the department to those faculty outside the department directors perceive that they appear supportive to neither supportive or unsupportive. By and large directors see administration as supportive and very supportive (87.9%) of the communication center.

Administrative challenges. In the open-ended responses, respondents (N = 28) identified key challenges they face with their administration. Respondents also reported that they primarily experience tangible difficulties acknowledging a variety of factors related to directors, staff, and/or the center. Directors were confronted with challenges including release time, financial compensation, faculty track position, and overall support. Respondents also identified staff related obstacles in regards to their administration including lack of financial compensation, summer and travel funding op-
opportunities. Finally, respondents indicated center-focused challenges that included: budget problems, space allocation issues, equipment needs, limited public relations resources, lack of support, technological assistance, knowledge of the communication center, services, and resources.

**Faculty challenges.** Additional qualitative responses \((N = 25)\) identified key problems respondents face from faculty. Two particular faculty challenges they experienced were naïveté or misuse. Faculty challenges from naïveté included: lack of knowledge about the center (e.g., hours, time constraints, purpose), limited faculty diffusion of information about the center, limited capacity to extend services beyond resources or other interdisciplinary subjects, unclear roles and responsibilities, lack of support from faculty network, and difficulty in generating marketing and public relations efforts. Additionally, challenges emerged from misuse included inappropriately substituting class time with center services and sending students to the center without a purpose or set goal.

**DISCUSSION**

These findings support the fact that there are many varied complexities associated with operating and organizing an efficient center. To date little research has been gathered and identified about communication center data. This data highlights that establishing a center is one challenge while maintaining a viable center is another thing altogether. With the evolution of pre-existing centers and emergence of new centers, it is im-
important to identify tasks associated with establishing and maintaining a center. In order to expand beyond the descriptive results, we highlight five interpretative discussion points that arise from the findings.

First, logically situating a communication center’s affiliation within a Communication department establishes center credibility and an identity at its early stages of development because of its relationship to the basic communication course. As noted in the most recent survey of the basic communication course (Morreale et al., 2010), over 50% of students enroll in the basic communication course focused exclusively on public speaking, and another 36% enroll in a hybrid basic communication course that includes public speaking as part of the curriculum. Therefore, 86% of students are exposed to public speaking through the basic course, which communication centers support to maintain the integrity of the communication skills taught in the basic course. As communication centers directors unanimously reported, public speaking in this survey is the most popular service provided by communication centers. Directors articulated that communication centers primarily consult on public speaking, which explicitly stems from the relationship to both the basic communication course and Communication departments. Thus, it makes sense that respondents reported in this study that 82.8% of communication centers are affiliated with Communication departments. It appears that connecting to a Communication department allows a center to have roots within the college or university that may enable more stability. Faculty considering or working to establish a center at their institution would be wise to procure endorsement from their basic course and Com-
munication department to give the center a firm scholarly foundation.

Next, more than half of the responses indicated that the center is supported financially by their institution/department. Funding is essential to hire staff, obtain space, and secure technology needed to offer services. To maintain funding support, the value of the services provided must be clearly communicated to administration, especially in today’s financial climate of accountability and assessment. It seems prudent, at a minimum, to track the number of consultations that occur, note when these consultations take place (day of week and time of day), and keep records of the consultation focus. Additionally, centers should incorporate a feedback mechanism to gather information about usefulness from the students assisted (e.g., Nelson et al., 2012). Many times the quantitative data and qualitative comments received from these individuals can be quite powerful to maintain support for sustainability.

Third, visibility begins by acknowledging and informing students and faculty within the Communication discipline and in other disciplines of the center’s availability and usefulness. To maintain the presence of a center, directors and departments must show evidence of its utilization and constructive impact on student achievement. Communication center leadership often has the responsibility of marketing the resource center to faculty, staff, and students. A number of effective strategies provided by respondents include: class visitations, course section tours of the center, campus advertisements on television monitors, and classroom workshops. Department faculty members with whom the center is affiliated are essential to connecting students to
the communication center. Marketing the communication center to students is essential; otherwise, valuable and limited resources may be squandered in varying budgetary conditions ($1,000 to $135,000). Additionally, nearly three-quarters of respondents indicated that the center was not mentioned in course syllabi provided to students from department faculty. Departments can demonstrate support for centers in no better way than to assert departmental standards reflecting the value of these resources by either strongly suggesting or mandating information about the center be included in faculty syllabi guidelines.

Furthermore, directors opted out of certification by the NACC. A majority of respondents (91.4%) indicated that their tutor training programs are not certified and of that number fully half indicated little if any interest in seeking certification. We speculated on several factors that may account for this course of action. The procedures and standards for certification have only recently been approved by the national organization (Turner & Sheckels, 2010). Center directors and facilitators may not be uniformly convinced that heightened respect, recognition, or institutional legitimacy will inevitably result from certification. This is an interesting controversy for the leadership and membership of the organization. As the organization continues to grow as a result of more communication centers its membership will need to explore certification support and recommendation processes.

Fifth, most communication centers have only been in existence for approximately eight years. Centers are still a relatively new resource for departments with formats varying from one institution to another. Never-
theless, we are learning what processes and procedures make for a successful and highly utilized communication center. The NACC organization is situated to aid in creating documents to assist departments that are establishing centers at their institutions. The NACC should consider creating and publishing a document that provides start-up tips and practices for founding a communication center. Thus, departments considering adding this valuable resource would benefit from information provided in this article or from the NACC website when initiating a communication center.

Furthermore, the resurgence of centers in the last decade would be greatly aided by an organization that would provide leadership for outlining strategic plans, offering an outlet for communication center research, and disseminating that body of research to established and developing center directors. For instance, Weiss (1998) found half of the centers implemented in the 1980s had been discontinued a decade later due to financial issues, lack of leadership, and not firmly rooting centers in a department to aid in institutional integration. It would seem that what started as a grassroots movement now is at a stage in its development where the NACC organization is able to offer a top-down approach that is coordinated and able to promote communication center development.

Lastly, the NACC would be wise to consider establishing a communication center journal, in the near future, to expand its voice and value. Currently, collaborative research is undertaken in outlets, such as the Basic Communication Course Annual. Another research outlet would enhance the collaborative sharing scholarship already existing between basic course and communication
center directors (e.g., Dwyer & Davidson, 2012; Nelson et al., 2012) and continue to enhance the services and learning for much needed research related to centers.

**LIMITATIONS AND FUTURE DIRECTIONS**

The current study accumulates communication centers descriptive data within the United States and as with any study has several limitations and provides insight for future directions. One limitation with this research is the sample size \((N = 40)\). The sample was appropriate for conducting the study, but limits its generalizability to the full center experience. Although, this study extends description beyond previous studies, we must continually obtain a wider diversity of experiences. For instance, more participation from directors would allow for a greater holistic perspective of communication centers. Additionally, future replications of the study should consider improving the response rate by on-site sampling at the NACC conference or NCA conference. This would allow for improved standards of assessment and consistency for effective centers and sharing of information.

