

Basic Communication Course Annual

Volume 32

Article 4

2020

Measuring Essential Learning Outcomes for Public Speaking

Melissa A. Broeckelman-Post
George Mason University, mbroecke@gmu.edu

Karla M. Hunter
South Dakota State University, karla.hunter@sdstate.edu

Joshua N. Westwick
South Dakota State University, joshua.westwick@sdstate.edu

Angela Hosek
Ohio University - Main Campus, hosek@ohio.edu

Kristina Ruiz-Mesa
California State University, Los Angeles, kruizme@calstatela.edu

See next page for additional authors

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

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

Recommended Citation

Broeckelman-Post, Melissa A.; Hunter, Karla M.; Westwick, Joshua N.; Hosek, Angela; Ruiz-Mesa, Kristina; Hooker, John; and Anderson, Lindsey B. (2020) "Measuring Essential Learning Outcomes for Public Speaking," *Basic Communication Course Annual: Vol. 32*, Article 4.
Available at: <https://ecommons.udayton.edu/bcca/vol32/iss1/4>

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

Measuring Essential Learning Outcomes for Public Speaking

Cover Page Footnote

This project was funded by a National Communication Association Advancing the Discipline Grant. Dr. Cheri Simonds (Illinois State University), Dr. LeAnn Brazeal (Missouri State University), and Dr. Andrew Wolvin (University of Maryland) were also involved in other portions of this project that helped to lead to the development of this manuscript.

Authors

Melissa A. Broeckelman-Post, Karla M. Hunter, Joshua N. Westwick, Angela Hosek, Kristina Ruiz-Mesa, John Hooker, and Lindsey B. Anderson

Research Article

Measuring Essential Learning Outcomes for Public Speaking

Melissa A. Broeckelman-Post, George Mason University

Karla M. Hunter, South Dakota State University

Joshua N. Westwick, South Dakota State University

Angela Hosek, Ohio University

Kristina Ruiz-Mesa, California State University, Los Angeles

John Hooker, Illinois State University

Lindsey B. Anderson, University of Maryland

Abstract

Basic Course Directors (BCDs) are typically expected to assess course learning outcomes, but few formal guidelines and resources exist for new BCDs. As one part of a larger, multi-methodological assessment tool development project, this manuscript maps existing quantitative measures onto the six essential competencies and associated learning outcomes established by the Social Science Research Council Panel on Public Speaking. This manuscript compiles dozens of measurement resources, aligned by outcome, and also identifies areas where future assessment measures development is needed. Although there are many measures available for evaluating outcomes related to creating messages, critically analyzing messages, and demonstrating self-efficacy, there are measurement gaps for outcomes related to communication ethics, embracing difference, and influencing public discourse.

Keywords: assessment, basic course, essential competencies, evaluation, quantitative measures

Introduction

According to the Association of American Colleges and Universities (AAC&U), almost 70% of accredited colleges and universities across the United States have a required general education basic communication course (Hart Research Associates, 2016). The most common version of this course is public speaking, with more than 61% of institutions responding to a basic course survey indicating this is the course structure they use (Morreale et al., 2016). With thousands of basic communication courses being offered in any given semester, it is beneficial to have an established set of communication competencies that guide course development, as well as a variety of measures that can be utilized to assess course effectiveness and learning.

In 2017, the Social Science Research Council (SSRC), in partnership with the National Communication Association (NCA), gathered a group of eight communication professors from across the United States to analyze communication concepts, competencies, and learning outcomes in public speaking. This experienced public speaking panel composed of basic communication course directors and instructional communication scholars built on previous assessment projects and reports to explore existing measures and determine opportunities to develop new measures and assessment tools (see Kidd et al., 2016; Morreale et al., 2016; Morreale et al., 1998; Ward et al., 2014). The public speaking panel of the Measuring College Learning project with the SSRC identified six essential competencies, 12 essential learning outcomes, and 44 enabling objectives that all students who complete a public speaking course should be able to accomplish (Broeckelman-Post & Ruiz-Mesa, 2018); these authors' call for a complete set of assessment tools was the impetus for this project.

The goal of this manuscript is to provide a summary of existing quantitative measures that can be used to assess each of the communication competencies or learning outcomes that should be achieved by students when they are enrolled in an introductory communication skills course. To compile these measures, our team did searches of communication journals, consulted *Communication Research Measures I: A Sourcebook* (Rubin et al., 2004) and *Communication Research Measures II: A Sourcebook* (Rubin et al., 2009), and searched other journals and databases that were likely to include relevant measures (e.g., education and psychology journals). Our hope is that this compilation will provide a valuable resource for course directors and instructors who are preparing to assess their own introductory communication skills courses and identify several opportunities for measure development.

Each of the following sections describes one of the six essential competencies of public speaking, as determined by the SSRC Measuring College Learning panel, and provides resources for instructors and course directors who are looking to conduct assessment in this area. The six essential competencies include: 1) Create messages appropriate to the audience, purpose, and context, 2) Critically analyze messages, 3) Apply ethical communication principles and practices, 4) Utilize communication to embrace difference, 5) Demonstrate self-efficacy, and 6) Influence public discourse.

Competency 1: Create Messages Appropriate to the Audience, Purpose, and Context

The SSRC panel recognized the first essential competency for public speaking students as the ability to *create messages appropriate to the audience, purpose, and context*, which includes analysis of the speaking situation, locating and using information, and presenting messages (Broeckelman-Post & Ruiz-Mesa, 2018). Since the early 1990s, multiple measures and instruments have been introduced and tested to assess message creation within the public speaking context (Schreiber et al., 2012). Most of these measures focus on competencies related to preparation and delivery. To illustrate strengths of these assessment tools, we highlight the learning outcomes associated with message creation. Then, we introduce the measures that have been utilized to evaluate public speaking students' ability to create communication messages that are appropriate for the audience, purpose, and context. Next, we discuss other assessment measures that can be utilized to assess specific objectives associated with the message creation competency. We conclude by discussing the need for additional assessment measures that focus on the evaluation of learning outcomes associated with message creation.

Essential learning outcomes. The first learning outcome, *analysis of the speaking situation* (audience, purpose, and context), has been included in numerous assessments that measure effective public discourse (Avanzino, 2010; Morreale et al., 2007; Schreiber et al., 2012). Backlund (1978) argued that to demonstrate communication competence, one must have “the ability to demonstrate a knowledge of the socially appropriate communicative behavior in a given situation” (p. 24). The second learning outcome, *locate and use information*, has also been included in numerous assessments of public discourse (Avanzino, 2010; Morreale et al., 2007; Schreiber et al., 2012; Thompson & Rucker, 2002). For a student to create a message that is appropriate for the audience, purpose, and context, the student must search

for appropriate research resources and use the information gathered from that research appropriately and effectively. Broeckelman-Post and Ruiz-Mesa (2018) explained that in relationship to message creation, students should demonstrate their ability to locate and use information by conducting research to support ideas and arguments, by evaluating the credibility and the appropriateness of research materials, and by designing presentation aids that clarify the message and improve understanding. The third learning outcome, *present messages*, focusses on the message organization and delivery, which includes the development of a speaking outline with attention to arrangement as well as the use of evidence and reasoning, the use of effective verbal and nonverbal techniques, and the use of appropriate technology and communication modalities to present a message. Again, several scholars have utilized measures that assess this outcome as well (Avanzino, 2010; Morreale et al., 2007; Schreiber et al., 2012; Thomson & Rucker, 2002).

Measures for broad-based assessment of message creation. Instructors who have sought to provide comprehensive evaluation of students' public speaking competence have traditionally utilized common assessment measures described below. Although designed for holistic evaluation, each measure appears to provide opportunity for pre- and post-test evaluation of public speaking students' ability to create messages appropriate to the audience, purpose, and context. (For a comprehensive review of these instruments, see Schreiber et al., 2012.)

