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CHAPTER I

BACKGROUND AND STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

The speech to inform is one of the most important of the basic types of speeches. When one considers the number of times the average person speaks to impart information, the importance of this speech form becomes evident. Daily we instruct, narrate, describe, expostulate, demonstrate or engage in other forms of informative speaking. Furthermore, the importance of speaking to inform is also quite evident in the more specialized speech activities encountered in business, political and educational activities. It would be difficult indeed to find any business or industry, government bureau or educational institution that is not expending an appreciable amount of its efforts in seeking to inform its members or the general public concerning its activities, services or philosophies.

Nowhere is imparting information orally of any greater importance than in the field of education. The keystone of education is the dissemination of information either through writing or speaking. Of these two media of expression the average teacher probably speaks much more than he writes. Dr. Sorrenson emphasizes this when he states, "It is essential that a teacher possess skill in informative speaking, for he makes greater use of
informative speech than of any other basic type of speech."¹

Although the lecture has often been criticized by pedagogues, it still is an important speech activity for most college professors. The lecture is an informative speech activity. "A class lecture is a speech situation whose aim is understanding in general and the imparting of information in particular."²

What is true of the more informal speech activities is also applicable to public speaking. The public speaker is a teacher. Even when instruction is not the chief purpose of the speech, often it is necessary to instruct in order to impress or convince or actuate.³ Thus, any type of speech activity is, in part, informative.

There are many types of informative speaking situations such as the report, instruction, announcement, travelogue, statement of policy, demonstration and lecture.

It is with the latter form of informative speaking that this study is most concerned. Broadly speaking, the chief concern is with the effect of praise and reproof


when used in an informative speech. More narrowly defined, this study is planned to determine the relative effect of praise and reproof on the amount of audience comprehension and retention when used in a college lecture.

A survey reveals that informative speaking is not extensively covered in the field of speech. Experimental studies and articles on this speech form are comparatively scarce both in the professional journals and in indices of speech graduate theses. This scarcity is especially evident when compared with the number of articles and studies concerned with persuasive and argumentative speech. In almost every index of graduate studies or speech journals there is at least one or more references to studies or articles about persuasion or argumentation while references to studies of informative speaking are few and far between. A good example of this is the report compiled by Franklin H. Knower on graduate theses in speech for the year 1954.4 In this particular index there are three references to theses dealing with persuasion and no mention of any study of informative speech. In the last five years there have been at least three new books published devoted to persuasion and persuasive speaking while no new books have been published during this same period of time.

---

concerned specifically with the speech of information. In fact, the author found less than a dozen references to studies or articles concerned with informative speaking in an analysis of all the indices to graduate studies and professional journals in the field of speech from 1900 to the present.

There have been four master's theses devoted to studies of informative speaking. These are: "Comprehension of Expository Material Presented in Speaking," by David C. Phillips in 1941 at State University of Iowa; "The Relative Effectiveness of Long and Short Sentences in Informative Speeches," by Charles T. Browne in 1940 at the University of Wisconsin; "An Experimental Study of Audience Comprehension," by Fern E. F. Koeppel in 1942 at State University of Iowa; "The Preparation of the Informative Speech," by Paul E. Young, Jr. in 1950 at Wayne University.

The other references were to more extensive studies done as dissertations and published in professional journals. One of these studies was done by Heron and Ziebarth. They compared the effectiveness of the use of radio with

---

that of classroom lectures in imparting information. This study reported no significant difference between the two media in the amount of information obtained.

Jack Matthews completed an interesting and excellently done study on the effect of loaded language on audience comprehension of informative speeches. He found that loaded language did not have a statistically significant effect on comprehension.

The following year another study tested the effect of the personality and skill of a speaker in securing comprehension by an audience of his information. The author attempted to determine whether a significant difference in speaking skill and personality would influence the effectiveness of informative speaking to already motivated audiences as shown by listening comprehension test scores. He found only slight, but not statistically significant differences in favor of the skilled speaker and concluded that "it is possible for an average person to secure essentially the same degree of comprehension as a speaker of superior skill and personality, when using an


already motivated audience."\textsuperscript{8}

In the same year, Harold E. Nelson studied the effect of variation of rate on radio audiences' retention of "straight" newscasts.\textsuperscript{9} He concluded that rate was not as highly significant as the differences in the levels of difficulty of the newscasts.

In 1951 Joe Ball conducted a study of the relationship between informative speaking ability and primary mental abilities, verbal comprehension and good reasoning.\textsuperscript{10}

Last year a study was completed whose purpose was to investigate the retention of speech content as measured through immediate and delayed recall by a number of auditors. Experimentally derived data were sought to help answer four questions. First, what is the amount remembered by listeners immediately after the presentation of a speech? Second, how accurately do listeners remember speech materials immediately after presentation? Third, what are the effects of delay on the amount and accuracy of speech retention? Fourth, how does opinion bias effect the amount

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textsuperscript{9} Harold E. Nelson, "The Effect of Variation of Rate on the Recall by Radio Listeners of 'Straight' Newscasts," Speech Monographs, XV, 2, 1948, pp. 173-180.
  \item \textsuperscript{10} Joe Ball, "An Experimental Study of the Relationship Between the Ability to Impart Information Orally and the Primary Mental Abilities, Verbal Comprehension and General Reasoning," Ph.D. dissertation, University of Southern California, 1951.
\end{itemize}
and accuracy of speech retention, both immediate and delayed?

The results of thorough statistical analyses revealed significant differences between immediate and delayed recall. The amount of forgetting was approximately half between the immediate and delayed recall tests. In addition, the number of distortions and intrusions almost doubled from immediate to delayed reproduction.\(^\text{11}\)

Although Conboy's study was not concerned primarily with informative speaking, it is closely related to the objectives of this study.

Another study of informative speaking was reviewed in the *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*. In a series of experimental studies Knower, Phillips and Koeppel found that under ordinary conditions there was a direct relationship between the quality of a speaking or reading performance and the amount of information retained by the auditors. The report also suggested that auditors who know they will be tested retain more material than those who are unaware that they will be tested.\(^\text{12}\)


There have also been a few studies dealing primarily with listening to informative speaking. Martha Heath studied the relationships among interest, educability and score on an objective examination over the factual content of an informative speech.\(^\text{13}\)

Kramar was concerned with the difference between test scores on orally presented expository material when the speaker is seen and not seen.\(^\text{14}\) According to the results of this study, it makes little difference whether the speaker is present.

Beighley tested the effect of four speech variables on listener comprehension. One of these four variables was the mode of communication. He found comprehension through reading superior to comprehension through listening.\(^\text{15}\)

Turning now to the other aspect of this study, that of the effect of praise and reproof on audiences, the author again finds a dearth of studies in the literature of speech. There have been a few studies indirectly related

---


to this problem in the area of argumentative speech determining the effect of positively and negatively slanted arguments on audience attitudes and comprehension. But, as far as the author can determine, there have been no studies testing the effect of positive and negative informative speaking nor any concerned with the effect of praise and reproof in sharing information.

The fields of education and psychology, however, have been very prolific in their production of quantitative studies concerned with testing the effects of praise and blame, reward and punishment, and the larger problem of positive and negative incentives. In fact, here, it becomes a problem of elimination and selection to enumerate even a small sampling of the more important and pertinent studies. An example of this profuseness is illustrated in the Review of Educational Research for 1936 when it states: "There seems to be no doubt, at least judging by the number of studies reported, that the law of effect as stated by Thorndike has caused more controversy and more experimentation than any other question of motivation."17

During the period 1933-1936 there appeared to be a


highly concentrated interest in studies of this problem. At least thirty-nine different articles dealing with rewards and punishment all reporting one or more experiments were published. The results of these experiments are conflicting, although there is a considerable body of evidence showing that rewards have a beneficial effect on learning. The degree of benefit received from reward seems to vary with the type and amount of rewards given. The effect of punishment is more doubtful. A few studies will bear out the above points with respect to these experiments of the middle thirties.