A second limitation of the study was grouping all communication centers into a single examination. It may be pertinent to examine the services provided by two- and four-year communication centers to compare differences or determine if differences exist. Also, future surveys might examine diversity in promotion, hiring practices, staffing, and center services at these differing institutions. To date few studies have examined centers’ effectiveness, usefulness to students, and connection to
public speaking competencies (Dwyer & Davidson, 2012). Examinations across center practices beyond description would also assist in identifying effective and ‘best’ practices for stimulating student learning in communication centers. Lastly, communication centers sometimes operate in association with other departments and it might be important to expand center applications by extending study to similar departmental centers and disciplines. Understanding the similarities and differences that exist between centers may generate insight into general practices and common approaches.

**CONCLUSION**

The immediate purpose of this study was to examine data about communication centers at U.S. colleges and universities. The value of centers to the discipline of communication, basic communication course, and communication across the curriculum programs will continue to have a larger impact as the centers movement continues to emerge as a viable resource at institutions across the country. It appears that these centers will continue to play a larger role in the education of 21st century college students. Institutions allocating resources to support centers are organizing facilities that facilitate learning opportunities for student engagement and institutional integration. As centers continue to evolve and research becomes more generalizable centers have the capacity to be a very rich resource for investigating student retention and learning. Over the long-term this study will be replicated to gather longitudinal data about centers to track their development and pre-
dict the future of communication centers as a resource and service facility assisting learners to pursue excellence in communication education skills. It is imperative that communication education continues to expand center scholarship and this study initializes numerous opportunities for future research and growth.

Authors’ Note: We would like to thank Dr. Sandra Pensoneau-Conway, Linda Hobgood, Dr. Joseph Valenzano, and the two anonymous reviewers for their valuable suggestions and comments on our article.
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INTRODUCTION

In a recent nationwide study, Arum and Roksa (2011) found that students spend remarkably little time on coursework outside of class and often make no significant academic gains during college, which suggests that limited learning and poor preparation have become the norm on many campuses. At academic conferences and in the hallways of our own institutions, we have often heard faculty lament that getting students to do the assigned reading before coming to class is an immense challenge, and it is not uncommon for students to forgo buying the textbook for a course altogether. However, it is possible that students come to class unprepared because they are given little incentive to prepare well for class. When students typically come to class unprepared and believe that their classmates will do the same, it is possible that instructors tend to lecture more and make sure that they talk about everything that was in the textbook, believing that it is the only way they can teach if students do not come to class with a foundational
knowledge of the material, thereby giving students even less incentive to read the textbook, and this becomes a vicious cycle.

Public speaking or oral communication courses, which serve as the Basic Course on many campuses, present unique challenges that make it especially important for students to use the time between classes to prepare for class. Public speaking classes usually have two complementary goals: to develop students’ understanding of communication theories about effective speaking and to build students’ public speaking skills. While building speaking skills includes applying communication theory in practice, it has been our experience that students see reading the textbook and preparing speeches as separate assignments that compete for their time in between classes.

However, providing a clear structure for work done before class and an incentive for completing readings and other preparatory work has the potential to increase student learning in public speaking courses and allow instructors to develop more engaging classroom activities that help students learn at the higher levels of Bloom et al.’s (1956) taxonomy of learning. For the purposes of these studies, learning will be conceptualized primarily within the cognitive domain and includes knowledge, comprehension, application, analysis, synthesis, and evaluation. There has been significant controversy in instructional communication research about the measurement of learning, and since many of the perception-based measures of learning are often associated with affective learning, performance-based measures that include multiple levels of Bloom’s cognitive domain will be relied upon most heavily in this series of
studies (King & Witt, 2009). Previous research has documented the academic benefits of frequent quizzing, particularly as a learning tool that can facilitate increased preparation and learning (e.g., Azerloza and Renner, 2006; Bangert-Drowns et al, 1991; Chan, 2010; Glenn, 2007). The goal of this paper is to investigate whether frequent quizzing might facilitate greater preparation and learning in the Basic Course and to test variations of frequent quizzing through a series of three separate studies in order to identify best practices for using such quizzes.

**LITERATURE REVIEW**

While little research in instructional communication and communication education has examined the impact of frequent quizzes in communication classes, research in other disciplines has well documented the effects of frequent testing. In this literature review, we will summarize the existing research on the effects of frequent testing and variables within the public speaking classroom before introducing our research hypotheses.

*Effects of Frequent Testing*

Most existing research suggests that giving students frequent quizzes increases learning. Many studies have found that students who take frequent quizzes over the course of an academic term retain more information (Carpenter, 2009; Chan, 2009; McDaniel, Anderson, Derbish, and Morrisette, 2007), perform better on subsequent in-class exams (Gretes and Green, 2000; Had-
sell, 2009; Johnson and Kiviniemi, 2009; Johnson and Mrowka, 2010; McDaniel et al., 2007; Narloch et al, 2006; Nevid and Mahon, 2009), and produce better results than when practicing the skill for an equal amount of time (Kromann, Morten, and Ringsted, 2009). Bangert-Drowns, Kulik, and Kulik (1991) conducted a meta-analysis of 35 studies; of those studies, 13 found statistically significant positive effects, 16 found statistically insignificant positive effects, and only one found a statistically significant negative effect on overall learning in the course. They sum up their findings by saying, “The average student who was frequently tested outperformed 59% of the students who were not frequently tested” (p. 94).

In addition to research that suggests that quizzes increase student learning, there is also literature that indicates that using frequent quizzes impacts the way that instructors teach and the ways that students engage in and perceive their classes. Instructors who use frequent quizzing can identify student weaknesses more quickly and easily than when they only offer a midterm and final exam (Haigh, 2007; Waite, 2007) and point out that regular class quizzes can enhance and sustain student engagement, attendance, and learning in courses that build progressively (Haigh, 2007). Haigh also argued that when students come to class prepared for a quiz, they already have a useful foundation of knowledge upon which to construct deeper learning. This in turn allows instructors to prepare for a different kind of class, one that allows for more in-depth learning since less time needs to be spent reviewing foundational knowledge. Quizzes allow instructors to spend less time
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lecturing and more class time on activities (Fernald, 2004).

Furthermore, Waite (2007) found that students prefer taking frequent quizzes to having only a final exam or midterm and final exam. Students believe that frequent quizzes help them to understand the material (Cooper, Tyser, & Sandheinrich, 2007; Feldhusen, 1964), motivate students to study more than usual (Feldhusen, 1964; Haigh, 2002), and better prepare students for the final exam (Johnson, 2007). Others have found that frequent quizzes increase student attendance and preparation for class (Azerlosa and Renner, 2006), though it appears in other studies that quizzes increase attendance on days that quizzes are given but might actually contribute to a decrease in attendance on non-quiz days compared to classes in which quizzes are not given (Hovell, Williams, and Semb, 1979). Students who take frequent quizzes participate more in classroom discussion (Haigh, 2002) and have a more favorable opinion of their instructor and the course (Bangert-Drowns et al, 1991). Based on this research, it is reasonable to expect that frequent quizzes over the reading in a public speaking class will also increase students’ understanding of communication theories about public speaking so that they will be better able to apply those theories when developing their speeches.