Morreale et al. (2007) developed the Competent Speaker Speech Evaluation Form, based on an NCA large-scale assessment effort, "to assess public speaking competency at the higher education level..." (p. 8). The scale, developed as one of the first comprehensive public speaking assessment tools, assesses a speech as "excellent," "satisfactory," or "unsatisfactory" in eight competencies, half of which focus on public speaking preparation and half on delivery (Morreale et al., 2007). Seven of the eight competencies connect to the audience, purpose, and/or occasion.

Avanzino (2010) created the Oral Communication Assessment rubric to assess the general education outcomes for oral communication at her institution. The instrument examines each speech's organization, content, and delivery as "effective," "adequate," or "unacceptable" (Avanzino, 2010). Although this instrument has not been utilized in pretest/posttest analysis, it has demonstrated reliability and appears to evaluate the fundamental outcomes associated with message creation.

Schreiber et al. (2012) developed the Public Speaking Competence Rubric as an assessment tool that could be easily utilized not only by communication educators, but also educators in other academic areas. The instrument evaluates nine core

competencies and includes two additional performance standards that can be evaluated based on five levels of standards. Nearly all of the competencies appear to relate to the message creation outcomes outlined by Broeckelman-Post and Ruiz-Mesa (2018).

The AAC&U (2009c) advanced the Oral Communication VALUE rubric which assesses public speaking in five areas including organization, language, delivery, supporting materials, and central message. This measure, however, was created to assess oral communication, in general, as opposed to communication specific to the public speaking situation. One of the critiques of this instrument focuses on its lack of precision (Schreiber et al., 2012). Our review of the literature did not identify published studies that used the VALUE Rubric for assessment.

Measures for focused assessment of message creation. We found a scant number of assessment measures that focused on precise markers in the analysis of message creation learning outcomes. Below, we discuss those measures that can be used to assess some, but not all, of the essential learning outcomes associated with message creation. Thomson and Rucker's 20-item Public Speaking Competence Rubric (PSCR; 2002), for instance, did not assess analysis of the speaking situation; however, the student's ability to locate and use information was assessed in questions six through eight, which inquired whether a speech employed an adequate amount of supporting material that "adds interest to the speech" and "aids audience understanding of the topic." Presenting messages was also assessed in this measure via Questions 1-5, which focused on elements of outlining and structure, and questions 13-19, which assessed elements of nonverbal delivery. Thus, some items from these measures could be utilized for assessment of the noted learning outcomes. Nonverbal delivery can also be assessed using a modified form of several of the questions on the Other-Perceived Nonverbal Immediacy Scale (Richmond et al., 2003), which asks such questions as "His/her voice is monotonous or dull when he/she talks to people" (p. 510). Although used primarily for immediacy research, this tool could be adapted to evaluate a component of the presenting messages outcome.

Additional assessment needs. The assessment measures described above have demonstrated their capability to measure learning outcomes associated with message creation – a core competency in the evaluation of public speaking (Broeckelman-Post & Ruiz-Mesa, 2018). However, as Morreale and Backlund (2007) asserted, "the next generation of assessment will need to expand upon these practices with more precise and detailed strategies" (p. 48). Based on a review of the assessment

measures, there is the need for the creation of specific assessment measures to evaluate students' ability to analyze the speaking situation. Therefore, additional measures are needed to specifically assess the proficiency with which a student "selects a presentation topic that is appropriate for the context in which the speech will be given," as well as those that "analyze the audience and situation" and the student's "ability to adapt a speech to the specific cultural and social context in which it will be delivered" (Broeckelman-Post & Ruiz-Mesa, 2018, p. 8).

Competency 2: Critically Analyze Messages

The second competency identified by the SSRC Public Speaking Panel is *Critically Analyzing Messages*, which includes outcomes for analyzing others' messages as well as analyzing one's own messages before, during, and after speaking (Broeckelman-Post & Ruiz-Mesa, 2018). These outcomes are further broken down into enabling objectives that center around listening, responding, argumentation and logic, and information literacy.

Listening. Listening is viewed as a complex, multidimensional construct that consists of cognitive, affective, and behavioral processes. The cognitive dimension focuses on attending, understanding, comprehending, receiving, and deciphering messages (Imhof, 2010). The affective dimension relates to the motivation or desire to listen based on the listener's relationship with the speaker (Bodie & Jones, 2018). Finally, the behavioral dimension attends to providing verbal and nonverbal feedback (Weger et al., 2010). Janusik (2010) argued that teachers spend more time teaching students how to speak than on how to listen. Most educators and scholars agree that listening is universally valued (Weaver, 1972), yet we spend very little time on how to do it well. The construct of listening has been studied for more than 50 years, and typically measures assess individual differences (Bodie & Worthington, 2010). Further, measures have typically been designed to (a) develop the construct of listening, (b) measure perceived listening abilities, or (c) identify how listening includes another communication phenomenon such as patient satisfaction (for a review of additional listening measures see Fontana et al., 2015).

Numerous listening measures can be and have been applied to the basic communication course. Rubin's (1982) Communication Competency Assessment Instrument (CCAI) was designed to measure speaking and listening skills. The goal of the instrument is to assess only actual speaking and listening skills, not knowledge about communication. The CCAI was designed using the NCA (then SCA)

Education Policy Board report on “Criteria for Evaluating Instruments and Procedures for Assessing Speaking and Listening” (Backlund et al., 1979). The CCAI has three sections, and the listening portion has students watch a videotaped lecture and respond to four questions to determine how well they understood the material presented. Other measures ask students to self-assess their listening behaviors.

Watson et al.’s (1995) Listening Styles Profile-16 is a 16-item scale that asks participants to reflect on their preferred listening style across four orientations (people, action, content, and time). Initial and follow-up studies have demonstrated low reliability estimates for the LSP-16 and indicate that the four styles in the LSP-16 are interrelated (Bodie & Worthington, 2010). Cooper’s (1997) Listening Competency Model, typically applied to workplace settings, is a 19-item survey that asks respondents to identify their attitudes and behaviors about listening. Ford et al. (2000) created the Self-Perceived Listening Competency (SPLC) scale, which has students report the extent to which they engage in 24 listening behaviors in four different contexts (e.g., in other classes, with family, with friends, and at a current job). Also, the SPLC assesses students’ self-perceived competencies on five levels of listening (e.g., discriminative, comprehension, appreciative, critical, therapeutic) and attending behaviors (Wolvin & Coakley, 1996). The SPLC was further validated by Mickelson and Welch (2012). Bodie et al. (2013) further validated Bodie’s (2011) Active-Empathic Listening (AEL) scale, a self-report measure of active-empathic listening. Active-empathic listening is “...the active and emotional involvement of a listener that can take place in a least three key stages of the listening process” (e.g., sensing, processing, and responding; Bodie, 2011, p. 278). Bodie et al. (2013) found that the AEL is a reliable measure, regardless of context, of individual tendencies towards active-empathic listening. Additionally, those with high-levels of AEL engage in this practice in most situations, which can be interpersonally rewarding in many situations but problematic in others.

Another approach was used by Ferrari-Bridgers et al. (2015), who created a critical listening assessment instrument to assess gains in critical listening. The critical listening instrument has students listen to a speech and identify critical aspects of the speech. To do so, students watch a substandard speech and identify missing elements in the introduction, body, and conclusion and answer a series of questions about the content of the speech itself. This approach is fairly easy to replicate with the use of taped speeches or during peer presentations. Finally, the Metacognitive Awareness Listening Questionnaire (MALQ) is useful to facilitate the measurement of language learners’ ability to reflect on and build second language (L2) learning. Metacognition

of language learning comprises personal reflection and self-motivation as we learn a new language (Vandergrift et al., 2006). The MALQ is a 21-item measure that asks respondents to indicate their level of agreement with behaviors related to strategies surrounding problem-solving (i.e., dealing with lack of understanding), planning and evaluation (i.e., preparing to listen and evaluate listening efforts), mental translation (i.e., aspects to avoid when listening), person knowledge (i.e., perceptions about difficulty listening and self-efficacy for L2 learning), and directed attention (i.e., concentration methods). In all, listening research has produced a robust array of instrumentation and analysis.