Brenner conducted an experiment with 403 pupils of twelve third grade classes. These classes were divided into the following six groups: immediate praise, immediate control, immediate blame, delayed praise, delayed control, and delayed blame. The learning task consisted of learning eighty spelling words. The examiner concluded that immediate praise tends to be more effective than delayed praise and immediate blame and delayed blame tend to be equally effective. No difference statistically significant was found between the recall performance of the different groups.\textsuperscript{18}

Crafts and Gilbert, in an experiment with one hundred college students divided into two groups of twenty-five men

\textsuperscript{18} Benjamin Brenner, "Effect of Immediate and Delayed Praise and Blame Upon Learning and Recall," Contributions to Education, No. 620, New York: Columbia University, 1934, p. 152.
twenty-five women each, found that punishment for error was advantageous, not only for the learning of a maze but also for retention of learning.\textsuperscript{19}

In another experiment, Muenzinger tried to discover the function of punishment in learning upon college students. No significant differences were found between groups that received an electric shock and those that did not. The same conclusions were reached whether the shocks were for right or for wrong responses.\textsuperscript{20}

In still another study with college students as subjects, Stephens found that punishment has no uniform "stamping-in" influence but that its effects vary with the conditions.\textsuperscript{21}

Garrison also reported that there is a close relation between motivation and learning. He stated that interest, knowledge of progress, praise and reproof, and competition are all important factors in motivation.\textsuperscript{22}


\textsuperscript{22} Karl C. Garrison, "Motivation and Learning," \textit{Peabody Reflector}, 7: 171-172; 1934.
Thorndike with Lorge, Tuckman, Stephens and Rock conducted several experiments regarding the influence of punishment on multiple choice learning by human subjects.23

Eisenson found evidence supporting the work of Thorndike and Lorge namely, that multiple choice learning is a function of rewards and not of punishment.24

Jensen studied the effect of punishment by electric shock on the performance of fifty-five college students in learning a maze and found that punishment had an adverse effect with the control groups doing better than the experimental groups.25

An important summary of forty-two experimental studies dealing with the problem of incentives was prepared by Davis and Ballard,26 The authors state that "investigation in this field was hardly known before 1920, when there is a marked increase in the amount of research which has


been produced." Two of their important conclusions are summarized as follows:

When pupils are informed concerning the quantity and quality of their performance of tasks, effort and attitude are improved. Praise is more effective than reproof as an incentive, although any comment is better than a neutral attitude.27

There were several studies dealing with Thorndike's "law of effect" and the role of incentives in learning during the decade of the 1920's before this noticeable increase which occurred in the middle thirties.

In two early studies Laird presented the testimony of ninety-two freshmen and sophomores in a state university as to the effects of the two kinds of incentives on their high school and college work. Without preparatory discussion or assignment the students were asked to report whether they worked better, the same, or worse in high school under twenty-one different situations. He summarized thusly, "The evidence from both studies is convincing that commendation, praise and encouragement are superior to censure, ridicule, threats and punishment."28

About the same time Hurlock summarized most of the then existing evidence in the introductory chapter to her dissertation. It shows that from several experiments

27 Ibid.

animals learned faster when rewarded for their trial efforts than when punished, that experienced printers tremendously increased their output under promise of a bonus, that pupils improved achievements of several kinds merely through being informed of their scores, that in every reported experiment incentives of encouragement were superior to those of censure.\textsuperscript{29}

It is interesting to note that a negative incentive has been employed in a number of experiments, notably by Anderson,\textsuperscript{30} who found that for young children using a hand dynameter blame and failure were less efficient than praise and a knowledge of accomplishment, and Sears,\textsuperscript{31} who concluded that in learning nonsense syllables and in card sorting false reports of successful performance were more effective than reports of failure.

A further item of interest is that the effectiveness of praise or blame as an incentive was shown, as a result of a detailed and carefully controlled experiment, to be

\textsuperscript{29} Elizabeth B. Hurlock, "The Value of Praise and Reproof as Incentives for Children," \textit{Archives of Psychology}, No. 71, July, 1924, p. 78.


dependent in large measure on the test situation and the tester.\textsuperscript{32}

T. W. Wood conducted an experiment which produced two interesting results appropriate to the question of effect of praise and reproof on learning. Approbation and reproof were found to be of practically equal value as incentives among a group of thirty college students for learning nonsense syllables. Galvanometric readings under proper experimental technique were discovered to be of value in ascertaining accompanying emotional states in praise and reproof.\textsuperscript{33}

Hunnicutt and Thompson completed a most provocative and comprehensive experiment testing the effect of praise and blame when used with extroverted and introverted children.

A group of fifth grade pupils were classified by the Introversion-Extroversion section of a Personality Test by Pinter and others. A cancellation test marked $G$-(good) or $P$ (poor) provided the basis for administering praise or blame. Repeated praise increased the work output of intro-


verts significantly higher than that of introverts who were blamed or extroverts who were praised. Repeated blame increased the work output of extroverts more than that of extroverts who were praised or introverts who were blamed. Both praise and blame were more effective than the absence of either stimulation.

A more recent study also relating to the effects of positive and negative incentives on various personality characteristics was done by Gloria Grace. The investigation was designed to test the effects of three types of verbal statements upon sixth grade children's performance in a simple learning task and to relate these effects to certain personality characteristics. Although no significant differences were found between positive and negative statements, both positive and negative statements were more effective than neutral statements. The effects of personality characteristics on response to verbal approval were not clearly distinguished, although some trends were noted. The groups most influenced by positive statements were in general well adjusted and emotionally stable with a tendency toward leadership, while those groups most influenced by negative comments were characteristically more

---

submissive, introvertive and emotionally unstable.35

After this array of experimental studies the question might well be asked as to which has the most powerful effect on learning—praise or blame? Although praise seems to be slightly more powerful, the evidence indicates that both serve to stimulate learning. "Both praise and reproof are strong drugs...Both praise and blame, like certain drugs, lose their effectiveness as we become tolerant of them, but our tolerance varies in relation to the individual from whom we receive them. If praise or blame is to affect behavior, it must either satisfy or threaten security, self-esteem, esteem in the eyes of others, or some other impelling motive."36

The varying effect that praise and blame have on different personality types also has been well demonstrated by experiments.

QUESTIONSPOSED AND HYPOTHESESFORMULATED

This survey of the literature in the fields of speech, psychology and education revealed a lack of information concerning the effects of praise and reproof when used in


the informative speaking situation. The apparent need for such information instilled in the author a desire to secure data which could shed some light on this problem.

Several empirical questions were posed which resulted in this experiment. The answers to three of these questions were sought as a direct result of this study. There were, however, other questions which arose not basic to the study but the answers to which could be obtained as indirect results from this research. The major questions were stated first followed by the minor incidental questions.

**Basic Questions**

1. Is there a difference in the amount of immediate recall caused by the use of praise or by the use of reproof in an informative speech?

2. Is there a difference in the amount of delayed recall brought about by the use of praise or by the use of reproof in an informative speech?

3. Do either praise or reproof produce a significant amount of immediate and delayed recall when used in an informative speech?

**Related Questions**

4. Does a statistically significant amount of forgetting of oral information occur during a three week period?

5. Is there a difference in the amount of exhibited speaking skill between two classes taught in an over-all atmosphere of praise or in an over-all atmosphere of reproof?
Related Questions

6. Is listening to a lecture more effective than reading the material covered by the lecture in producing audience comprehension?

7. Will college students respond differently to an objective evaluation or rating of the instructor when taught by the praise method or by the reproof method?

8. Will an oral interview produce an accurate picture of the attitudes and feelings toward and evaluations of the class procedure and instructor when operating under two different conditions of praise and reproof?

Several hypotheses were subsequently formulated as tentative answers to these questions. These were stated as null hypotheses. They, too, were classified under the headings we have used.

Basic Hypotheses

1. There is no difference in the amount of audience comprehension as the result of using praise or of using reproof in an informative speech.

2. There is no difference in the amount of audience retention as the result of using praise or of using reproof in an informative speech.

3. Neither praise nor reproof will produce a significant amount of audience comprehension and retention when used in informative speeches.

Related Hypotheses

4. There is no significant amount of forgetting of oral information during a three week period.

5. There is no difference in the amount of speaking skill exhibited by classes taught in the atmospheres of praise and reproof.
6. There is no difference in the amount of audience comprehension of informative material between hearing it in a speech and reading it out of a textbook.

7. College students will not respond differently to an objective evaluation of an instructor when taught by the two different methods of praise and reproof.

8. An oral interview will not produce an accurate picture of the reactions - attitudes toward, and evaluations of the class procedure used or the instructor when operating under the two conditions of praise and reproof.
CHAPTER II

RESEARCH DESIGN AND PROCEDURE

As stated in the first chapter, the main objective of this study is to determine the relative effect of the use of praise and reproof on audience comprehension and retention of informative speech materials. In addition, there are some minor or incidental objectives of the study, namely, to determine the effect of teaching procedures based on praise and on reproof upon the development of student speaking skills; and to determine if there is a difference in the amount of audience recall between listening to and reading informative materials. In order to attain these objectives the following research methodology was adopted.