The Testing Effect

There are several theories that help to explain why frequent quizzing impacts student learning, a phenomenon often referred to as the “testing effect” (Glenn, 2007). Three of the most frequently used explanations
include retrieval-induced facilitation, retrieval-induced forgetting, and generative learning.

The retrieval-induced facilitation hypothesis posits that the process of recalling information when taking a quiz enhances students’ ability to remember that information later, such as when taking a final exam. Carpenter (2009) theorizes that this benefit likely results from the elaborative retrieval process. Hadsell (2009) found that the closer to when the material is covered in class that students take quizzes, the greater the impact on final exam scores, suggesting that when students connect with material in multiple ways in a short period of time, they are more likely to succeed in future retrieval-induced remembering. Kang, McDermott, & Roediger (2007) discovered that students who completed short-answer quizzes and then received instructor feedback rather than standard multiple-choice quizzes without feedback performed better on the final exam, suggesting that a more demanding the retrieval process facilitates greater long-term learning.

The retrieval-induced forgetting hypothesis suggests that quizzing increases students’ ability to remember information over which they were quizzed, but decreases their ability to remember information over which they were not quizzed (Anderson, Bjork, and Bjork, 1994). However, Chan (2009) found that retrieval-induced forgetting fades over time and is further reduced when items are integrated. Despite an initial forgetting, students who are frequently quizzed are more likely than students who are not quizzed to remember the tested and untested material later in the term (Chan, 2010).
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The generative learning model is the third explanation for why frequent quizzing might increase student cognitive learning. Wittrock (1989) argues that deeper understanding is achieved through active constructive meaning that activates four learning components: generation, motivation, attention, and memory. Johnson and Mrowka (2010) found that the relationship between quizzing and exam performance is due to quiz structure—not just the act of quizzing alone. They argue that generative learning “results from structuring quizzes to require linking concepts to one’s own experiences, comparing and contrasting and justifying conclusions” (Johnson and Mrowka, 2010, p. 118).

**Online quizzes**

Less research has been conducted on the impact of online quizzes on student learning, but early research suggests that online quizzes might have the same benefits for cognitive learning as in-class quizzes. Some studies show no differences on course performance between online and in-class quiz groups (Harter and Harter, 2004; Peng, 2007; Pont, 2009), though one study shows that online quizzes improve course performance more than in-class quizzes (Kibble, 2007), a difference that disappears when time limits are set for online quiz groups (Daniel, 2004). Online quizzes make it possible for students to see their scores (Peng, 2007) and receive immediate feedback. Online quizzes also allow instructors to see how many students answered each question correctly (Harter and Harter, 2004) so that they can tailor their lesson plans to focus more on material with which students are having the most difficulty, skip de-
tailed explanations of concepts students already comprehend (Cooper, Tyser, & Sandheinrich, 2007), and spend more time in class doing activities that help students develop their ability to use course concepts at the highest levels of Bloom’s taxonomy. In a public speaking class, using online quizzes could potentially allow instructors to use more class time for informal and formal speaking assignments, giving students more opportunities to apply theory and practice speaking skills.

Notetaking

Kiewra (2002) reminds college educators that, despite having been in school for twelve years, most college students are not expert learners and must be taught how to learn. He argues that helping students learn to take better notes is an important aspect of this since students have a 50% chance of remembering information that was included in their notes versus only a 15% chance of remembering information that was not in their notes (Aiken, Thomas, & Shennum, 1975), and since students are usually take incomplete notes, recording only 20-40% of the important details (Kiewra, 1985a).

The way that an instructor presents information in class can influence student notetaking. The use of prominent spoken organizational cues during a lecture can increase the amount of important information recorded in students’ notes and improve test performance (Titsworth, 2004; Titsworth & Kiewra, 2004), but using too much immediacy can distract students from recording details (Titsworth, 2004). Giving students the opportunity to rewatch a lecture also allows students to add
to their notes, first filling in the most important information and then adding lower-level ideas in subsequent viewings (Kiewra, Mayer, Christensen, Kim, & Risch, 1991). However, even when the instructor utilizes these techniques, student notes are usually incomplete.

In attempt to remedy this, some instructors prepare skeletal notes (also called guided notes or partial notes) that provide the lecture’s structure and key terms or main ideas before the lecture, but leave room for the students to fill in the notes with additional main ideas and details. Several studies have shown that students record more details and perform better on later exams when they are given skeletal notes instead of taking traditional unguided notes (e.g. Austin, Lee, & Car, 2004), and these benefits are greater when students are trained to use the guided notes (Konrad, Joseph, & Eveleigh, 2009). Kiewra (1985b, 2002) recommends providing students with partial or skeletal notes before a lecture and a full set of instructor notes afterward, while others have found that students actually learn more retain the information longer when they are given skeletal notes instead of a full lecture transcript or a full set of instructor’s notes (Katayama, 1997; Russell, Caris, Harris, & Hendricson, 1983). While Neef, McCord, & Ferreri (2006) found no difference in mean quiz scores between students who had been provided with guided and completed notes, they did find that students who were only given guided notes performed better on more complex analysis-level questions.

Since college students spend approximately 80% of the class time listening to lectures (Armbruster, 2000), it is not surprising that all of these studies have tested student note-taking in a lecture-based scenario. How-
ever, as more and more instructors consider “flipping” their classrooms, and as we seek to identify ways to help students better prepare for class, we should investigate whether asking students to fill in skeletal notes as they prepare for class and then add to those notes during class might facilitate greater learning.

**CONTEXT**

This series of studies was conducted at an urban public university in the Pacific region of the United States with a total enrollment of 21,755, including 18,074 undergraduates (Office of Institutional Research, 2012). In this Basic Course, master’s level Graduate Teaching Assistants (GTAs) teach standalone sections of the course, but are supervised by a faculty Basic Course Director who oversees the course. Although each GTA has considerable freedom in how they develop their lesson plans and are given a small number of “discretion points” that can be used for section-specific assignments and activities, all sections of the course are taught using the same textbook, workbook, syllabus, speeches, major assignments, and exams, so there is a high degree of consistency among sections of the course, allowing comparisons across sections for assessment and research purposes. All three of the studies described below were approved by the university’s Institutional Review Board, and each was designed with the purpose of answering questions that lingered from the preceding study in order to help refine our Basic Course pedagogy and curriculum.
STUDY 1: FREQUENT QUIZING

The purpose of our first study was to find out whether giving students frequent, announced reading quizzes would increase their learning in the Basic Course. Even though a great deal of previous research attested to the benefits of frequent quizzing for student learning, only two of those studies were done in communication (Johnson, 2007; Johnson & Mrowka, 2010), and those studies either used unannounced quizzes that were given after the material had been previously discussed in class or were student-generated quizzes in other types of communication courses. Prior to completing this study, our Oral Communication course utilized a midterm and final exam, similar to many other Basic Course programs, and our goal was to find out whether our students would learn more if the midterm was replaced with frequent, announced reading quizzes. With these issues in mind, this study was designed to test the following hypothesis:

H1: There will be a significant difference in the student learning in public speaking classes when frequent pre-lecture quizzes are given compared to when a midterm examination is given.