Responding and feedback. Although there are currently several resources for helping to teach instructors and students to respond to other's work and to give high-quality feedback (see Broeckelman et al., 2007; Broeckelman-Post & Hosek, 2014; Frey et al., 2018; Hosek et al., 2017; Simonds et al., 2009), there are few measures for evaluating the quality of students' responsiveness to others in conversation, whether in their presentation, in a peer workshop, or as an audience member. However, there are several measures that allow a participant to evaluate someone else's responsiveness as part of a broader type of communication. For example, Mottet's (2000) Nonverbal Visual and Audible Response Items allow an instructor to evaluate a student's responsiveness in the classroom. Additionally, Burgoon and Hale's (1987) Relational Communication Scale allows individuals to rate their conversation partner on eight different dimensions, including immediacy/affection, similarity/depth, receptivity/trust, composure, formality, dominance, equality, and task orientation. Similarly, Canary and Spitzberg (1987) have developed a Conversational Appropriateness Scale and Conversational Effectiveness Scale in which a participant rates a partner's conversation skills.

Argumentation and logic. Critical thinking (CT) is a term used to encompass creation and evaluation of messages containing argument, but previous studies attempting to measure CT have proven problematic in that the operationalization of the construct has varied (Halpern, 2001). The AAC&U (2009a) offers a general content analytic critical thinking assessment tool that can be applied to the basic course. Mazer et al. (2007) developed a measure specifically for the basic course to operationalize critical thinking as students' "ability to construct meaning and articulate and evaluate arguments" (p. 176). The questionnaire asks students to determine how they interact with persuasive materials (e.g., articles, stories, books, speeches) and how they react in their own writing and speaking as a result of each statement (e.g., "I look for the hidden assumptions that are often present in an

argument”). Meyer et al. (2010) offer an alternative way to approach the assessment of critical thinking by examining students’ preemptive argumentation usage in persuasive speeches.

Information literacy. The American Library Association argues, “To be information literate, a person must be able to recognize when information is needed and have the ability to locate, evaluate, and use effectively the needed information” (1989, p. 1). Information literacy is a crucial component of the introductory communication skills course and often results in teaching collaborations between instructors and librarians because students must typically do research, evaluate the credibility of sources, present and interpret information, and cite sources in their presentations (Hunt et al., 2009; Meyer et al., 2008). There are three primary formats for existing information literacy assessments: (1) performance-based quizzes, (2) self-report measures, and (3) measures that ask students to rate specific sources. Performance-based quizzes have been used by Meyer et al. (2008) and Broeckelman-Post (2017) to test students’ information literacy using quiz questions. Meyer et al. (2008) used a test that included multiple-choice items, a citation construction exercise, and matching items to measure information literacy. Similarly, Broeckelman-Post (2017) created a ten question multiple-choice quiz that measured three dimensions of information literacy: locating information, source citations, and evaluating sources of information. Self-report measures have been developed to evaluate students’ perceptions of their own media literacy, which is an important component of information literacy.

These measures include Ashley et al.’s (2013) News Media Literacy Scale and Vraga et al.’s (2016) Self-Perceived Media Literacy Scale and Perceptions of the Value of Media Literacy Scale. Finally, some measures have been developed that ask students to rate the credibility of a specific news source, such as Meyer’s (1988) Credibility Index and Gaziano and McGrath’s (1986) News Credibility Scale. Although it is not a specific measure that can easily be used in a study, students can also be encouraged to use the CRAAP test (Currency, Relevance, Authority, Accuracy, and Purpose) to evaluate sources that will be used in presentations (Merriam Library, 2018).

Competency 3: Apply Ethical Communication Principles and Practices

The third competency identified by the SSRC Public Speaking Panel is *applying ethical communication principles and practices*. In 1984, NCA initiated the formation of a

Communication Ethics Commission. This newly formed commission, as Andersen (2000) explained, “developed convention programs, established a newsletter and sponsored a biannual conference on communication ethics” (p. 132). On November 6, 1999, NCA adopted the Credo for Ethical Communication. Prior to this credo, as Andersen (2000) notes, students rarely brought up ethical issues, instead depending on the text, the instructor, and the curriculum for guidance; ethical concerns dealt predominately with plagiarism, content appropriateness, and violations, not on the importance of ethical reasoning.

Teaching ethical reasoning in the communication classroom. McCaleb and Dean (1987) addressed the need for teaching ethics and tolerance within communication courses and noted that “group discussions of current events, role play exercises, and classroom and co-curricular speaking and debate often concern moral issues” (p. 411). However, they argue that unless embedded into the curriculum, these topics are rarely touched. They explain that “understanding the relationship among communication, ethics, and morality is vital to this integrated understanding” (p. 412). Although past researchers have argued the necessity for pedagogy focused in tolerance and ethical communication in the classroom, little research has been focused on the outcome of this act, possibly due to the lack of pedagogical tools existing in the college setting.

Measures. There is a dearth of measures for meaningfully analyzing ethical communication principles and practices in the basic course. The AAC&U (2009b) Ethical Reasoning VALUE Rubric was designed to assess students’ own values, recognition of how issues are situated in a social context, ability to recognize problems, skill at comparing differing ethical frameworks in application, and identification of possible outcomes through alternate courses of action. Additionally, Hooker et al. (2013) developed a self-report measure targeting the public speaking course mapped to NCA’s Credo for Ethical Communication that evaluates whether the students perceive any improvement in their own ethical communication, but this measure needs further development.

Competency 4: Utilize Communication to Embrace Difference

The fourth competency of *utilizing communication to embrace difference* is achieved when a public speaking student is able to “articulate the connection between communication and culture and respect diverse perspectives and the ways they influence communication” (Broeckelman-Post & Ruiz-Mesa, 2018, p. 7). The first

step in embracing difference, and utilizing communication to do so, is to recognize how communication norms are established and reified through culture, and how one's communication should adapt in a variety of settings. The two essential learning outcomes in this area include: 1) Demonstrate a commitment to diversity and inclusivity and 2) Understand the connection between communication and culture. Currently, very few measures exist that measure these outcomes specifically, but there are many broader measures that measure this construct by evaluating Intercultural Communication Competence or Efficacy.

Measures. One of the primary ways that existing research conceptualizes embracing difference is through Intercultural Communication Competence (ICC) and Intercultural Communication Effectiveness (ICE), which are both terms that are measuring the same construct (Bradford et al., 2000). Early research in ICC focused on defining dimensions that could be used to describe and categorize other cultures (Hall, 1976; Hofstede & Hofstede, 2019) or lists of skills, attitudes, and abilities that were important for interacting with culturally different others (Spitzberg, 1989, 1997). Early research defined ICC as being comprised of two primary components, appropriateness and effectiveness, which are defined by Spitzberg (1997): “Appropriateness means that the valued rules, norms, and expectancies of the relationship are not violated significantly. Effectiveness is the accomplishment of valued goals or rewards relative to costs and alternatives” (p. 279). In the past decade, however, there has been a shift toward thinking about ICC/ICE as a much more dialectical and dialogic process. Martin and Nakayama (2015) wrote that “the majority of ICC models have been based on Eurocentric, ethnocentric, and egocentric perspectives” and argued that “these individual-centered models tend to focus on national culture, conceptualize culture and bounded and static, and ignore issues of power and large structures that constrain and impact individual attitudes and actions” (p. 14), noting that larger societal attitudes often impact the treatment of individuals based on gender, sexuality, race, social class, religion, nationality, and other factors. Instead, they proposed a dialectical approach to ICC that considers the individuals in the interaction as well as the “larger global, economic, political, and social contexts in which their intercultural interaction is taking place” (p. 22). Similarly, Dai and Chen (2015) recommended a reconceptualization of ICC as interculturality, which is a dialogic process through which culturally different individuals talk, learn, and connect with others in mutual and reciprocal relationship, while also mutually adapting to each other and managing the dialectical tension between inclusion and differentiation, in order to achieve intercultural agreement and

build a productive relationship. Likewise, Ting-Toomey and Dorjee (2015) proposed an integrative model for intercultural-intergroup communication competence that includes mindfulness of culture-sensitive and identity-sensitive knowledge, an ethnorelative mindset and open-hearted attitudes, and intercultural-intergroup communication skill sets.