The Lectures

The lectures in which the informative materials were presented are among the most important components of this study since the crux of the experiment was to obtain valid differences between praise and reproof procedures in the lectures. The topic for these lectures was selected as one expected to be: (1) interesting and thought provoking; (2) connected with the course work of the subjects; (3) one
about which these students would have little previous information; and (4) a subject not covered to any great extent by their text. One topic which seemed to meet all these qualifications was that of "developing confidence in the speaking situation" or, "overcoming stage fright."
The informative material on this topic was taken from Chapter 12 of Baird and Knower's General Speech, entitled, "Development of Confidence."

The important ideas were culled from this chapter and gathered into a list. Those ideas covered in the course's text, Effective Speaking, were eliminated from the list.

Then, two lectures were composed around the remaining major ideas. These two lectures were of approximately equal length, containing an equal number of the same ideas and differing only in the way praise and reproof were inserted in the content. In other words, each lecture contained the same ideas but these points appeared in a context of praise in one lecture and in a context of blame or reproof in the other.

The lectures were given to the speakers in manuscript

---


form to be delivered in person, one to each of two classes. (See Appendix A). Although the speakers were asked to speak from the manuscript, they were free to make slight modifications to fit the situation and the audience. These lectures were then tape recorded to provide a record of the speeches as given. (See Appendix B) An examination of the four speeches as delivered and transcribed from the tapes reveals some minor changes from the original manuscripts. However, these insertions and deletions made by the lecturers were probably not of enough magnitude to effect the results of this phase of the experiment to any great extent.

Since it was necessary to obtain two persons not only to give the lectures to two different classes, but also to teach these two classes for a period of about five weeks, the decision was to use two speech instructors at The Ohio State University. Each instructor taught two sections of the beginning course in the speech department and was willing to cooperate in this study by using both of these classes as experimental groups. No attempt was, therefore, made to equate these two instructors as to teaching ability or experience since each taught both a "reproof" class and a "praise" class. Thus, each instructor's two classes were in reality a separate experimental entity within themselves and were compared with each other.
The Subjects

The subjects of this study were beginning speech course students at The Ohio State University. Four classes of mostly freshman and sophomore students enrolled in Beginning Speech 401 were used as the experimental groups. Each set of two classes (a "praise" and a "reproof") was taught by one of the above mentioned instructors. There were approximately twenty students in each class and no attempt was made to equate the subjects in these classes.

Two other 401 Speech classes consisting of fifty-five students, were used as controls for this study.

Three classes of Speech 501 (a beginning course at a somewhat advanced level) were also enlisted for this study to participate in the study of the reading versus the listening variables. These students were asked as an assignment to read the chapter on developing confidence in General Speech$^3$ which is the text used in this course, and the source of the materials used in the speech to the other classes.

$^3$ Baird, op. cit.
The Measuring Instruments

The principal measuring instrument used in this study was a thirty-four item multiple choice test covering the information contained in the lectures. Each item offered five possible choices with one best response. The test was preceded by a set of instructions and was set up for machine scoring. The same test was used to measure both comprehension and retention and the amount of information obtained through reading by the 501 students. The major ideas contained in the lectures made up the questions of the test. (See Appendix C)

Another measuring instrument used in the study was a speech rating scale. This scale is the "classroom speech rating scale" used by students and instructors to evaluate student speeches in the Speech 401 course. Thus, the instructor—judges, who used this scale later to rate the informative speeches of the experimental groups, were all familiar with this rating device. The rating scale consists of seven criteria each to be evaluated on a 1-5 point scale. (See Appendix D) Six of these criteria were used by the judges in this experiment. "Bodily postures and action" was not used as a criterion because the judges listened to tape recordings of the subjects' speeches.
Conducting the Experiment

There were several preparatory activities or preliminary steps necessary to put this study into operation. First, the participating instructors were prepared by being given procedural outlines advising them as to the attitudes, behavior patterns, and teaching procedures they were to adopt in each of their classes. (See Appendix E) These outlines suggested in some detail the class procedure to be followed both in the class that was to hear the praise lecture, to be handled permissively, and the class that was to hear the reproof or blame lecture, to be taught restrictively. In other words, this difference in teaching methodology was to serve as background atmosphere for the particular type of lecture to be delivered in each class. It would also serve to establish a "character type" for each instructor in each class in accord with the type of lecture he was to deliver. However, the procedural outlines were presented to the instructors primarily as suggestions to be used or modified as they deemed wise in creating the proper permissive and restrictive settings for the lectures and not as a rigid set of rules. They were also asked for suggestions in formulating these outlines.

The two cooperating instructors were also asked to refrain from informing students that they were being
subjected to the study until after the delayed recall test.

The lectures were delivered during the third week of the course in a typical place in the curriculum for a discussion of stage fright. The lectures were administered to all experimental classes on the same day and an equal amount of time was allowed for the speeches in all the experimental groups. The students were requested to take no notes. The lectures were tape recorded with the explanation to the students that the author wanted to use the material later.

Immediately following the lecture the informative test was administered for the first time. All four classes were allowed an equal amount of time, twenty-five minutes, to complete the test. The instructors went over the instructions for the test with each group before they began. The testees were told that it was a quiz on the lecture material to be considered as part of the course requirements.

Three weeks later the second issue of the same test was administered under the same conditions as described. This was explained to the subjects by saying the instructor was interested in learning how much of the lecture they had retained.

The controls received both administrations of the test with the same time lapse but were not subjected to
the stimulus or lecture.

The third group of subjects, those in the 501 Speech Course, received the test during the fourth week after having been assigned to read the chapter on developing confidence as a regular part of their course work. The author was interested only in measuring immediate recall (comprehension) with this group.

During the fifth week of the quarter the students' informative speeches, which is normal activity in all 401 classes at this time, were tape recorded. The subjects were prepared for this recording as they had recently finished recording oral readings and personal experience talks the week before and the recording equipment was left in their classes. These taped speeches were later judged and rated by instructors in the speech department.

During the sixth and last week of this study each instructor's teaching procedure or methodology was validated by having the students in each of his experimental classes complete a behavior description rating form. This form consisted of forty-four teaching activities on which the subjects rated their teachers on a 1 - 5 point scale. There were an equal number of positive (permissive) and negative (restrictive) items in this list. The rating form was administered by the author during the planned absence of the instructors. The subjects were told that
it was an impersonal survey being conducted by the course supervisor and they were requested not to sign either their names or the name of their instructor.

**The Interview**

An oral interview was conducted more or less as a follow up to this study. The purpose of this interview was two-fold. First, it could serve as a check or an indirect validation of the afore-mentioned instructor's rating scale by revealing if a sample of the subjects responded orally in the same manner that the whole group responded in writing to the rating scale. Secondly, the interview could also produce a profile of the students' attitudes, reactions and opinions toward the instructors and their teaching procedures.

A sample of four or five students from the four experimental classes was chosen by each instructor to serve as the interviewees. These students were not chosen because they were a representative sample but because they reacted either favorably or unfavorably to the particular experimental condition of praise or reproof to which they were subjected.

These interviews were conducted in a leisurely manner in the author's office at the interviewee's convenience. During the interview note taking was kept to a minimum by the interviewer through the use of coded answers.
to the questions asked in the interview schedule. The students were made to feel at ease and assured of their anonymity. The interview was presented to them as a survey being made to determine the reactions of students to the type of teaching they were receiving in their speech classes.

Each interview lasted approximately twenty minutes but no conscious effort was made to keep to any set time schedule.

The results of these interviews will be discussed in the next chapter.
CHAPTER III

ANALYSIS OF THE DATA AND RESULTS

The Information Test for Immediate and Delayed Recall

As previously stated, the principal objective of this study is to determine the relative effect of the use of praise and reproof on audience comprehension and retention when used in informative speaking. Consequently, the data which are of prime importance to this study center around the information test with its accompanying results.

In the last chapter it was mentioned that this test was a thirty-four item multiple choice examination covering the information contained in the lectures. A comparison of the test with the lectures will produce a face validity for the content of the examination. (See Appendices A and C)

A reliability coefficient was computed on the experimental groups by using the split-half, odd-even technique and a Pearson product-moment r of .40 was obtained, which, when corrected by the Spearman-Brown Prophecy Formula,\(^1\) produced a reliability of .57 for the whole test.