Procedures and Instrumentation

This study used a quasi-experimental field research design with one independent variable, assessment type, and one dependent variable, learning. This is a quasi-experimental design because we did not randomly assign students to groups; instead, students self-selected into their group when they chose to enroll in a section of
the class in a particular quarter. However, choosing this kind of design allowed us to collect data in the most realistic natural setting possible: Basic Course classrooms. Students did not know about the study until they were invited to sign a consent form on the day of the final exam, so it is highly improbable that student self-selection into groups could have caused differences due to unequal groups. Both groups of students were given a list of chapter learning objectives for every chapter of the textbook at the beginning of the year as part of the course workbook.

Assessment type was a nominal variable with two levels: midterm or quizzes. All students who were enrolled in the course in the winter quarter were given the same midterm exam halfway through the quarter; the midterm was a comprehensive exam of all material that had been covered prior to the exam. All students who were enrolled in the course in the spring quarter were given a quiz at the beginning of each class for which they were supposed to have read part of the textbook (i.e., most days except speech days, for a total of nine quizzes throughout the quarter) instead of a midterm exam. These quizzes were based on the chapter learning objectives that were provided in the course workbook and included a blend of short answer and multiple-choice questions. Because the quizzes were given after students had read the textbook chapter but before the material had been covered in class, GTAs were instructed to keep all questions at the knowledge and comprehension levels of Bloom’s cognitive learning taxonomy (Bloom et al, 1956), and then use class time in ways that would help students learn at the higher levels of the taxonomy. During both quarters, students were
given the same comprehensive final exam that assessed students’ understanding of material covered throughout the entire quarter at all six levels of Bloom’s Taxonomy. Though choosing to select groups by quarter increased the risk of maturation threat, assessments in previous years had indicated that there was no difference in student learning between the winter and spring quarters, so we decided this risk was minimal compared to the risk of threats from compensatory rivalry, resentful demoralization, or the Hawthorne effect that might have resulted from utilizing both treatments in different sections at the same time.

Learning was operationalized as the student’s grade on the comprehensive final examination, which included equal coverage of all chapters in the textbook and included questions that tested learning at all six levels of Bloom’s cognitive learning domain. The final exam was identical for both groups of students.

**Participants**

All students who were enrolled in Oral Communication during the winter and spring quarter when this study was conducted were invited to participate in this study. A total of 1194 undergraduate students participated in this study.

**Results**

An independent-samples t-test was conducted to find out whether the final exam scores were significantly different. For the group that was given the midterm exam, $N = 616$, $M = 54.33$, $SD = 9.66$. For the group that was
given frequent quizzes, $N = 578$, $M = 57.31$, $SD = 8.23$. Levene’s Test for the Equality of Variance was significant ($F = 12.757$, $p < .001$), so values for equal variances not assumed were used. The $t$-test indicated that the final exam scores were significantly different, $t(1191.235) = -5.743$, $p < .001$. Students who were given frequent quizzes scored an average of 3 points higher on the 75-point final exam than students who were given a midterm exam, which was an increase of 4%.

**Summary and Discussion**

This study shows that students benefit from frequent quizzes in public speaking classes. While a 4% increase in final exam scores might not sound like a large change, this is a fairly substantial finding when we consider that this is the average change for all students, even including those who might have been less than diligent about attendance and preparation, and suggests that this is a strategy well worth incorporating into public speaking classes.

There are several explanations for our findings. First, it is possible that the quizzes simply provided an additional incentive for students to engage in other activities that are facilitating learning. GTAs were encouraged to talk about the quizzes as a means of rewarding students for the preparatory work that they should already be doing, so it is highly likely that the quizzes were seen by many students as an incentive. Other studies report that the use of quizzes can increase attendance (e.g., Hovell, Williams, & Semb, 1979), motivate students to keep up with the course readings (e.g., Feldhusen, 1964), and give students an opportunity to
practice retrieving knowledge (e.g., Chan, 2010), and it is likely that these factors play an important role in our findings as well. Second, it is also probable that actual process of taking the frequent quizzes is helping students learn. Karpicke & Zaromb (2009) argue that the process of effortful retrieval helps students remember more later than they would if they had not been quizzed. Third, the quizzes provided frequent opportunities for low-stakes assessment so that students could check their own understanding of the material and adjust their preparation throughout the term. In this way, the quizzes provided students with near-constant feedback so that they had a good idea of how they were progressing before any of the higher-stakes assessments (e.g., the final exam) took place.

**STUDY 2: ONLINE VS. IN-CLASS QUIZZES**

While our first study found that students retained more knowledge over time and performed better on their final exam when they were given frequent quizzes, giving those quizzes took up valuable class time and substantially increased instructors’ grading loads. For this second study, conducted a little over a year later, we wanted to find out whether there might be alternatives that would allow us to garner the benefits of frequent quizzing while minimizing the time spent in class or grading. Additionally, we wanted to learn more about the impact of quizzes on several variables and course outcomes, including psychomotor learning (through speech performance), Public Speaking Anxiety, and cognitive learning on course concepts (including perception-
Preparing to Learn

Based measures and performance-based measures). Since most Learning Management Systems (LMS) allow instructors to create online quizzes that can be taken out of class and automatically graded, we developed a study to test the following hypotheses:

- **H_2**: There is a significant difference in the change in speech grade across the academic term for students who have been given in-class quizzes and those who have been given online quizzes.
- **H_3**: There is a significant difference in the change in public speaking anxiety across the academic term for students who have been given in-class quizzes and those who have been given online quizzes.
- **H_4**: There is a significant difference in the change in cognitive learning across the academic term for students who have been given in-class quizzes and those who have been given online quizzes.
- **H_5**: There is a significant difference in final exam score for students who have been given in-class quizzes and those who have been given online quizzes.
- **H_6**: There is a significant difference in the final course grade for students who have been given in-class quizzes and those who have been given online quizzes.

**Procedures**

This study used a split-plot design with one independent variable (between-subjects factor), quiz type, and three dependent variables that were measured repeatedly (within-subjects factors), speech grade, public
speaking anxiety, and cognitive learning. Additionally, several measures were taken once: demographic characteristics, final exam grade, and final course grade. The repeated measures design reduces the number of subjects needed by removing variability due to individual differences from the error term, which is statistically “much more powerful than completely randomized designs” (Stevens, 2002, p. 492).

Students were assigned to one of two groups based on the sections of public speaking in which they were enrolled, again making this a quasi-experimental design that allowed us to use real Basic Course classes as our research setting. Both groups had quizzes about the reading each day that reading was due in the class (a total of 10 quizzes); however, Group 1 took paper-and-pencil quizzes in class at the beginning of the class period, whereas Group 2 was asked to take the quizzes online before coming to class. Both groups were given a list of chapter learning outcomes on which the quizzes were based.