Most existing measures reflect older conceptions of ICC, though some of the newer measures are attempting to capture these more contemporary conceptualizations of ICC. Additionally, some measures seek to measure negative attitudes and anxiety around ICC, including the Ethnocentrism Scale (Neuliep & McCroskey, 1997b), Personal Report of Intercultural Communication Apprehension (PRICA; Neuliep & McCroskey, 1997a), and the Personal Report of Interethnic Communication Apprehension (PRECA; Neuliep & McCroskey, 1997a). Yet others seek to measure an individual's location on an intercultural dimension, such as the Auckland Individualism and Collectivism Scale (AICS; Shulruf et al., 2007) and Hofstede's six dimensions of national culture (Hofstede & Hofstede, 2019).

Currently, there are over 100 existing measures that attempt to capture some element of ICC (Deardorff, 2015). Ruben (1976) developed one of the first assessments of Communication Competency for Intercultural Adaptation, which relied on the systematic collection and analysis of behavioral observation data. Hammer et al. (1978) developed a 24-item measure of intercultural effectiveness, which included three dimensions: (1) ability to deal with psychological stress, (2) ability to effectively communicate, and (3) ability to establish interpersonal relationships. Bennett (1986, 1993) proposed a Developmental Model of Intercultural Sensitivity that included three ethnocentric orientations (Denial, Defense, Minimization) and three ethnorelative orientations (Acceptance, Adaptation, and Integration); and Hammer et al. (2003) built upon their previous work and used Bennett's framework to develop a 52-item Intercultural Development Inventory. Arasaratnam (2009) sought to develop a measure of Intercultural Communication Competence that included cognitive, affective, and behavioral components that could be used, but had some problems with the factor analysis and reliability of the measure. Building on this previous work, Portalla & Chen (2010) developed and validated an updated 20-item Intercultural Effectiveness scale that was comprised on six dimensions: Behavioral Flexibility, Interaction Relaxation, Interactant Respect, Message Skills, Identity Maintenance, and Interaction Management. However, these six factors together only accounted for 42% of the variance in the scale (Portalla & Chen, 2010), and subsequent studies revealed low

reliabilities for some of these sub-scales, so Broeckelman-Post & Pyle (2017) later revised this into an eight-item Abbreviated Intercultural Effectiveness Scale.

Additional assessment needs. Many of the aforementioned measures can assess the second learning outcome of understanding the connection between communication and culture; however, to assess a demonstration of a commitment to diversity and inclusivity requires reflection of ideals and beliefs. For example, Hammer et al. (2003) offer the Intercultural Development Inventory (IDI) as a tool for assessing individual cross-cultural and intercultural competence and suggest resources for increasing intercultural competency. The IDI, and other intercultural communication measures, can be used to determine how skilled one is at adapting to diverse audiences but cannot ascertain one's commitment to diversity and inclusivity, rather a commitment to intercultural communication competence and efficacy. Although it may be assumed that one must be committed to diversity and inclusivity in order to strive for intercultural competence and effectiveness, this is not always the case. One can strategically recognize the utility or marketability of intercultural communication skills, yet demonstrate no commitment to diversity and inclusivity. There is currently no widely available quantitative communication measures to assess a demonstrated commitment to diversity and inclusivity. Our recommendation would be for instructors and administrators interested in assessing this learning outcome to utilize qualitative methods, including interviews, focus groups, and/or reflections, to better understand if a demonstrated commitment to diversity and inclusion exists, and pair such assessment with a developmental tool to help build understanding and empathy across an array of diverse experiences related to structural oppression, equity, and inclusion.

Competency 5: Demonstrate Self-Efficacy

The American Psychological Association defines self-efficacy as “an individual's belief in his or her capacity to execute behaviors necessary to produce specific performance attainments” (n.p.) (see also Bandura, 1977, 1986, 1997). The perception of self-efficacy is critical for students enrolled in the basic course who must believe that they can develop and eventually deliver a successful presentation. For the essential public speaking competencies, self-efficacy is further described as being able to “articulate personal beliefs about abilities to accomplish public speaking goals” (Broeckelman-Post & Ruiz-Mesa, 2018, p. 9). There are three enabling objectives associated with this outcome: (1) Establish public speaking goals and

develop strategies for improving one's own presentation skills, (2) Manage communication anxiety and increase confidence in one's own presentation skills, and (3) Evaluate the strengths and weaknesses of one's own presentation skills. Although there are not quantitative measures that clearly assess objectives one and three, the second objective can be evaluated using measures of self-efficacy, public speaking anxiety, and communication competence.

Self-efficacy. There are self-efficacy measures that either have or can be applied to the basic course. For example, Dwyer & Fus (2002) used Pintrich and DeGroot's (1990) Motivated Strategies for Learning Questionnaire to evaluate self-efficacy in a public speaking course; whereas Lucchetti et al. (2003) used the Self-Efficacy Inventory (SEI) developed by Haycock et al. (1998). Daly and Thompson (2017) used part of Sherer et al.'s (1982) general Self-Efficacy scale to measure social self-efficacy, and also developed a five-item persuasive self-efficacy measure. Nordin & Broeckelman-Post (2020) adapted Chen et al.'s (2001) General Self-Efficacy Scale so that it could be used to measure communication self-efficacy. Additionally, the Self-Efficacy Questionnaire (SE-12), which measures self-efficacy levels before and after a communication event, has primarily been used in healthcare settings but could easily be adapted to educational settings to gauge students' communication skills (Axobe et al., 2016). Additionally, growth mindset, which is the belief that someone can improve their intelligence or skills with effort (Dweck, 2006), is associated with mastery goal orientation (Ames & Archer, 1988) and self-efficacy. Course directors can use the Communication Mindset Scale (Nordin & Broeckelman-Post, 2019) to evaluate mindset in a public speaking course, which was adapted from Dweck et al.'s (1995) Mindset Scale.

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). PSA is a specific type of Communication Apprehension (CA), which is "an individual's level of fear or anxiety associated with either real or anticipated communication with another person or persons" (McCroskey & Richmond, 2006, p. 55). PSA and CA function as both trait and state variables and can never be completely mitigated (Harris et al., 2006), but there are interventions that have been shown to help reduce PSA. Many of these interventions are commonly embedded in the pedagogy of public speaking courses, and previous research has demonstrated that an effective public speaking course should reduce PSA (e.g., Broeckelman-Post & Pyle, 2017; Hunter et al., 2014). The two measures that are most commonly used to measure CA and PSA in public speaking courses

include the Personal Report of Communication Apprehension (PRCA-24; McCroskey, 1982) and Personal Report of Public Speaking Anxiety (McCroskey, 1970). Additional measures that could be used to measure CA and PSA include Booth-Butterfield & Gould's (1986) Communication Anxiety Inventory; Beatty's (1988) Situational Causes of Anxiety measure; and Spielberger et al.'s (1970) State-Trait Anxiety Inventory (from which Beatty's measure was drawn). While they are not measuring CA specifically, related constructs can be measured using Burgoon's (1976) Unwillingness to Communicate scale and Keaton et al.'s (1997) Reticence Scale.