This value of \( r \) is significant at the one-percent level.

The results of an item analysis of this test are shown in Table I. This table gives the percentage of correct responses to each item and each item's correlation to the results of the whole test. In other words, the item-test correlation illustrates how well each item predicts the results of the test as a whole.

Several facts concerning this test are revealed from an examination of this table. First, only seven items fail to fall within the 20 - 90 percent of difficulty range which means that almost eighty percent of the examination discriminated adequately. In addition, only ten of the items received less than a .25 correlation coefficient in the item-test correlation. This is less than one-third of the total examination.

**Immediate Recall**

The test was first administered immediately after the lectures to the experimental groups and on the same day to the control group which did not receive the lecture. The control group served to check whether the scores of the experimental groups were due to the lectures or to some outside variables. As explained earlier, there were two groups who heard the "praise" and "reproof" lectures; each instructor delivered one of these lectures to each of two
TABLE I
An Item Analysis of the Information Test Over the Material Contained in the Lectures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Number</th>
<th>Percentage of Difficulty</th>
<th>Item-Test Correlation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>-.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>-.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>-.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>-.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>.10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
classes. Table II shows the results of this immediate recall test. It can be observed from this table that the differences in the amount of recall were slight both between experimental conditions and between instructors. These slight differences proved not to be statistically significant as the result of an analysis of variance. This double classification analysis produced an $F$ of 1.047 which is not significant at any level of confidence. This means that the differences between the experimental groups and between the instructors could just as well have occurred by chance. However, there was a very significant difference between all four of the experimental groups and the controls. A $t$ test\(^2\) revealed a statistically significant difference between each of the four experimental groups and the controls at the .001 level of confidence. This would indicate that hearing the lectures did make a difference in the amount of comprehension as measured by the test.

The results of giving this information test to the group of students who did not hear the lecture but read the chapter as an assignment are also shown in Table II. The mean for the "reading group" is 18.66 with a standard deviation of 4.48 which is significantly better than the control group at the .001 level of confidence. However,

\[ t = \frac{X_1 - X_2}{\sqrt{\frac{s^2}{n_1} + \frac{s^2}{n_2}}} \]

\[ \text{where} \quad X_1 = \text{mean of experimental group} \]
\[ X_2 = \text{mean of control group} \]
\[ s^2 = \text{ pooled variance} \]
\[ n_1, n_2 = \text{sample sizes} \]

\[ \text{Ibid., p. 223} \]
### TABLE II

Results of the Information Test When Used to Measure Immediate Recall

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instructor I</th>
<th>Instructor II</th>
<th>Control</th>
<th>Reading Group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Praise</td>
<td>Reproof</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>20.60</td>
<td>18.92</td>
<td>13.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard Deviation</td>
<td>3.38</td>
<td>3.38</td>
<td>3.70</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE III

Results of the Information Test When Used to Measure Delayed Recall

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instructor I</th>
<th>Instructor II</th>
<th>Control</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Praise</td>
<td>Reproof</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>16.63</td>
<td>17.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard Deviation</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>4.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T. Value</td>
<td>.007</td>
<td>.006</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Instructor I | Instructor II | Control |
| Praise       | Reproof       |         |
| Mean         | 17.60         | 18.10   |
| Standard Deviation | 4.55         | 4.54    |
| T. Value     | 3.25          | 2.23    | 2.58         |
the difference between the "praise" and "reproof" lecture groups and the reading group are not statistically significant at the .05 level in three out of the four cases. In only one instance did the T-test show a difference that was significant at the .05 level, this was between the "praise" group of Instructor I and the "reading" group, the former producing a mean of 20.60 compared to a mean of 18.66 for the latter. These results indicate that the amount of immediate recall was approximately equal for both the lecture and reading groups with the lecture groups having a slight, but statistically insignificant advantage. They also indicate that the use of praise and reproof in informative speeches produced no significant differences in the amount of immediate recall as measured by this test of comprehension of information.

Delayed Recall

The same information test was administered a second time to the four experimental groups and the controls three weeks later. This second administration of the test was to determine the amount of retention caused by the two experimental conditions -- the "praise" and "reproof" lectures. The differences in the results of the delayed recall test between the praise and reproof groups of both instructors again is negligible. (See Table III) Applying
the same T test to these differences, produced T values of .007 and .006 neither of which is significant at the .05 level of confidence. However, when comparing the experimental groups with the controls the test produced the following results:

Instructor I...Praise T = 2.23 - significant at .05 level
Instructor I...Reproof T = 3.25 - significant at .01 level

Instructor II...Praise T = 2.58 - significant at .02 level
Instructor II...Reproof T = 3.24 - significant at .01 level

These results parallel those of the first test on immediate recall showing very minute and statistically insignificant differences between the groups that heard the praise and reproof lectures but also showing a definite difference between the experimental and control groups.

A comparison of the four groups of subjects' scores on the first, immediate recall (comprehension) test with their scores on the second, delayed recall (retention) test produced some interesting results.

Table IV shows the scores obtained by the subjects in the various groups on both the immediate and delayed recall tests along with the means of the scores on both tests. The mean of the differences is 2.41 with the standard deviation of the mean differences being .34.

Using the T test for related scores a T value of 7.09 was

---

3 George W. Snedcor, *Statistical Methods*, Iowa State College Press, Ames, Iowa, 1946, pp. 44-45. $T= \frac{(x-\bar{x})^2}{S_x^2}$
TABLE IV
The Scores Obtained by the Subjects of the Four Experimental Groups on the Immediate and Delayed Recall Tests

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Test I</th>
<th>Test II</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Instructor II</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Praise</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructor II</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reproof</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE IV CONT'D

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Test I</th>
<th>Test II</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Instructor II</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reproof</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Instructor I</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Praise</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject</td>
<td>Test I</td>
<td>Test II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Instructor I</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reproof</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mean</strong></td>
<td><strong>19.81</strong></td>
<td><strong>17.40</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
obtained which is significant at the .01 level of confidence. From these results it may be safely stated that there was a significant amount of forgetting of the information of the lectures between the immediate and delayed recall tests but the amount did not differ significantly between the experimental conditions of praise and reproof.

Instructor Rating Scales

Because each instructor was to make an effort to establish the proper atmosphere in each class as background for the type of lecture to be delivered in that particular class it was necessary to check in some way whether or not the proper atmosphere was realized. Stated differently, the author was interested in ascertaining the degree to which each instructor followed the procedural outlines given to him at the beginning of the experiment which suggested appropriate teaching procedures, behavior patterns and attitudes to be adopted in order to create the two distinct classroom backgrounds. The academic atmosphere appropriate for the class hearing the praise lecture could be identified as a "permissive" atmosphere and the one for the group hearing the reproof lecture as a "restrictive" atmosphere.

The validating instrument used to accomplish this check on the difference between class procedures was a type of behavior description rating scale. The subjects
were asked to give their reactions to the behavior of their instructor by marking a list of forty-four types of teaching behavioral acts. Every item was to be evaluated by each subject as to the degree his instructor exhibited the type of behavior indicated. The degrees of difference were set up on a five point scale; 1, barely evident; 2, seldom evident; 3, sometimes evident; 4, often evident and 5, very evident (See Appendix F). The forty-four items were equally divided between permissive and restrictive teaching behavior traits. The permissive teaching traits were assigned plus values and the restrictive traits minus values. (Refer to Scale on next page) A total score for each subjects' rating was obtained by totaling his minus ratings and plus ratings and then subtracting the minus score from the plus score. In this way, each instructor was given a single rating score by each of his students, thereby, making it possible to compute total rating scores, means and standard errors for both instructors by each of their classes.