Table 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research Design and Timeline</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>O1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSA1, CL1, Narrative Speech</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: SG = Speech Grade, PSA = Public Speaking Anxiety, CL = Cognitive Learning
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Except for grades, all data was collected using an online survey. Students received extra credit for completing the surveys (5 points per survey; the maximum 10 survey points was 2% of the course total). A survey link was sent to students in the second week of the class and again in the final week of the class, allowing the surveys to serve as pre-tests and post-tests. Speech grades were collected from the instructors’ grade books at the end of the quarter. Table 1 shows the timeline for all measurements and treatments for both groups.

Instrumentation

The first variable included in this study was speech grade, which serves as a proxy for speech quality and is a performance-based measure of learning. All speeches were graded by the course instructors using standardized grading rubrics, and all speech grades were converted into a 100-point scale for the purposes of this analysis. The three speeches that students gave included a narrative speech, an informative speech, and a persuasive speech.

Public Speaking Anxiety was measured using Booth-Butterfield and Gould’s (1986) State Communication Anxiety Inventory, which includes twenty items measured with a four-point Likert-type scale in which 1 = Not at all, 2 = Somewhat, 3 = Moderately so, and 4 = Very much so. The authors report an overall reliability of $\alpha = .912$ for this scale and include items such as, “I felt tense and nervous,” and “My words became confused and jumbled when I was speaking” (p. 199). In our study, the scale reliability was $\alpha = .878$. 
Perceived Cognitive Learning was measured using Frymier and Houser’s (1999) Revised Learning Indicators scale, which includes nine items measured with a 5-point scale ranging from Never (1) to Very Often (5). This scale is an improved measure based on Learning Empowerment Indicator Scale created by Frymier, Shulman, and Houser (1996). The authors report an overall reliability of $\alpha = .83$ for this scale and include items such as “I actively participate in class discussion” and “I think about the course content outside of class” (p. 8). In our study, the scale reliability was $\alpha = .860$.

Final exam grade and final course grade were included as additional performance-based measures of cognitive learning. Students were also asked which type of quiz they would prefer if given a choice between in-class and online quizzes and were asked to provide a rationale for their choice.

**Participants**

A total of 101 students enrolled in four sections of Oral Communication were selected to participate in this study. Students did not know about the study prior to enrolling in these sections of the course, so the sections should have been equivalent groups similar to the groups that would have resulted from random assignment. These sections were taught by two instructors, and each instructor was asked to teach one section using each of our two treatment conditions to equalize any instructor effects between the two conditions. We have grade data for all 101 students who participated in this study, but only 64 students completed the first survey and 34 students completed the second survey, so we
only have partial participation in the measures that were taken via the two online surveys (demographic information, Public Speaking Anxiety, and Cognitive Learning).

Of the 64 students who completed the first online survey, which is the survey that included demographic items, 37 (57.8%) were female and 27 (42.2%) were male, and the mean age was 19.2 years (SD = 2.16). For ethnicity, 3 (4.7%) of the students reported that they are African-American, 9 (14.1%) are Asian, 42 (65.6%) are Hispanic, 4 (6.3%) are white, 4 (6.3%) are of other ethnicities, and 2 (3.1%) prefer not to respond.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 2</th>
<th>Means for Dependent Variables by Group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Group 1 (In-Class Quizzes)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>O1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speech Grade</td>
<td>88.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(7.09)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Speaking Anxiety</td>
<td>42.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(10.57)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cognitive Learning</td>
<td>29.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(5.32)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final Exam Grade</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final Course Grade</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Means are shown on top in each cell; standard deviations are shown in parentheses in the bottom of each cell. All grades are expressed as percentages.
Results

Split-plot within-subjects repeated measures analyses were conducted to find out whether there was a difference between the two treatment groups in Speech Grade, Public Speaking Anxiety, and Cognitive Learning across the quarter. Additionally, independent samples t-tests were used to find out whether there was a difference between the groups on the final exam and final course grade. Means for these variables are included in Table 2. Alpha was set at .05 for all tests.

Speech Grade. A within-subjects split plot analysis was conducted to determine whether speech grades changed differently across the quarter between the two groups. Wilks’ Lambda was significant for speech grades, $\lambda = .897, F(2, 98) = 5.651, p = .005, \eta^2_p = .103$, but not for speech grades by group, $\lambda = .964, F(2, 98) = 1.822, p = .167, \eta^2_p = .036$. Between-subjects effects were not significant, $F(1, 99) = 2.037, p = .157, \eta^2_p = .020$. Tests of within-subjects effects were significant for speech grade, $F(2, 198) = 6.700, p = .002, \eta^2_p = .063$. Within-subjects contrasts for speech grades showed a significant linear trend, $F(1, 99) = 10.465, p = .002, \eta^2_p = .096$, but did not show a significant quadratic trend, $F(1, 99) = .989, p = .323, \eta^2_p = .010$. However, pairwise comparisons and tests of simple main effects show that in-class and online quizzes have a slightly different impact on student changes in speech grade throughout the term. Students taking in-class quizzes did not have significant differences between their first and second speech ($p = .551$) or between their first and third speech ($p = .126$), but did have significant differences between their second and third speech ($p = .019$). However, students taking online quizzes showed significant growth.
in their speech grades between their first and second speeches \( (p = .036) \) and between their first and third speech \( (p = .003) \), but not between their second and third speech \( (p = .163) \). This means that, while there were no statistically significant differences between groups on any of the speech grades at any one point in time, students who took online quizzes improved their speeches more from the beginning to the end of the quarter, while students taking in-class quizzes only improved between the second and the third speech. However, these results do not provide any kind of conclusive evidence about which type of quiz is more effective for improving speech quality.

**Public Speaking Anxiety**

A within-subjects split plot analysis was conducted to determine whether state public speaking anxiety changed differently across the quarter between the two groups. Wilks’ Lambda was not significant for PSA, \( \lambda = .852, F(1, 22) = 3.808, p = .064, \eta^2_p = .148 \), nor for PSA by group, \( \lambda = .972, F(1, 22) = .628, p = .436, \eta^2_p = .028 \). Tests of within-subjects effects, within-subjects contrasts, and between-subjects effects were not significant. However, tests for simple main effects showed a significant change in public speaking anxiety for students who took online quizzes, \( F(1, 22) = 9.036, p = .007, \eta^2_p = .291 \), but not for students who took in-class quizzes, \( F(1, 22) = .424, p = .522, \eta^2_p = .019 \). This indicates that students who took online quizzes significantly reduced their state PSA through the quarter, while students who took in-class quizzes saw no significant change in state PSA. However, students who took the online quizzes also
started with slightly (but not statistically significantly) higher levels of state PSA when giving their speech at the beginning of the quarter, so these results do not provide compelling evidence that either type of quiz is preferable for reducing Public Speaking Anxiety.