Communication competence. Communication competence is “an impression formed about the appropriateness of another person’s behavior” (Rubin, 1985, p. 173) and is comprised of three dimensions: motivation, knowledge, and skill. There are several broad-based measures that can be used to measure perceptions of one’s own communication competence as well as to rate others’ communication competence. Some of these measures include Rubin’s (1985) Communication Competence Self-Report Questionnaire, Wiemann’s (1977) Communication Competence Scale, McCroskey & McCroskey’s (1988) Self-Perceived Communication Competence Scale, Pavitt’s (1990) Communicative Competence Scale, Norton’s (1978) Communicator Style measure, and the Willingness to Communicate scale (McCroskey, 1992; McCroskey & Richmond, 1987).

Because interpersonal and group interaction is often required to help meet public speaking course outcomes, measures that focus specifically on those types of communication competence can also be helpful. Some of the measures that can be used to measure interpersonal communication competencies include the Interpersonal Communication Competence Scale (Rubin & Martin, 1994), the Interpersonal Communication Satisfaction Inventory (Hecht, 1978), the Communication Adaptability Scale (Duran, 1992; Duran & Kelly, 1988), the Interaction Involvement Scale (Cegala, 1981), and the Revised Self-Disclosure Scale (Wheless, 1978). Group interaction skills can be measured using the Competent Group Communicator Scale (Beebe et al., 1995), the Small Group Relational Satisfaction Scale (Anderson et al., 2001), and the Group Behavior Inventory (Friedlander, 1966).

Competency 6: Influence Public Discourse

The sixth competency identified by the SSRC is *influence public discourse*. This is achieved by demonstrating advocacy and becoming more civically engaged in one's community. The goal is for students to explain complex ideas for different audiences and promote action through involvement using logic. The Carnegie Foundation sponsored the Political Engagement Project (PEP) to explore ways to implement instruction and measurement of civic engagement (Beaumont, 2013). The project utilized scales of political knowledge and understanding, political interest and media attention, civic and political skills, political identity and values, political efficacy, and civic and political involvement (Colby et al., 2007).

Moely et al. (2002) developed a Civic Action scale to measure intent for involvement in the community. They used the lens of service learning not just for existing projects in the area, but also for the potential for students to engage in future endeavors. This scale can be used to measure outcomes, longitudinal participation, and as a pre-test to examine opt-in characteristics for service learning.

Bennion and Dill (2013) reported issues of weakness in studies of civic engagement including “a lack of focus on political engagement and skill development...an overreliance on self-reported data... (and) a lack of longitudinal studies that test...the long-term effect of their work” (p. 427). More research on and development of assessment in this area is needed.

Conclusion and Areas for Future Research

This review demonstrates that there are numerous measures that can be quantitatively used to measure the Essential Learning Outcomes and Enabling Objectives associated with the six Essential Public Speaking Competencies (Broeckelman-Post & Ruiz-Mesa, 2018). Our goal in writing this manuscript was to provide a comprehensive list of possible measures that Basic Course Directors (BCDs) can use for assessing the Essential Public Speaking Competencies in their own programs. Whether BCDs choose to select measures that allow them to measure all six competencies or to select one or two areas for initial assessment as part of a longer assessment cycle, this study provides a valuable reference and set of recommendations. Although any comprehensive assessment in a public speaking course should include multiple measures and might include a blend of course performance, speech evaluation, and self-report measures (e.g., Broeckelman-Post et

al., 2019), these quantitative measures are an important component of a basic course program assessment process.

However, those measures do not map evenly onto the essential competencies, nor do they comprehensively address those competencies. Some of the areas where there is the greatest need for assessment development include Competency 3: Apply ethical communication principles and practices, Competency 4: Utilize communication to embrace difference, and Competency 6: Influence public discourse. Though there are numerous measures for assessing ICC and ICE, which allows for assessing understanding the connection between communication and culture, none of the measures that we identified assess the first outcome, demonstrating a commitment to diversity and inclusivity. Likewise, assessments of ethics and influencing public discourse are still in developmental stages, so many opportunities exist for future development. The dearth of assessment measures in these three areas also suggests that these are especially difficult outcomes to measure using quantitative methods, so in addition to working on the development of quantitative measures, researchers should explore ways to evaluate these outcomes using qualitative methods. This study also suggest that there are opportunities for further scale development, perhaps including a comprehensive measure that includes sub-scales for each of the six competencies.

References

- American Library Association. (1989). *Presidential committee on information literacy: Final report*. <http://www.ala.org/acrl/publications/whitepapers/presidential>
- American Psychological Association. (nd). *Teaching tip sheet: Self-efficacy*. <https://www.apa.org/pi/aids/resources/education/self-efficacy>
- Ames, C., & Archer, J. (1988). Achievement goals in the classroom: Students' learning strategies and motivation processes. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 80, 260-267. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-0663.80.3.260>
- Andersen, K. E. (2000). Developments in communication ethics: The ethics commission, code of professional responsibilities, credo for ethical communication. *Journal of the Association for Communication Administration*, 29, 131-144.
- Anderson, C. M., Martin, M. M., & Riddle, B. L. (2001). Small group relational satisfaction scale: Development, reliability and validity. *Communication Studies*, 52, 220-233. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10510970109388555>

- Arasaratnam, L. A. (2009). The development of a new instrument of intercultural communication competence. *Journal of Intercultural Communication, 20*.
<http://www.immi.se/intercultural/>
- Ashley, S., Maksl, A., & Craft, S. (2013). Developing a news media literacy scale. *Journalism & Mass Communication Educator, 68*, 7-21.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/1077695812469802>
- Association of American Colleges and Universities. (2009a). *Critical Thinking VALUE Rubric*. <https://www.aacu.org/value/rubrics/critical-thinking>
- Association of American Colleges and Universities. (2009b). *Ethical Reasoning VALUE Rubric*. <https://www.aacu.org/value/rubrics/ethical-reasoning-value-rubric>
- Association of American Colleges and Universities. (2009c). *Oral Communication VALUE Rubric*. <https://www.aacu.org/value/rubrics/oral-communication>
- Avanzino, S. (2010). Starting from scratch and getting somewhere: Assessment of oral communication proficiency in general education across lower and upper division courses. *Communication Teacher, 24*, 91-110.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/17404621003680898>
- Axobe, M. K., Christensen, K. S., Kofoed, P-E, & Ammentorp, J. (2016). Development and validation of a self-efficacy questionnaire (SE-12) measuring the clinical communication skills of health care professionals. *BMC Medical Education, 16*, 272-282. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12909-016-0798-7>
- Backlund, P. M. (1978). Defining communicative competence. In C. Larson (Ed.), *Assessing functional communication*. Speech Communication Association.
- Backlund, P. M., Brown, K. L., Gurry, J., & Jandt, F. E. (1979). Criteria for evaluating instruments and procedures for assessing speaking and listening. In *Resources for assessment in communication*. Speech Communication Association.
- Bandura, A. (1977). Self-efficacy: Toward a unifying theory of behavioral change. *Psychological Review, 84*, 191-215. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-295x.84.2.191>
- Bandura, A. (1986). Social foundations of thought and action: A social cognitive theory. Prentice-Hall.
- Bandura, A. (1997). Self-efficacy: The exercise of control. W. H. Freeman.
- Beatty, M. J. (1988). Situational and predispositional correlates of public speaking anxiety. *Communication Education, 37*, 28-39.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/03634528809378701>