The expectation would be that the better an instructor accomplished his purpose of creating two distinct class atmospheres, the greater would be the difference between the two means of the ratings given him by his two classes. In other words, the mean of the total ratings given to each instructor by his praise (permissive) group
THE SCALE OF STUDENT REACTIONS TO THE BEHAVIOR OF SPEECH INSTRUCTORS*

Item Stems Only

P  1. Criticism is constructive and inclined to praise
P  2. Respect is shown for students' opinion and suggestions.
N  3. Cross, crabby, grouchy
P  4. Has a sense of humor
P  5. Minimizes mistakes and misfortunes of class
N  6. Superior, aloof, haughty, or overbearing
N  7. Inconsiderate of pupils' feelings
N  8. Makes use of ridicule and sarcasm
N  9. Criticism inclined to blame, negatively constructed around fault finding
P 10. Friendly in manner, tone of voice and actions toward class
P 11. Alert to individual weaknesses and problems
N 12. Strict authority maintained and no questions allowed
P 13. Not superior or aloof in manner
N 14. Insists on order and strict obedience to rules
P 15. Inspires responses from pupils thus causing many to participate
N 16. Permits no incomplete or late work
P 17. Interest shown in all pupil effort no matter how small

* N indicates a negative or minus item
P indicates a positive or plus item
THE SCALE OF STUDENT REACTIONS TO THE BEHAVIOR OF SPEECH INSTRUCTORS (CONTINUED)

P 18. Not tied excessively to rules or routine
N 19. Not helpful with work, problems, and assignments
P 20. Uses democratic procedure: promotes democracy as a way of life in the classroom
N 21. Dominates class, demands respect
P 22. Sympathetic to individual problems
P 23. Helpful with work, problems and assignments
N 24. Severely criticizes pupils in the presence of class
P 25. Human, friendly, companionable, "one of us"
P 26. Appears interested in pupils and to understand them
P 27. Assignments reasonable
P 28. Helpful with students' problems, including matters outside of class work
N 29. Unreasonable assignments and homework
N 30. Is strict and arbitrary
N 31. Does not respect individual differences in students
P 32. Gives students a fair chance to make up work
N 33. Mean, unreasonable, hardboiled and intolerant
N 34. Very exacting, gives no chance to make up work
P 35. Friendly in discipline, maintains control of class without demanding respect
N 36. Changeable, inconsistent, unreliable
N 37. Reproves and condemns mistakes
P 38. Assignments are given in a vague and routine fashion
THE SCALE OF STUDENT REACTIONS TO THE BEHAVIOR
OF SPEECH INSTRUCTORS (CONTINUED)

N 39. Disrespectful of students' opinions

N 40. Stifles students response' thus restricting class
discussion

P 41. Makes assignments interesting and challenging

N 42. Uses threats of poor grades and other punishments
for motivating assignments

P 43. Encourages and motivates students to work for more
than grades

N 44. Does not encourage initiative
should be significantly higher than the mean of the ratings obtained from his reproof (restrictive) class; the greater the difference between the two means the better he accomplished his purpose. Slight, or insignificant, differences would indicate that the instructor did not differentiate enough between the teaching attitudes and methodologies used in his praise and reproof classes for the students to be able to recognize the differences.

The results, shown in Table V, give evidence that the instructors did establish a difference between their classes in the atmospheres they created through their teaching procedures. In both instances the instructors received a significantly higher mean rating from their praise (permissive) group than they did from their reproof (restrictive) group. One of the these differences -- Instructor II-- was significant at the .01 level and the other difference--Instructor I--was even more significant at the .001 level of confidence.

When comparing instructors, the differences between the mean ratings are also noticeable. Instructor I obtained a statistically significant higher rating at the .02 level than Instructor II from his praise class, and a higher rating than Instructor II from his reproof class, significant at the .01 level. This indicates that Instructor I was evidently more permissive in his handling of
TABLE V
Results of Student Ratings on the Instructor Behavior Rating Scale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instructor I</th>
<th>Instructor II</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Praise</td>
<td>Reproof</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permissive</td>
<td>Restrictive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>51.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stand. Error</td>
<td>11.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T Value</td>
<td>4.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Significant at</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
both of his classes than Instructor II thereby receiving higher positive scores and lower negative scores than Instructor II.

In testing the reliability of this rating scale two sets of split-half correlations were run. The first set correlated the plus, or positive, items with the negative, or minus, items and used the Pearson product-moment $r$. This, as would be expected, produced a negative correlation. The actual figure was $-0.31$. Since the positive items and negative items should bear an inverse relationship to each other this negative correlation coefficient is a slight indication of the scale's reliability. As a check on this reliability coefficient, however, a rank-difference correlation coefficient was also computed on a split-half in which each half contained both positive and negative items. Each half of the test was scored and ranked for a random sample of twenty-subjects and the two sets of "half-test" ranks were correlated.\textsuperscript{4} This computation produced a Rho of $+0.84$ which is significant at the .01 level of confidence.

\textsuperscript{4} Allen L. Edwards, \textit{Statistical Analysis}, New York, Rinehart and Company, 1946, p. 124. $r = 1 - \frac{6 \text{SD}^2}{N(N^2 - 1)}$. 
Rating of Student Speeches

As was explained in Chapter II, the students' informative speeches in the experimental classes were tape recorded and later rated by judges who are instructors in the speech department. There were two teams of three judges each. The same team rated both the praise-permissive and the reproof-restrictive classes of a single instructor. Thus, in several sessions, one team of three judges would listen to and rate the two classes' speeches of Instructor I while the other team of three judges would rate the speeches of the two classes taught by Instructor II. The rating scale that was used is the "Classroom Speech Rating Scale" used by all instructors and students of the first course in speech at The Ohio State University. Since all of the judges who cooperated in this study either were teaching, or had taught, sections of this course, they were familiar with this scale. The scale (See Appendix G) consists of eight criteria of speech effectiveness to be rated on a 1 (weak) to 5 (strong) point scale. These ratings are then totalled and a rank order is determined for each set of speeches given on a particular day. The criterion, "bodily postures and action" was ignored by the judges in this study since they were rating from tape recordings which ruled out the visual element.
Since the purpose of this phase of the study was to determine if the two teaching methodologies and class atmospheres (praise-permissive-reproof-restrictive) would produce any significant differences in student speech skills, the ensuing statistical procedures were followed in the treatment of these data.

First, an average inter-correlation of ranks was determined for each set of judges in each class by using the rank-difference and then corrected for increased length by a summation of ranks. Secondly, the total ratings given each speaker by the three judges were likewise averaged producing an average rating for each speaker. These average ratings were then used in computing means and standard deviations for each group or class of speakers.

Finally, using the obtained means and standard deviations, T values were arrived at to determine if the differences between the means of the various groups were significant.

The results of these statistics are shown in Table VI. It can be seen from this table that the results are consistent with those of the immediate and delayed recall tests. The difference between the means of the subjects' scores in the two experimental conditions of praise and reproof are not significant at the .05 level of confidence. That the judging process which produced the results was fairly reliable is attested by the average correlation
**TABLE VI**

Ratings of Student Informative Speeches in the Four Experimental Groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Instructor I</th>
<th>Instructor II</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Praise</td>
<td>Reproof</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>20.75</td>
<td>20.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard Deviation</td>
<td>3.04</td>
<td>3.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inter-Correlation of Ranks</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td>.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T. Values</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>not sig. at .05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
coefficients of each class.

**Interview Results**

The results of the interview, discussed at the end of the last chapter, were both informative and interesting.

As stated in Chapter II, a sample of sixteen subjects were selected from the four experimental classes, four from each praise and reproof group or eight from the praise classes and eight from the reproof classes. Eleven of these sixteen interviewees were freshmen, four of them sophomores and the remaining one was a junior. Their ages ranged from 18 to 27 with an average of 20.9. Seven of these students were in the upper third of their high school graduating class, six in the middle third, and only three in the lower third. The accumulative point hour ratios ranged from 1.5 to 3.8 with an average of 2.5.

The most concise manner of discussing the results of these interviews is to take the questions one at a time as they appear in the Interview Schedule. (See Appendix H)

**QUESTION 3  How do you like Speech 401?**

An approximately equal number in both the permissive and restrictive groups responded that they liked the class, were indifferent, and disliked it. Three in both groups said they liked Speech 401, three in both groups were indifferent and two in both groups disliked the class.
QUESTION 4 How would you rate the instructor? Strong, average or weak?

The students from the praise-permissive classes rated their instructors higher than did those from the reproof-restrictive classes. Five students in the permissive groups rated their instructor as "strong" while only two in the restrictive classes gave that rating. Five of the interviewees from the restrictive classes rated the instructor as "average" as against three such ratings from the permissive groups. One student in the permissive group of interviewees, however, rated his instructor as "weak."