**Perceived Cognitive Learning.** A within-subjects split plot analysis was conducted to determine whether Cognitive Learning changed differently across the quarter between the two groups, as measured by the Revised Learning Indicators Scale. Wilks’ Lambda was not significant for CL, $\lambda = .962$, $F(1, 22) = .864$, $p = .363$, $\eta^2_p = .038$, nor for CL by group, $\lambda = .920$, $F(1, 22) = .1.917$, $p = .180$, $\eta^2_p = .080$. Tests of within-subjects effects, within-subjects contrasts, and between-subjects effects were not significant. However, pairwise comparisons and tests for simple main effects showed a significant change in cognitive learning for students who took online quizzes, $F(1, 22) = 6.426$, $p = .019$, $\eta^2_p = .226$, but not for students who took in-class quizzes, $F(1, 22) = .065$, $p = .801$, $\eta^2_p = .003$. This indicates that students who took online quizzes significantly increased their cognitive learning throughout the quarter, while students who took in-class quizzes reported no significant change in cognitive learning.

**Performance-Based Measures of Cognitive Learning.** Independent samples $t$-tests were conducted to find out whether there was a difference in the final exam grade and final course grade between students who took in-class quizzes and those who took online quizzes throughout the quarter. There was not a significant difference between groups in final exam grade, $t$ (99) = .654, $p = .514$, nor for final course grade, $t$ (99) = .771, $p = .443$. 
Student Preferences. At the end of the quarter, students were asked to indicate whether they would prefer to take quizzes in-class or online before class and explain why they chose their preference. Of the students who took online quizzes before coming to class, 97.1% indicated that they prefer taking online quizzes, while only 2.9% indicated that they would prefer to take in-class quizzes. However, for students who took in-class quizzes, 79.3% indicated that they prefer to take in-class quizzes, and only 20.7% indicated that they would prefer to take online quizzes online before coming to class. In short, students indicated a strong preference for whichever type of quiz they were given throughout the quarter. Students who preferred online quizzes gave reasons such as, “I feel less pressured at home” and “It is more convenient and allows you to refer to the book if need be,” whereas students who preferred in-class quizzes gave reasons such as, “I feel more focused when I am in the classroom taking the quizzes. I would get more distracted if they were online,” and “It motivates me to come to class on time.” Even though students did not get to choose their quiz type, they appear to be engaging in effort justification by arguing for the benefits of the type of quiz that they were given.

Summary and Discussion

In terms of student speech performance, public speaking anxiety, cognitive learning, final exam performance, and overall course grade, there is not a significant difference between students who took in-class and online quizzes on any measure at any point in time. However, when looking at student growth at the indi-
vidual level across the entire term, these results show that there might be very slight advantages to using online quizzes in public speaking classes, which might be attributed to the increased face to face instructional time in the classes that use online quizzes. If in-class quizzes take an average of ten minutes per quiz, ten quizzes over the course of the quarter adds up to 100 minutes of class time that can be used to further clarify concepts, engage students in higher-level learning activities, and allow students to extend their time giving and receiving feedback in peer workshops. The TAs who taught these classes confirmed that they usually adapted their lesson plans for students who took online quizzes to give students more time on activities, in workshops, and preparing and giving informal group speeches as part of in-class activities. This study is one in which we believe that the non-significant findings have important practical implications because they show that online quizzes are a valid alternative that can facilitate learning just as well as in-class quizzes.

However, the success of online quizzes depends on having a reliable LMS infrastructure that is not frequently down for maintenance, on students remembering to take the quizzes, and on students having reliable access to a high-speed internet connection to take the quizzes, all of which proved problematic when we attempted to replace in-class quizzes with online quizzes across our entire Basic Course. Despite these findings, we chose to continue to use in-class quizzes, which led to the third study in this sequence.
STUDY 3: NOTES VS. NO NOTES

As we conducted the first two studies described in this paper, we heard complaints from many students who claimed that they read the textbook and studied for hours, but could not remember the information when it was time for the quiz. It soon became apparent that many of our students did not know how to read the textbook or identify key concepts, which was not particularly surprising since we were working with a student population that was underprepared for college. Drawing on previous research on student notetaking, we decided to provide skeletal notes that students could fill in as they read the textbook to help guide them through the reading, keep them focused on their learning task, and help them learn to identify key concepts throughout the text. However, this raised an important question. Should we allow students to use their notes on the pre-class quizzes, assuming that doing so would motivate students to spend more time developing their notes and ultimately learn more because they would likely be spending more time on task? Or should we ban the use of notes during quizzes, assuming that student would learn more if quizzes gave students an opportunity to engage in effortful retrieval? To find out which process would facilitate greater learning, the following hypotheses were developed:

H7: There is a difference in class preparation for students who are allowed to use notes on quizzes and students who are not allowed to use notes on quizzes.

H8: There is a difference in Student Intellectual Stimulation for Students who are allowed to use notes on quizzes and students who are not allowed to use notes on quizzes.
notes on quizzes and students who are not allowed to use notes on quizzes.

H9: There is a difference in Cognitive Learning for students who are allowed to use notes on quizzes and students who are not allowed to use notes on quizzes.

H10: There is a difference in Affective Learning for students who are allowed to use notes on quizzes and students who are not allowed to use notes on quizzes.

**Procedures**

Like the previous studies, this study used a quasi-experimental design in which students self-selected into groups when they enrolled in their Oral Communication course. However, students did not know that they were enrolling in sections that would be included in this study, so groups should be equal and approximate random assignment, and this again allowed us to collect data in a natural classroom setting. Six sections of Oral Communication taught by three instructors were selected to participate in this study. Each instructor was asked to allow students to use their skeletal notes on the reading quizzes in one section that they taught, but not in the other section. This was done to equalize any potential instructor effects between groups. Students were given seven quizzes throughout the quarter, and all of the sections included in this study gave the same quizzes.
Instrumentation

This study included one independent variable (Notes vs. No Notes) and four dependent variables (Student Intellectual Stimulation, Cognitive Learning, Affective Learning, and Class Preparation). Student Intellectual Stimulation and Affective Learning were included in this study so that we could capture additional dimensions of learning and engagement. Quiz, final exam, and final course grades were collected from instructors’ final grade books, and all other measures were obtained using a voluntary in-class paper survey. Students who volunteered to participate received five extra credit points, which accounted for less than 1% of their total course grade.

Student Intellectual Stimulation Scale. This study used the short form Student Intellectual Stimulation Scale (SISS) which is a 10-item, self-report measure that uses a 7-point Likert format ranging from “never” to “always”. Bolkan and Goodboy (2010) developed the SISS to measure intellectual stimulation in the college classroom. It is also an indicator of transformational leadership displayed by the instructor within the classroom. With regard to transformational leadership, this scale measures Teacher Confirmation, Nonverbal Immediacy and Teacher Accessibility. This scale includes items such as “My teacher uses unique activities to get the class involved with the course material,” “My teacher stimulates students to help us get involved in the learning process in a variety of ways,” and “My teacher wants me to think critically about what we are learning.” The authors report a Cronbach’s alpha scale reliability of $\alpha = .94$. 
Cognitive Learning. Cognitive learning was measured in two ways. The first method was a self-report measure using Frymier and Houser’s (1999) Revised Learning Indicators Scale, which was also used in Study 2. Cognitive learning was also measured using classroom performance-based measures of learning, including quiz scores, final exam grades, and final course grades.