- Beaumont, E. (2013). Political learning and democratic capacities: Some challenges and evidence of promising approaches. In A. R. M. McCartney, E. A. Bennion, & D. Simpson (Eds.), *Teaching civic engagement: From student to active citizen* (pp. 41-55). University Press of America.
- Beebe, S. A., Barge, J. K., & McCormick, C. (1995). *The competent group communicator: Assessing essential competencies of small group problem solving*. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Speech Communication Association. San Antonio, TX.
- Bennett, M. J. (1986). Towards ethnorelativism: A developmental of intercultural sensitivity. In R. M. Paige (Ed.), *Cross-cultural orientation: New conceptualizations and applications* (pp. 27-70). American Political Science Association.
- Bennett, M. J. (1993). Cultural marginality: Identity issues in intercultural training. In R. M. Paige (Ed.), *Education for intercultural experience* (pp. 109-136). Intercultural Press.
- Bennion, E. A., & Dill, H. M. (2013). Civic engagement research in political journals: An overview of assessment techniques. In A. R. M. McCartney, E. A. Bennion, & D. Simpson (Eds.), *Teaching civic engagement: From student to active citizen* (pp. 41-55). University Press of America.
- Bodie, G. D. (2010). A racing heart, rattling knees, and ruminative thoughts: Defining, explaining, and treating public speaking anxiety. *Communication Education, 59*, 70-105. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03634520903443849>
- Bodie, G. D. (2011). The Active-Empathic Listening Scale (AELS): Conceptualization and evidence of validity within the interpersonal domain. *Communication Quarterly, 59*, 277-295. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01463373.2011.583495>
- Bodie, G. D., & Jones, S. M. (2018). Measuring affective components of listening. In D. L. Worthington & G. D. Bodie (Eds.), *The sourcebook of listening research: Methodology and measures* (pp. 97-122). John Wiley & Sons.
- Bodie, G. D., & Worthington, D. L. (2010). Revisiting the Listening Styles Profile (LSP-16): A confirmatory factor analytic approach to scale validation and reliability estimation. *The Intl. Journal of Listening, 24*, 69-88. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10904011003744516>
- Bodie, G. D., Gearhart, C. C., Denham, J. P., & Vickery, A. J. (2013). The temporal stability and situational contingency of active-empathic listening. *Western Journal of Communication, 77*, 113-138. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10570314.2012.656216>

- Booth-Butterfield, S., & Gould, M. (1986). The communication anxiety inventory: Validation of state- and context-communication apprehension. *Communication Quarterly*, 34, 194-205. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01463378609369633>
- Bradford, L., Allen, M., & Beisser, K. R. (2000). Meta-analysis of intercultural communication competence research. *World Communication*, 29, 28-51.
- Broeckelman, M. A., Brazeal, L. M., & Titsworth, B. S. (2007). Using peer workshops in the public speaking classroom. In B. Hugenberg, S. Morreale, D. Worley, L. Hugenberg, & D. Worley (Eds.), *Basic communication course best practices: A training manual for instructors* (pp. 119-136). Kendall/Hunt.
- Broeckelman-Post, M. A. (2017). Context matters: Multilingual learners in public speaking courses. *Communication Teacher*, 33, 63-79. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17404622.2017.1372616>.
- Broeckelman-Post, M. A., & Pyle, A. S. (2017). Public speaking versus hybrid introductory communication courses: Exploring four outcomes. *Communication Education*, 66, 210-228. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03634523.2016.1259485>
- Broeckelman-Post, M. A., Hyatt Hawkins, K. E., Arciero, A. R., & Malterud, A. M. (2019). Online versus face to face public speaking outcomes: A comprehensive assessment. *Basic Communication Course Annual*, 31, 144-170. <https://ecommons.udayton.edu/bcca/vol31/iss1/10/>.
- Broeckelman-Post, M., & Ruiz-Mesa, K. (2018). Measuring college learning in public speaking. *Learning in Higher Education*. Social Science Research Council. higher.ed.ssrc.org/wp-content/uploads/2018.10-MCL-in-Public-Speaking-Report.pdf.
- Broeckelman-Post, M.A., & Hosek, A. M. (2014). Using in-class versus out-of-class peer workshops to improve public speaking. *Basic Communication Course Annual*, 26, 57-94. <https://ecommons.udayton.edu/bcca/vol26/iss1/11>
- Burgoon, J. K., & Hale, J. L. (1987). Validation and measurement of the fundamental themes of relational communication. *Communication Monographs*, 54, 19-41. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03637758709390214>
- Burgoon, J. K. (1976). The unwillingness to communicate scale: Development and validation. *Communication Monographs*, 43, 60-69. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03637757609375916>
- Canary, D. J., & Spitzberg, B. H. (1987). Appropriateness and effectiveness perceptions of conflict strategies. *Human Communication Research*, 14, 93-118. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-2958.1987.tb00123.x>

- Cegala, D. J. (1981). Interaction involvement: A cognitive dimension of communicative competence. *Communication Education, 30*, 109-121.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/03634528109378460>
- Chen, G., Gully, S. M., & Eden, D. (2001). Validation of a new general self-efficacy scale. *Organizational Research Methods, 4*, 62-83.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/109442810141004>
- Colby, A., Beaumont, E., Ehrlich, T., & Corngold, J. (2007). Educating for democracy: Preparing undergraduates for responsible political engagement. Jossey-Bass.
- Dai, X., & Chen, G. (2015). On interculturality and intercultural communication competence. *China Media Research, 11*, 100-113.
- Daly, J. A., & Thompson, C. M. (2017). Persuasive self-efficacy: Dispositional and situational correlates. *Communication Research Reports, 34*, 249-258.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/08824096.2017.1297224>
- Deardorff, D. K. (2015). Intercultural competence: Mapping the future research agenda. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 48*, 3-5.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijintrel.2015.03.002>
- Duran, R. L. (1992). Communicative adaptability: A review of conceptualization and measurement. *Communication Quarterly, 40*, 253-268.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/01463379209369840>
- Duran, R. L., & Kelly, L. (1988). An investigation into the cognitive domain of competence II: The relationship between communicative competence and interaction involvement. *Communication Research Reports, 5*, 91-96.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/08824098809359806>
- Dweck, C. S. (2006). *Mindset: The new psychology of success*. Random House Incorporated.
- Dweck, C. S., Chiu, C., & Hong, Y. (1995). Implicit theories and their role in judgments and reactions: A world from two perspectives. *Psychological Inquiry, 6*, 267-285. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15327965pli0604_1
- Dwyer, K. K., & Fus, D. A. (2002). Perceptions of communication competence, self-efficacy, and trait communication apprehension: Is there an impact on basic course success? *Communication Research Reports, 19*, 29-37.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/08824090209384829>
- Ferrari-Bridgers, F., Vogel, R., & Lynch, B. (2015). Fostering and assessing critical listening skills in the speech course. *International Journal of Listening, 31*, 19-32.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/10904018.2015.1020231>