The answers to questions number five and six, are found in Tables VII A and VII B. An examination of these tables reveals the responses one would expect from college students who, by this point in their academic careers, have become somewhat indifferent or calloused toward their instructors. In the majority of cases it made little difference to what group the respondents belonged as it affected their permissive or restrictive evaluations of the instructor or class. Examples of this are clearly shown in Part 6 to Question 5 where an equal number of interviewees from both types of classes considered their instructor "encouraging" and again, in Part 9 to the same question, where an equal number from each group rated their instructor as "reasonable."
TABLE VII

Student Reactions to Question 5 of the Interview

During the first five weeks of this course would you say that the instructor was:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Restrictive</th>
<th>Permissive</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Easy</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hard</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Fair</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unfair</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Dictatorial</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Democratic</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Friendly</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cold</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Critical</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kind</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Encouraging</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discouraging</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Understanding</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indifferent</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Fault Finding</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Praise</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Reasonable</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unreasonable</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Lenient</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rigid</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE VII:
Student Reactions to Question 6 of the Interview

During this same period of time did you find the class:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Restrictive</th>
<th>Permissive</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Interesting</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dull</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Dictatorial</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Democratic</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indifferent</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Formal</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informal</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Enjoyable</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miserable</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Challenging</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stifling</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Different</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
QUESTION 7 - Did the class or instructor bother you in any way during this period?

Seven of the students interviewed answered "yes" to this question, three were in a permissive class and four in a restrictive class. The complaints in both of these groups were mostly that the instructor was caustic in his criticism of their speeches, indifferent, cold and "hard to reach." One interviewee from a restrictive class said the instructor was too "cynical" which bothered this student.

QUESTION 8 - Did you suffer any personal ill effects or discomfort from this class?

Only one student answered "yes" to this question and his complaint was that there was too great a variability in speaking abilities in his class and he felt inferior. However, he did not blame the instructor for this feeling of inferiority.

QUESTION 9 - Do you feel that you can do your best work in this type of class and under this type of instructor?

Four of the "yes" respondents to this question were from permissive classes while only two restrictive class members answered "yes." However, an equal number of both groups felt that they could not do their best work in the type of class they were in and under their speech instructor. The fact that the class was a performance class accompanied by criticism accounted for most of the "no"
answers. It mattered little to these students how the class was taught as they didn't like making speeches.

QUESTION 10 - Would you rather have an instructor who makes you "toe the mark" or one who allows a good deal of freedom?

Six interviewees from the reproof-restrictive classes said they preferred instructors who made them "toe the mark" while only three from praise-permissive classes gave this response. Three from the permissive classes said they preferred a permissive instructor while none of the restrictive classes chose this response. Three from the praise-permissive classes were uncertain while only one was in this dilemma from the reproof-restrictive groups. It is impossible to predict how much these preferences were due to chance and how much to the influence of their speech instructors.

QUESTION 11 - a. Considering the instructor or teachers you have experienced, which of the above types do you think taught you the most?

a. Eleven of the sixteen respondents stated that "toe the mark" instructors taught them the most; four stated the reverse, and one wasn't sure.

b. Which did you do your best work under?

b. An equal number (7) thought they did their best work under each of the above two instructor types while two weren't sure.
c. Which did you enjoy the most?

Twelve of these students maintained they enjoyed having a permissive instructor the most as against three favoring a restrictive teacher and one who didn't know. These numbers were about equally divided between the praise and reproof groups.

QUESTION 12  a. Do you believe that an effective teacher must require strict adherence to rules, assignments, etc. with no exceptions, or

b. Do you believe that an effective teacher takes into account individual differences, modifying the rules as they apply to individuals?

There was a unanimous response from both groups for choice b on this question. Evidently even those students that favored a restrictive instructor in question number eleven would rather he be a modified version of this type who is cognizant of individual differences.

QUESTION 13 - Which of the following types of instructors would you respect the most?

a. One who always maintains his dignity thereby creating a distance between himself and students.

b. One who at times forgets his dignity and comes down to the level of his students.

c. One who never assumes a dignity and becomes "one of the gang."

This question also elicited a unanimous response for choice b. The wording of these two questions might have
biased them towards these responses.

**QUESTION 14** - Are you motivated to work harder for an instructor who praises your efforts or finds fault with them?

The responses to this question were somewhat unexpected. Six from the permissive group and four from the restrictive class maintained they were motivated best by an instructor who uses praise. No one stated that he was best motivated by a fault-finding (blameful) instructor which is slightly inconsistent with the responses to Question 11. Three in each group said that their response to this question would depend on the circumstances. From this response one might imply that the majority of these students favored a praise-using restrictive instructor.

**QUESTION 15** - Are you motivated to do your best work by threats of punishment or promises of rewards?

Every interviewee but one responded they were better motivated by promises of rewards then by threats of punishment. The surprising fact is that the one student who maintained she was best motivated by threats of punishment was from a reproof-restrictive experimental group.

In conclusion, the over-all total of these responses repeat the results from the other phases of this study, namely, that differences in responses from students in praise or reproof groups are slight and inconsistent. A larger and more representative sample, however, might have
produced greater and more stable difference.
CHAPTER IV

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

The main problem chosen for this study was the following: What is the relative effect of the use of praise and reproof in informative speeches on audience comprehension and retention?

The importance of speaking to impart information is well recognized. Not only is this speech type one of the most important forms of speech but probably the most frequently used. This is as true of the everyday speech of the average person as it is in the more specialized speech activities of the professions, the business and political spheres and the more formalized social life of the average citizen. Certainly in the field of education informative speaking is of great importance if not the foundation stone of most instruction. The author's realization of this fact, being a teacher as well as a student of speech, created interest for this particular study.

However, a survey of the literature in the field of speech did not attest to the importance of sharing information through speaking. This analysis revealed a distinct scarcity of articles and reports of research on this type of speech in the professional journals and reports of graduate studies compiled in the field.
Certain basic hypotheses were formulated early in this study and were stated as null hypotheses. These were:

1. There is no difference in the amount of comprehension or immediate audience recall as the result of using praise or reproof in an informative speech.

2. There is no difference in the amount of retention or delayed recall as the result of using praise or reproof in an informative speech.

3. Neither praise nor reproof will produce a significant amount of comprehension and retention when used in informative speeches.

In addition to these basic hypotheses, there were several related hypotheses that grew out of the research in this study. These related, or minor hypotheses were:

4. There is no significant amount of forgetting of oral information during a three week period.

5. There is no difference in the amount of speaking skill exhibited by classes taught in the different atmospheres of praise and reproof. (A permissive class atmosphere was used in the class hearing the praise lecture and a restrictive atmosphere was established for the class hearing the reproof speech.

6. There is no difference in the amount of audience comprehension of informative material between hearing it in a speech or reading it out of a textbook.

7. College students will not respond differently to an objective evaluation of an instructor when taught by the two different methods of praise and reproof.

8. An oral interview will not show a difference in student attitudes, feelings and evaluations of a class procedure or of an instructor when operating under the two conditions of praise and reproof.
In order to test these hypotheses, the ensuing research design was adopted and research procedure followed. First, two lectures were written of equal length and containing the same ideas differing only in their context of praise and reproof. Two speech instructors were selected to deliver these informative speeches; one to each of two beginning (401) speech classes. These four classes of beginning speech students, therefore, became the subjects of this experiment. The stimuli (praise and reproof lectures) were administered during the fifth week of the course. Immediately following these lectures a thirty-four item, multiple choice test covering the information contained in the lectures was given to the four experimental groups, a control group and to another group of students who didn't hear either lecture but read the material as an assignment for their course (Speech 501). Three weeks later the same information test was repeated to the experimental and control groups.

A checklist or rating scale was constructed and administered to the experimental groups in order to validate the class atmospheres and teaching procedures employed by the two instructors in their respective classes.

During the fifth week of the course the informative speeches of the experimental subjects were tape recorded and judged by groups of three speech instructors using a
rating scale used in all beginning public speaking courses at The Ohio State University.

As a follow up procedure, a small sample of the subjects were interviewed by the author in order to get a profile of student reactions to the two different teaching conditions they were subjected to and to discover their attitudes to this style of teaching and class procedure as a whole.

In analyzing the data obtained from the above procedures several statistical processes were carried out. The reliability of the test was ascertained by the split-half method and a Pearson product moment correlation coefficient of .57 was obtained. An item analysis of this test was run and item difficulties plus item-test correlations were determined.

After computing the means and standard deviations of the scores obtained from the two administrations of the informative test, T tests were applied and the significance of the differences between the experimental conditions and and the two instructors were thereby determined. In general, the same statistical analysis was applied to the results obtained from the instructor rating scales and the ratings of student speeches.