Affective Learning Measure. The Affective Learning Measure (ALM) is a 7-point bipolar semantic differential scale (McCroskey, 1994). This measure includes four separate scales that ask students to rate their course or instructor on each of four items; for example, one of these scales asks students to rate the class content on the following bipolar semantic differential items: bad—good, valuable—worthless, unfair—fair, and positive—negative. There are two subscales included in this measure, affective learning and instructor evaluation, each of which includes eight items. For this study, we will use Affective Learning and Instructor Evaluation as separate measures. The authors report a Cronbach’s alpha scale reliability of $\alpha = .90$.

Class Preparation Questionnaire. The Class Preparation Questionnaire was created by the researchers and asked students, “In a typical week, approximately how many minutes do you spend doing each of the following activities outside of class to prepare for your COMM 150 class?” for each of the items listed in Table 3.
Participants

A total of 142 students participated in this study. Of all of our participants, 37.3% (N = 53) were male and 62.7% (N = 89) were female. For ethnicity, 80.3% (N = 114) were Hispanic, 8.5% (N = 12) were Asian, 4.2% (N = 6) were African American, .7% (N = 1) were Caucasian, 2.1% (N = 3) were More Than One, 2.8% (N = 4) were Other, and 1.4% (N = 2) Preferred Not to Respond. The mean age was 18.61 years (N = 139, SD = .90), the mean G.P.A. was 3.12 (N = 139, SD = .59), and the mean for the number of terms enrolled in college was 2.76 terms (N = 132, SD = 1.50)

Results

The primary goal of this study was to find out whether there were differences on a variety of measures between students who were allowed to use their notes while taking quizzes and those who were not allowed to use their notes while taking quizzes. First, we wanted to find out how students prepared for class. T-tests were conducted to find out whether there were differences between the students who used notes and who did not use notes for each measure of preparation for class. Means and standard deviations for each measure are shown in Table 3. However, significant differences were found only for “Read the textbook while taking notes,” t (135) = 2.21, p < .05, and for “Review, organize, or revise my notes,” t (93.27) = .94, p < .05. For both of these variables, students who were allowed to use their notes on their quizzes spent more time engaging in those preparation activities.
Table 3

*Time Spent Preparing for Class in Minutes per Week by Group*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Use notes</th>
<th>No notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Read the textbook without taking notes</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>31.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Read the textbook while taking notes*</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>49.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review, organize, or revise my notes*</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>36.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prepare, revise, and practice speeches</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>80.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work on other homework assignments</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>128.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Take practice quizzes</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>6.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Talk about the course material with others</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>23.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>37.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Preparation</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>342.90</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Significant differences exist between groups
A chi-square was conducted to assess whether the use of skeletal notes or no skeletal notes on a quiz affects how students complete the given skeletal notes. The result of this test was significant, $\chi^2 (4, N = 100) = 11.016, p < .05$. Table 4 shows the valid percentages for each way students used their skeletal notes. In sum, both groups used the skeletal outlines heavily when preparing for class, but students who were allowed to use their notes on the quizzes were a little bit more consistent than those who were not allowed to use their notes in filling out their skeletal notes all or most of the time.

Independent-samples $t$-tests were conducted to find out whether there were differences in a variety of self-report outcome measures between students who were allowed to use their notes while taking quizzes and those who were not allowed to use their notes while taking quizzes. Table 5 shows the means and standard deviations for each group with respect to the four scale variables. There were no significant differences between groups on any of these variables; for the Student Intellectual Stimulation Scale, $t (133.15) = 1.65, p > .05$; for the Revised Learning Indicators Scale (cognitive learning), $t (136) = .879, p > .05$; for Affective Learning, $t (117) = .311, p > .05$; and for Instructor Evaluation, $t (117) = -.386, p > .05$. These results indicate that there is no difference in the ways that students perceive their learning and experiences in their class based on whether or not they are allowed to use their notes on quizzes.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Use Notes</th>
<th>No Notes</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I completely filled out the skeletal outlines every time there was reading assigned.</td>
<td>N = 38</td>
<td>N = 29</td>
<td>N = 67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>57.6%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>49.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I usually filled out the skeletal outlines, but I left them incomplete or didn't fill them out at all a couple of times.</td>
<td>N = 23</td>
<td>N = 21</td>
<td>N = 44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>34.8%</td>
<td>30.4%</td>
<td>32.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I completed about half of the skeletal outlines.</td>
<td>N = 2</td>
<td>N = 7</td>
<td>N = 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td>10.1%</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I completed the skeletal outlines a couple of times, but left more incomplete or undone than I actually completed.</td>
<td>N = 3</td>
<td>N = 6</td>
<td>N = 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.5%</td>
<td>8.7%</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I never filled out the skeletal outlines.</td>
<td>N = 0</td>
<td>N = 6</td>
<td>N = 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>8.7%</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5
Outcome Scores by Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Use Notes</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>No Notes</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Intellectual Stimulation Scale</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>59.40</td>
<td>10.12</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>56.17</td>
<td>12.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revised Learning Indicators Scale</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>31.43</td>
<td>6.70</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>30.44</td>
<td>6.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affective Learning</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>42.63</td>
<td>7.99</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>42.14</td>
<td>8.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructor Evaluation</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>48.89</td>
<td>7.45</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>49.46</td>
<td>8.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quiz Grade</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>41.35</td>
<td>8.38</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>29.20</td>
<td>8.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final Exam Grade</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>74.58</td>
<td>8.84</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>78.26</td>
<td>8.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course Grade</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>423.51</td>
<td>33.07</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>414.40</td>
<td>36.16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 6
Correlations between Preparation and Student Self-Reported Outcome Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Preparation</th>
<th>SISS</th>
<th>Cognitive Learning</th>
<th>Affective Learning</th>
<th>Instructor Evaluation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Preparation</td>
<td>$r = 1$</td>
<td></td>
<td>$r = .279^*$</td>
<td>$r = -.032$</td>
<td>$r = .065$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SISS</td>
<td>$r = 1$</td>
<td></td>
<td>$r = .476^*$</td>
<td>$r = .438^*$</td>
<td>$r = .494^*$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cognitive Learning</td>
<td>$r = 1$</td>
<td></td>
<td>$r = .413^*$</td>
<td></td>
<td>$r = .369^*$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affective Learning</td>
<td></td>
<td>$r = 1$</td>
<td></td>
<td>$r = .585^*$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructor Evaluation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$r = 1$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* $p < .001$. 
Next, independent samples $t$-tests were conducted to find out whether there was a difference in student performance on quizzes, the final exam, and the overall course grade. Students who were allowed to use their notes performed significantly better on the quizzes than students who were not allowed to use their notes, $t (153) = .107, p < .05$. However, students who were not allowed to use their notes on quizzes performed significantly better on the final exam than students who were allowed to use their notes on the final exam, $t (153) = -2.65, p < .05$. There was no significant difference between groups on final course grade, $t (153) = 1.64, p > .05$.