- Fontana, P. C., Cohen, S. D., & Wolvin, A. D. (2015). Understanding listening competency: A systematic review of research scales. *International Journal of Listening*, 29, 148-176. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10904018.2015.1015226>
- Ford, W. S. Z., Wolvin, A. D., & Chung, S. (2000). Students' self-perceived listening competencies in the basic speech communication course. *International Journal of Listening*, 14, 1-13. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10904018.2000.10499032>
- Frey, T. K., Simonds, C. J., Hooker, J., Meyer, K., & Hunt, S. (2018). Assessing evaluation fidelity between students and instructors in the basic communication course: The impact of criterion-based speech training. *Basic Communication Course Annual*, 30, 2-31. <https://ecommons.udayton.edu/bcca/vol30/iss1/4>
- Friedlander, F. (1966). Performance and interactional dimensions of organizational work groups. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 50, 257-265. <https://doi.org/10.1037/h0023361>
- Gaziano, C., & McGrath, K. (1986). Measuring the concept of credibility. *Journalism Quarterly*, 63, 451-462. <https://doi.org/10.1177/107769908606300301>
- Hall, E. T. (1976). *Beyond culture*. Doubleday.
- Halpern, D. F. (2001). Assessing effectiveness of critical thinking instruction. *Journal of General Education*, 50, 270-286. <https://doi.org/10.1353/jge.2001.0024>
- Hammer, M. R., Bennett, M. J., & Wiseman, R. (2003). Measuring intercultural sensitivity: The intercultural development inventory. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 27, 421-443. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0147-1767\(03\)00032-4](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0147-1767(03)00032-4)
- Hammer, M. R., Gudykunst, W. B., & Wiseman, R. L. (1978). Dimensions of intercultural effectiveness: An exploratory study. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 2, 382-393. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0147-1767\(78\)90036-6](https://doi.org/10.1016/0147-1767(78)90036-6)
- Harris, K. B., Sawyer, C. R., & Behnke, R. R. (2006). Predicting speech state anxiety from trait anxiety, reactivity, and situational influences. *Communication Quarterly*, 54, 213-226. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01463370600650936>
- Hart Research Associates. (2016). *Recent trends in general education design, learning outcomes, and teaching approaches*. https://www.aacu.org/sites/default/files/files/LEAP/015_Survey_Report2_GEtrends.pdf
- Haycock, L. A., McCarthy, P., & Skay, C. L. (1998). Procrastination in college students: The role of self-efficacy and anxiety. *Journal of Counseling and Development*, 76, 317-324. <https://doi.org/10.1002/j.1556-6676.1998.tb02548.x>

- Hecht, M. L. (1978). Measures of communication satisfaction. *Human Communication Research, 4*, 350–368. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-2958.1978.tb00721.x>
- Hofstede, G., & Hofstede, G. J. (2019). *Culture*. <http://www.geerthofstede.nl>
- Hooker, J. F., Lumberg, S., Simonds, C. J., & Hunt, S. K. (2013). Connecting the NCA Credo for Ethical Communication to assessment in the basic communication course: The development of the Ethical Communication Self-Assessment Scale. Paper presented at the meeting of the National Communication Association, Washington, D.C.
- Hosek, A. M., Munz, S., Bistodeau, K. C., Jama, Z., & Frisbie, A., & Ivancic, S. R. (2017). Basic communication course students' perceptions of the purpose and their role in the peer feedback process. *Basic Communication Course Annual, 29*, 29-52. <http://ecommons.udayton.edu/bcca/vol29/iss1/5>
- Hunt, S. K., Simonds, C. J., & Simonds, B. K. (2009). Uniquely qualified, distinctively competent: Delivering 21st century skills in the basic course. *Basic Communication Course Annual, 21*, 1-29. <http://ecommons.udayton.edu/bcca/vol21/iss1/6/>
- Hunter, K. M., Westwick, J. N., & Haleta, L. L. (2014). Assessing success: The impacts of a fundamentals of speech course on decreasing public speaking anxiety. *Communication Education, 63*, 124-135. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03634523.2013.875213>
- Imhof, M. (2010). The cognitive psychology of listening. In A. D. Wolvin (Ed.), *Listening and human communication in the 21st century* (pp. 97-126). Blackwell.
- Janusik, L. (2010). Listening pedagogy: Where do we go from here? In A. D. Wolvin (Ed.), *Listening and human communication in the 21st century* (pp. 193-223). Wiley Blackwell.
- Keaton, J. A., Kelly, L., & Finch, C. (1997). Development of an instrument to measure reticence. *Communication Quarterly, 45*, 37-54. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01463379709370043>
- Kidd, N., Parry-Giles, T., Beebe, S. A., & Mello, W. B. (2016). Measuring college learning in communication. In R. Arum, J. Roksa, & A. Cook (Eds.), *Improving quality in higher education: Learning outcomes and assessments for the 21st century* (pp. 189-223). Jossey-Bass.
- Lucchetti, A. E., Phipps, G. L., & Behnke, R. R. (2003). Trait anticipatory public speaking anxiety as a function of self-efficacy expectations and self-handicapping strategies. *Communication Research Reports, 20*, 348-356. <https://doi.org/10.1080/08824090309388834>

- Martin, J. N., & Nakayama, T. K. (2015). Reconsidering intercultural (communication) competence in the workplace: A dialectical approach. *Language and Intercultural Communication, 15*, 13-28.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/14708477.2014.985303>.
- Mazer, J. P., Hunt, S. K., & Kuznekoff, J. H. (2007). Revising general education: Assessing a critical thinking instructional model in the basic communication course. *The Journal of General Education, 56*, 173-199.
<https://doi.org/10.1353/jge.0.0000>
- McCaleb, J. L., & Dean, K. W. (1987). Ethics and communication education: Empowering teachers. *Communication Education, 36*, 410-416.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/03634528709378696>
- McCroskey, J. C. (1970). Measures of communication-bound anxiety. *Speech Monographs, 37*, 269-277. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03637757009375677>
- McCroskey, J. C. (1982). *An introduction to rhetorical communication* (4th ed). Prentice-Hall.
- McCroskey, J. C. (1992). Reliability and validity of the willingness to communicate scale. *Communication Quarterly, 40*, 16-25.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/01463379209369817>
- McCroskey, J. C., & McCroskey, L. L. (1988). Self-report as an approach to measuring communication competence. *Communication Research Reports, 5*, 108-113. <https://doi.org/10.1080/08824098809359810>
- McCroskey, J. C., & Richmond, V. P. (1987). Willingness to communicate. In J. C. McCroskey, & J. A. Daly (Eds.), *Personality and interpersonal communication* (pp. 129-156). Sage.
- McCroskey, J. C., & Richmond, V. P. (2006). Understanding the audience: Students' communication traits. In T. P. Mottett, V. P. Richmond, and J. C. McCroskey (Eds.) *Handbook of instructional Communication: Rhetorical and relational perspectives* (pp. 51-66). Allyn and Bacon.
- Merriam Library. (2018). *The CRAAP test*.
<http://libguides.csuchico.edu/c.php?g=414315&p=2822716>
- Meyer, P. (1988). Defining and measuring credibility of newspapers: Developing an index. *Journalism Quarterly, 65*, 567-574.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/107769908806500301>

- Meyer, K. E., Kurtz, R. R., Hines, J. L., Simonds, C. J., & Hunt, S. K. (2010). Assessing preemptive argumentation in students' persuasive speech outlines. *Basic Communication Course Annual*, 22, 6-38. <https://ecommons.udayton.edu/bcca/vol22/iss1/7>
- Meyer, K. R., Hunt, S. K., Hopper, M., Thakkar, K. V., Tsubakopoulos, V., & Van Hoose, K. J. (2008). Assessing information literacy instruction in the basic communication course. *Communication Teacher*, 22, 22-34. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17404620801926925>
- Mickelson, W. T., & Welch, S. A. (2012). Factor analytic validation of the Ford, Wolvin, and Chung listening competence scale. *International Journal of Listening*, 26, 29-39. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10904018.2012.639646>
- Moely, B. E., Mercer, S. H., Illustre, B., Miron, D., & McFarlan, M. (2002). Psychometric properties and correlates of the Civic Attitudes and Skills Questionnaire (CASQ): A measure of students' attitudes related to service-learning. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning*, 8, 15-26.
- Morreale, S. P., & Backlund, P. (Eds.). (2007). *Large-scale assessment in oral communication: K-12 and higher education* (3rd ed.). National Communication Association.
- Morreale, S. P., Myers, S. A., Backlund, P. M., & Simonds, C. J. (2016). Study IX of the basic communication course at two- and four-year U.S. colleges and universities: A re-examination of our discipline's "front porch." *Communication Education*, 65, 338-355. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03634523.2015.1073339>
- Morreale, S. P., Moore, M. R., Surges-Tatum, D., & Webster, L. (2007). *"The competent speaker" speech evaluation form* (2nd ed.). National Communication Association. https://www.natcom.org/sites/default/files/pages/Assessment_Resources_Compentent_Speaker_Speech_Evaluation_Form_2ndEd.pdf
- Morreale, S. P., Rubin, R. B., & Jones, E. A. (1998). *Competencies for college students: Basic skills for persuading*. https://www.natcom.org/sites/default/files/pages/Assessment_Resources_Speaking_and_Listening_Competencies_for_College_Students.pdf.
- Mottet, T. P. (2000). Interactive television instructors' perceptions of students' nonverbal responsiveness and their influence on distance teaching. *Communication Education*, 49, 146-164. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03634520009379202>.
- Neuliep, J. W., & McCroskey, J. C. (1997a). The development of intercultural and interethnic communication apprehension. *Communication Research Reports*, 14, 145-156. <https://doi.org/10.1080/08824099709388656>