In addition, however, the reliability of the instructor's rating scale was determined by the split-half method
using two sets of correlations — Pearson product-moment and rank difference — with compatible results. A rank difference correlation was also computed to test the reliability of the judges' ratings of student speeches.

A non-statistical analysis of the responses received during the oral interviews was also completed. This consisted mainly of a question-by-question breakdown of the interview schedule and a tabulation of the replies to each question.

This investigation carried out in this study resulted in the following conclusions concerning these basic or major hypotheses and related or minor hypotheses.

Conclusions about the Major Hypotheses

1. The hypothesis of no difference in the amount of audience comprehension as the result of using praise or using reproof in an informative speech could not be rejected. The difference between the praise and reproof conditions was not significant at .05 level of confidence.

2. The hypothesis of no difference in the amount of audience comprehension and retention on delayed recall as the result of using praise or using reproof in an informative speech could not be rejected. The difference between the experimental conditions continuing
to be not statistically significant at the .05 level of confidence.

3. The hypothesis that neither praise nor reproof will produce a significant amount of audience comprehension and retention when used in informative speeches was rejected. The difference between the experimental and control groups was significant for both comprehension and retention at the .01 level of confidence.

Conclusions about Related Hypotheses

4. The hypothesis that there is no significant amount of forgetting of oral information during a three week period was also rejected. The difference between the means of the scores obtained on the immediate and delayed recall tests was significant at the .01 level of confidence.

5. The hypothesis that there would be no difference in the amount of speaking skill exhibited by classes taught in the atmosphere of praise or the atmosphere of reproof could not be rejected. The differences between the mean average ratings of these two class types was not significant at the .05 level of confidence.

6. The hypothesis that there is no difference between the amounts of comprehension when listening to an informative speech and reading the same material could not be
rejected. The differences between these two methods of acquiring information was not significant at the .05 level of confidence when comparing three of the experimental groups with the reading group and significant only at the .05 level in one class, the praise group of Instructor I.

7. The hypothesis of no difference in the way college students will respond to a scale evaluation of an instructor when they are taught by one of the two different methods of praise and reproof was rejected at the .01 level of confidence.

8. The hypothesis that an oral interview will not produce an accurate picture of a student's reactions, attitudes, and evaluation toward the instructor or class procedure used, was to a large extent, accepted as a result of the interview conducted in this study. There is no statistical proof of this assertion. However, an examination of the students' responses to the interview schedule reveals too many vague and inconsistent reactions, attitudes and evaluations with the size sample used for accurate inferences.

**IMPLICATIONS OF THIS STUDY**

The implications of the results of this study are numerous but in no area are they more useful than in the field
of education. Considering, first, the prime objective of this study, that of determining the relative effectiveness of the use of praise and reproof in informative speeches upon audience comprehension and retention, the results are seen to be significant for teaching. It appears to make little or no difference whether an instructor uses praise or reproof as a style of communication for his lecture, if his main purpose for delivering the lecture is comprehension and retention by the students of the contained informative material.

It is reasonable to assume that the results might be similar if the same experiment were conducted among all types of captive audiences composed of adults with a high school education or better who knew they would be held responsible for the information contained in the speeches. However, the same results might not be obtained if non-captive audiences were used who would have freedom of choice to listen or not to listen. Thus, the lack of difference found in this study might be explained by the fact that these subjects were a captive audience knowing they eventually would be held accountable for the information contained in the lectures.

The results of the more minor or indirect hypothesis of the study also have interesting implications. The fact that it made no discernible difference in this experiment
whether the class was taught permissively or restrictively in the amount of speaking skill exhibited by the students of these classes could be important not only for speech teachers but for college teachers of other behavior skills as well. College teachers of such skills as speech, music, physical education, industrial arts, dancing, sewing and mechanics have long debated the advantages and disadvantages of handling their classes in an authoritarian or a democratic manner when teaching for the development of a specific skill. This study would imply that it makes no difference which teaching method, permissive or restrictive, is used when the amount of the skill is measured.

Another phase of the study which produced an interesting result was that of having the subjects rate their instructors to determine the type of teaching procedure and instructor behavior being used in each class. From the results of these ratings, it was seen that the students could and did objectively identify a difference between the two distinct class atmospheres established by each instructor. This seems to imply that college students are capable of giving a fairly accurate over-all profile of the instructor's attitude in teaching when evaluating him on an objective scale.

A third minor objective of the study was concerned with determining whether reading informative material or
listening to the same information produced better results in terms of audience comprehension. The results corroborated past studies of this problem in that there was no significant difference in comprehension between reading or listening to informative material.

Finally, it should be stated that several of these results discussed as applying principally to the field of education could also apply to other informative speaking situations where the goal is audience comprehension.
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PRAISE SPEECH MANUSCRIPT

A class as good as this one doesn't need a lecture on confidence in speaking if its purpose were merely immediate self improvement. But even good speakers ought to learn enough about it to help others and perhaps to prepare to avoid any unusual reactions which might arise. Since you already feel confident and enjoy your speaking, you may not realize how frequently it occurs. Persons who lack confidence tremble, gasp for breath and perspire. In a few extreme cases they might have difficulty remembering what they had planned to say and even fail to remember the ideas they had prepared.

Freedom from this condition is a source of attainment and satisfaction. In a survey of college groups almost seventy-five percent of the students admitted that they were bothered by their lack of confidence in speaking and well over a third of these students considered it a serious problem. The ratio might be better in this class since in general you have exhibited real confidence in your speaking. Even if some of you might feel that you have lacked confidence or wondered whether or not it is a serious problem, it probably isn't for you. You appear to be very conscientious.

To help you understand this subject thoroughly we
shall discuss it from four points of view: First, the
general nature of confidence; second, causes which operate
to reduce it; thirdly, some of the typical symptoms where
it is lacking, and lastly, procedures which may be fol-
lowed in developing confidence and poise in speaking.

The lack of confidence in the speech situation is ex­
erienced by many professional speakers and is not, there­
fore, restricted to the amateur. You should be pleased
that you do not lack confidence when speaking in public.
Just remember that actors, ministers, college professors
and business executives report that they have lived with
and struggled to develop confidence in speaking during
long careers. Thus, it seems that practice does not
assure complete confidence even though it might help
increase it.

Lack of confidence appears in various kinds of situ­
atations besides speaking. Less confident persons often
experience mild forms of such reactions as "buck fever,"
job or "date jitters."

Lack of confidence is a typical emotional experience
based on fear. The common causes of intense fear are, with
but a single exception, causes of violent death. The
single exception is, happily enough, speaking in public.
Emotional responses usually appear in what is or has been
for the individual a crisis situation. When a person does
not know what to do, he reacts emotionally. Once a less able person has been strongly conditioned to an emotional reaction, it may continue to appear in similar situations long after the specific crisis situation is forgotten.

As a typical emotional reaction, lack of confidence is experienced with various degrees of intensity. If it appears in only a moderate degree, it may actually pep up the speaker. If it appears as an intense reaction, which certainly you have not outwardly manifested, it inhibits the intellectual activities so that memory is disturbed, thinking is frustrated or disorganized and the mind may even become a "complete blank."

The individual may be a poor judge of the severity of his own reactions. Some of you seem to over estimate your nervousness. It is possible that a few of you may be underestimating it. Training has helped many persons to inhibit or cover up their emotional reactions, but one must work at it as diligently and intelligently as you do. Evidence has indicated that speakers do not appear as nervous as they feel. Now let us turn our thoughts to the causes of a lack of confidence.

The causes are usually complex and varied. We cannot say that nervousness in speaking is the result of any one factor. It is almost inconceivable that such reactions should be unlearned or inherited types of behavior.
To understand the manner in which speech fears may develop it is necessary that we know something of the nature of individual differences in emotional behavior. Some differences in emotional reaction are traceable to organic differences. We mean by this, that our bodies differ in their capacities to react emotionally and to inhibit emotional reactions. Besides our organic differences we also differ in the experiences we have had which are not biologically adequate causes of emotional reactions. Some of these experiences have been accidental and some have been thrust upon us by persons in our environment.

The skills that you acquire in emotional control are developed through incidental learning and through planned teaching by others and, therefore, differ from individual to individual. This combination of differences leads to conclusion that our emotional reactions are caused by predisposing (inherent in the body or background) and precipitating (environmental) factors. The predisposing causes to emotional reactions are difficult to control, primarily because we know least about them at the present.