Bivariate correlations were run to find out whether there were relationships between preparation and the four student self-reported outcome variables: student intellectual stimulation, cognitive learning, affective learning, and instruction evaluation. The correlations are reported in Table 6. As should be expected, all four of the student self-reported outcome variables had significant positive correlations. However, Preparation was only significantly correlated with Cognitive Learning, $r = .279, p < .05$, but not with the other variables.

**Summary and Discussion**

This study focused on the effects of using notes or not using notes on quizzes with regard to several learning outcome variables. Results showed that students who used their notes on quizzes spent more time reading and taking notes prior to class and scored higher on the quizzes, but scored lower on the final exam than students who were not allowed to use their
notes on the quizzes. These results support the retrieval-induced facilitation hypothesis (Chan, McDermott, & Roediger, 2006) and suggest that quizzes that require students to recall studied material without the aid of their notes is a more powerful learning tool than additional study time and note use. It appears that students who took the quizzes without notes studied more efficiently, the process of recalling information during the quizzes strengthened the learning process, or both. This suggests that giving frequent quizzes on which students are not allowed to use their notes helps to facilitate deep learning. However, it is also possible that students who were allowed to use their notes on quizzes developed a false sense of security about their understanding of the course material. These students had slightly higher course grades prior to the final exam and might have felt more confident about their performance in the class, which could have resulted in them spending less time studying prior to the final exam. While our data did not investigate confidence prior to the final exam, this is something that should be considered in future research.

This is not to say that the skeletal notes were not helpful to the students who were not allowed to use them when they took their quizzes. As Table 4 showed, most students who did not get to use their notes on the quizzes still relied heavily on the skeletal notes that were provided in their workbook to help them prepare for class, even if some were slightly less diligent about completely filling out the notes prior to every class. This suggests that the skeletal notes were perceived as being helpful for all students, and since previous research indicates that skeletal or guided notes are valuable tools
for helping students learn (Austin, Lee, & Carr, 2004), we would recommend integrating such notes into other courses.

This study also showed that there is no significant difference between the two groups on all four self-reported variables, including Student Intellectual Stimulation, Cognitive Learning, Affective Learning, and Instructor Evaluation. Since these are highly interactive courses and were taught by the same instructors using the same lesson plans, this is actually a positive finding because it suggests that being allowed to or forbidden from using their notes on the quizzes did not have a substantial impact on their overall experience in or perceptions of the course.

CONCLUSION

This paper shares the results of a sequence of three studies that were conducted to help develop a course framework that would encourage students to prepare well for class, ultimately allowing our program to maximize student learning both in and out of class. Results showed that there was a clear benefit to using frequent quizzes, both in terms of motivating students to come to class prepared and in terms of allowing instructors to use class time for higher-order learning activities that would promote deeper learning. While our second study showed that online quizzes can be just as effective as in-class quizzes, we caution that the reliability of your campus or publisher’s LMS is critical to the successful implementation of frequent online quizzes. Moreover, the results of our final study on the use of
notes during quizzes suggest that the retrieval-induced facilitation of learning is a powerful learning tool, which is a reason to rethink the use of online quizzes.

Nonetheless, online quizzes can potentially eliminate the need for classroom time and drastically reduce or even eliminate the time needed to grade quizzes so that students and teachers can garner the benefits of frequent quizzes without the drawbacks. While online quizzes give instructors less control over the actual quiz situation, allow students to look up answers in the textbook, and increase the risk that students will use the quizzes as a substitute for, instead of a supplement to, reading to prepare for class (Beyeler, 1998), they also increase in-class instructional time and reduce the grading load for instructors, and these advantages might possibly outweigh the advantages of retrieval-induced learning.

Additionally, providing skeletal notes to students before class gave students an additional learning resource, and as the results of our third study show, most students used the skeletal notes whether or not they would be allowed to use them later. This is an example of a simple innovation that can be implemented in a class that will not interfere with any other normal classroom activities or assignments, but could have lasting impacts on student learning, both in this course and possibly in the way that students approach learning in future courses. Future research should further investigate the impacts of taking notes prior to attending class.

One of the limitations of this study was that we used exam grades and other assignment grades as a proxy for learning since these served as performance-based measures of learning. We did not have the resources
available to do the type of robust assessment that is generally done during program review with external reviewers, and final course grade could not be used as a proxy for overall student learning since it would be influenced by grades on the quizzes or midterm exam in the first study (and to some extent in the second and third study). Since the final exam was carefully crafted each year to include both breadth and depth across content and levels of learning using the guidelines provided by Stiggins (2004), this was the most comprehensive measurement of learning that was available to us and was practical to implement. A future study should utilize a more comprehensive assessment protocol that includes the evaluation of portfolios of student work, including performances, by subject matter experts who serve as external evaluators.

In sum, based on the combination of these three studies, we strongly recommend that basic course instructors give frequent in-class quizzes that will encourage students to prepare for class and provide an opportunity for effortful retrieval, which will help embed the foundational knowledge in students’ long-term memory. These quizzes should be designed to be taken quickly so that the bulk of the class time is spent on other engaging learning activities, and instructors should be deliberate about utilizing class time for activities that provide opportunities for application, analysis, synthesis, and evaluation instead of giving lectures that simply repeat what students already read and were quizzed on. Online quizzes should be seen as a viable second option if course constraints and instructor workload make it too difficult to do in-class quizzes, but future research should evaluate whether clickers or other technology
might allow instructors to harness the benefits of in-class quizzes while avoiding heavy grading loads and class time involved with using paper and pencil quizzes. Additionally, we would encourage instructors to talk with students about effective preparation and study strategies and to provide skeletal notes and/or other resources that will help students focus on key concepts as they prepare for class. Future research should also examine whether other class preparation resources, such as video lectures, learning modules, and workshops, might help students achieve even higher levels of learning before coming to class. This combination of quizzes and preparation tools will not only increase learning in the basic communication course, but it might also lay a foundation for student success throughout their remaining college career.
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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...
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-
eration, 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>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author(s)</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Edition</th>
<th>Publisher</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rothwell, J.D.</td>
<td>In the company of others: An introduction to communication</td>
<td>3rd ed.</td>
<td>New York: Oxford University Press.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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-diagno-
sis (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 

In the twenty textbooks analyzed, the primary method for diagnosis was self-diagnosis (see Table 3).

Table 3

<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>PRCA-24</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRPSA</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Diagnosis</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</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, \( \chi^2 (1, N = 20) = .22, p = .61, FET = 1.00 \);
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>

\( = .64, FET = 1.00; \) and systematic desensitization, \( \chi^2 (1, N = 20) = 1.82, p = .18, \) \( FET = .37. \)

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 (\( M = 5.6, SD = 1.98 \)).
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 desentization 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. Over-
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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