- Neuliep, J. W., & McCroskey, J. C. (1997b). The development of a U. S. and generalized ethnocentrism scale. *Communication Research Reports*, 14, 385-398. <https://doi.org/10.1080/08824099709388682>
- Nordin, K., & Broeckelman-Post, M. A. (2019). Can I get better? Exploring mindset theory in the introductory communication course. *Communication Education*, 68, 44-60. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03634523.2018.1538522>
- Nordin, K., & Broeckelman-Post, M. A. (2020). Surviving or thriving? Demographic differences in mindset across the introductory communication course. *Communication Education*, 69, 85-104. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03634523.2019.1679379>
- Norton, R. W. (1978). Foundation of a communicator style construct. *Human Communication Research*, 4, 99-112. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-2958.1978.tb00600.x>
- Pavitt, C. (1990). The Ideal communicator as the basis for competence judgements of self and friend. *Communication Reports*, 3, 9-14. <https://doi.org/10.1080/08934219009367495>
- Pintrich, P. R., & DeGroot, E. V. (1990). Motivational and self-regulated learning components of classroom academic performance. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 38, 33-40. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-0663.82.1.33>
- Portalla, T., & Chen, G. M. (2010). The development and validation of the intercultural effectiveness scale. *Intercultural Communication Studies*, 19, 21-37.
- Richmond, V. P., McCroskey, J. C., Johnson, A. D. (2003). Development of the nonverbal Immediacy Scale (NIS): Measures of self- and other-perceived nonverbal immediacy. *Communication Quarterly*, 51, 504-517. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01463370309370170>
- Ruben, B. D. (1976). Assessing communication competency for intercultural adaptation. *Group Organization Management*, 1, 334-354. <https://doi.org/10.1177/105960117600100308>
- Rubin, R. B. (1982). Assessing speaking and listening competence at the college level: The communication competency assessment instrument. *Communication Education*, 31, 19-32. <https://doi.org/10.1080.03634528209384556>
- Rubin, R. B. (1985). The validity of the communication competency assessment instrument. *Communication Monographs*, 52, 173-185. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03637758509376103>

- Rubin, R. B., & Martin, M. M. (1994). Development of a measure of interpersonal communication competence. *Communication Research Reports*, 11, 33-44.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/08824099409359938>
- Rubin, R. B., Palmgreen, P., & Sypher, H. E. (2004). *Communication research measures I: A sourcebook*. Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Rubin, R. B., Rubin, A. M., Graham, E. E., Perse, E. M., & Seibold, D. R. (2009). *Communication research measures II: A sourcebook*. Routledge.
- Schreiber, L. M., Paul, G. D., Shibley, L. R. (2012). The development and test of the public speaking competence rubric. *Communication Education*, 61, 205-233.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/03634523.2012.670709>
- Sherer, M., Maddux, J. E., Mercandante, B., Prentice-Dunn, S., Jacobs, B., & Rogers, R. W. (1982). The self-efficacy scale: Construction and validation. *Psychological Reports*, 51, 663-671. <https://doi.org/10.2466/pr0.1982.51.2.663>
- Shulruf, B., Hattie, J., & Dixon, R. (2007). Development of a new measurement tool for individualism and collectivism. *Journal of Psychoeducational Assessment*, 25, 385-401. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0734282906298992>
- Simonds, C. J., Meyer, K. R., Hunt, S. K., & Simonds, B. K. (2009). Speech evaluation assessment: An analysis of written speech feedback on instructor evaluation forms in the basic communication course. *Basic Communication Course Annual*, 21, 69-96. <https://ecommons.udayton.edu/bcca/vol21/iss1/8>
- Spielberger, C. D., Gorsuch, R. L., & Lushene, R. E. (1970). *Manual for the state-trait anxiety inventory*. Consulting Psychologists Press.
- Spitzberg, B. H. (1989). Issues in the development of a theory of interpersonal competence in the intercultural context. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 13, 241-268. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0147-1767\(89\)90012-6](https://doi.org/10.1016/0147-1767(89)90012-6)
- Spitzberg, B. H. (1997). A model of intercultural communication competence. In L. A. Samovar & R. E. Poerter (Eds.), *Intercultural communication: A reader* (pp. 379-391). Wadsworth.
- Thompson, S., & Rucker, M. L. (2002). The development of a specialized public speaking competency scale: Test of reliability. *Communication Research Reports*, 67, 449-459. <https://doi.org/10.1080.08824090209384828>
- Ting-Toomey, S., & Dorjee, T. (2015). Intercultural and intergroup communication competence: Toward an integrative perspective. In A. F. Hannawa & B. H. Spitzberg (Eds.), *Communication competence*. (pp. 503-538). De Gruyter Mouton.

- Vandergrift, L., Goh, C. C., Mareschal, C. J., & Tafaghodtari, M. H. (2006). The metacognitive awareness listening questionnaire: Development and validation. *Language Learning, 56*, 431-462. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9922.2006.00373.x>
- Vraga, E. K., Tully, M., Kotcher, J., Smithson, A. B., & Broeckelman-Post, M. A. (2016). A multi-dimensional approach to measuring news media literacy. *Journal of Media Literacy Education, 7*, 41-53. <http://digitalcommons.uri.edu/jmle/vol7/iss3/4/>.
- Ward, S., O'Keefe, P. O., Myers, S. A., Engleberg, I., Disbrow, L., & Katt, J. (2014). *The case for core competencies in introductory communication courses*. https://www.natcom.org/sites/default/files/pages/Basic_Course_and_Gen_Ed_Case_for_Core_Competencies_in_Introductory_Comm_April_2014.pdf
- Watson, K. W., Barker, L. L., & Weaver III, J. B. (1995). The listening styles profile (LSP-16): Development and validation of an instrument to assess four listening styles. *International Journal of Listening, 9*, 1-13. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10904018.1995.10499138>
- Weaver, C. (1972). Human listening: Process and behavior. Bobbs-Merrill.
- Weger, H., Castle, G. R., & Emmett, M. C. (2010). Active listening in peer reviews: The influence of message paraphrasing on perceptions of listening skill. *International Journal of Listening, 24*, 34-49. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10904010903466311>
- Wheless, L. R. (1978). A follow-up study of the relationship among trust, disclosure, and interpersonal solidarity. *Human Communication Research, 4*, 143-157. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-2958.1978.tb00604.x>
- Wiemann, J. M. (1977). Explication and test of a model of communicative competence. *Human Communication Research, 3*, 195-213. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-2958.1977.tb00518.x>
- Wolvin, A. D., & Coakley, C. G. (1996). *Listening*. Brown Publishers.

Additional information

This project was funded by a National Communication Association Advancing the Discipline Grant. Dr. Cheri Simonds (Illinois State University), Dr. LeAnn Brazeal (Missouri State University), and Dr. Andrew Wolvin (University of Maryland) were also involved in other portions of this project that helped to lead to the development of this manuscript.