Many psychologically predisposing conditions result in tendencies to respond with uncontrolled emotion. One such psychological cause is the "sheltered" life, in which the individual has been shielded from stimulation by even mild crisis situations. This could not be a factor influ-
encing the speech of members of this class since you seem to take things in good stride.

A precipitating cause of nervousness need operate only once to condition the individual to fear reactions in a particular situation. One distasteful experience in speaking could thus condition you to experience fear in future speaking situations, although this is not likely to happen to you. Some persons are conditioned by one element in the speech situation; some by another element. Various elements (stimuli) which may arouse emotional reactions and thus condition the speaker to nervousness in speaking include: failure to anticipate the appearance of a person or the occurrence of an event; the reactions of an audience, such as criticism or manner of behavior; sudden awareness of a mistake or deficiency; and the failure or imagined failure to meet a standard. This class should have little concern about such items as most of you measure up very well to high standards.

Nervous reaction may also be conditioned to such factors as a room or type of room, a person or type of person, a speech situation or type of speech activity. When the security of the individual appears to be threatened, or he does not know how to respond, his defense against his emotional response is shattered and his emotions take control.
Failure to understand the nature of emotional response may cause less well adjusted individuals to be mystified and worried about it. Under these circumstances they become panicky, and their lack of confidence increases. This response at times occurs even to one who speaks reasonabably well, but who is unfamiliar with speech standards and therefore unable to judge his speech achievements with objectivity. If the speaker demands a false standard of perfection in his performance and believes that he has failed, he has set the stage for his own unnerving. Familiarity with these characteristics of the stage fright reaction should bring home to you the need for an understanding of the nature of emotion since all of you seem intelligent and interested in improving your speech. Precipitating causes are not so apt to operate when the speaker understands his emotional responses as well as you apparently do.

What are the symptoms of emotional behavior in stage fright which are so mystifying to some?

First, withdrawal, a symptom which you may have observed in other people. It is manifested in habits such as looking at the floor, ceiling, out of the window, leaning backward with the weight principally on one heel, putting the hands in one's pockets or behind one's back and retreating behind a table or speaker's stand, all
represent incipient retreat or flight from the unpleasant stimulus. There are also physiological symptoms of stage fright such as pounding of the heart, increase in the heart beat, gasping for breath, dry mouth, perspiration, and blushing or blanching. These are all results of changes in physiological processes associated with all fear reactions, not just stage fright. The sinking feeling which some people feel in the pit of the stomach is likewise probably associated with these physiological changes.

Still another symptom of nervousness in speaking is tension and muscular conflict. When the human organism is energized in conflict and then fails to use up this energy in struggle or flight, it tends to use up the energy in tension, trembling and in fidgeting. This trembling occurs in those regions which are most responsive, which are the antagonistic or opposite muscle pairs -- the vocal folds, the finer muscles of the face, the arms, the hands and knees. This is similar to the vibrations of the fenders of a "Model T" when the motor is raced while the car is stationary. You may find this difficult to understand because you have shown so little outward manifestations of these symptoms. If a few of you are tense you certainly have learned how to handle the situation well.

Nervous reactions in speaking affect voice control in many ways. One of the most common effects is to raise
the pitch which would give the girls a high shrill voice
and make the boys sound less mature when they speak. Since
tension in the vocal folds is one of the factors determin-
ing the pitch of the voice, it is easy to see how the
stress of emotional reactions acts to produce an unusually
high pitch. Monotony and harshness of voice also arise
from the difficulty of controlling the vocal chords under
tension.

A final factor descriptive of the state of stage
fright may be referred to as the psychological feelings of
the speaker in his condition. The speaker may be jittery,
embarrassed, mystified, disgusted, apologetic, sheepish
and altogether unhappy.

As we have already implied man's capacity for emotion-
al response is biological. Man's intellectual behavior,
however, is something he learns. The ability to inhibit
or lessen emotional responses is a form of intellectual
behavior. Thus, the two types of behavior in a sense
compete for control of the human organism. If intellectual
reactions are to function at their best, it would seem
necessary to inhibit intense emotional reactions. This
situation leads to what we may call the law of stage
fright control:

"anything which may be done to increase the
efficiency of intellectual activity or to re-
deuce the intensity of emotional reaction will
help in developing confidence in the speech
situation."
Reeducational techniques are often applied to develop control over these symptoms of emotional reaction, to eliminate their causes and to prevent the development of this type of reaction. It should be recognized, however, that there is no simple method which will work for all persons in developing confidence. Some practices help one person but do not help another. The best possible method is a matter for individual discovery. For most individuals the reasonable amount of effort which you have intelligently applied will go a long way toward the desired result.

There are occasionally persons who do not seem to be able to conquer their fears. But even these rare persons, if they will, can do something for themselves in learning to live reasonably happy in spite of their condition. What you have done others can do.

Now let me offer a few suggestions by which you may help others in controlling any nervous reactions they may have in speaking. We shall classify the principal suggestions offered under the two parts of the law of stage fright control which we have already mentioned. Namely, reducing the intensity of emotional reactions and increasing the efficiency of intellectual activity. It should be understood, however, that in many cases they overlap. Some techniques which reduce the intensity of emotion also
build up cortical or intellectual control. We shall consider first those methods which contribute most directly to the increase in self-confidence.

The first suggestion I would like you to consider would be to study the psychology of emotion. As you have no doubt heard, "we are afraid of what we don't understand." Thus, to understand stage fright we must understand the psychology of emotion. If we are really serious about this matter we should start immediately to read about the psychology of emotion.

Secondly, the speaker should think and talk about his emotions as an objective fact. Remember, "confession is good for the soul." This process is sometimes called "mental catharsis" and is often used by psychiatrists.

Still another suggestion would be to resolve personal conflicts, by this we mean both imagined and real psychological differences. For instance, inferiority complexes are often merely imagined or due to irresponsible suggestions of inferiority. Some persons' conflicts develop as a result of competition among their desires. Desire to excel versus desire not to appear egotistical, desire to talk about one's self as opposed to desire not to brag, are excellent examples.

A further suggestion might be to fight unpleasant, frustrating emotions with pleasant stimulating emotions.
This is called compensation in psychology. Some examples of this reaction are: whistling when afraid; losing self in work as a distraction from grief, and, applied to speaking, getting worked up about a subject the way many of you are able to do.

Another suggestion to help reduce the intensity of emotional reactions in speech would be to develop habits of voluntary relaxation and control of activity. Some methods which have proved successful are yawning, stretching, taking deep breaths and flexing your muscles.

Finally, advise such people to not submit unnecessarily to severe mental and physical strain while speaking. They should control the environment and get necessary rest before speaking. Most of you, apparently know how to do this.

Now, let us turn our attention to a few suggestions for aiding in increasing the efficiency of intellectual activity.

The first of these is to know what is reasonably to be expected of a speaker. A speaker shouldn't try to please everyone in speaking. He should only be concerned with the reasonable expectations of a reasonable audience.

Secondly, use devices in speaking which will facilitate memory for speech materials. Some of these devices would be, the use of stories, anecdotes, examples,
personal experiences. A speaker may use notes to refresh his memory but should not read from them or depend upon them too much.

Still a further suggestion would be to use directed movement to keep the mind active. Ways of doing this would be the use of deliberate pauses, moving from one side of the rostrum to the other purposively, taking a drink of water and repeating a previously stated idea.

Finally, and probably most important, you should try to develop in others the effective philosophy for speaking which you so ably demonstrated.
I'm going to talk about a problem which appears to bother members of this class more than most. I don't really recall teaching a class in which there were so many people who had some form of "stage fright." If you have not realized that this is one of the things that's wrong with you, you probably never will. You tremble, gasp for breath, and perspire. Your thoughts become disorganized, you forget what you had planned to say, and sometimes your mind appears to turn a "complete blank." Or maybe that's just natural for you?

This condition should be a source of embarrassment or even acute distress. In a survey of various college groups about sixty per cent of the students admitted that they were bothered by their nervousness in speaking but only slightly over a third of these students considered it a serious problem. I would guess that this ratio would be much higher in this class since many of HAVE ALREADY exhibited nervousness in speaking. I have determined, therefore, to do all I can to straighten you out on these problems.

I shall discuss the topic from four points of view: first, the general nature of this neurotic tendency; secondly, causes which operate to infect you with it; thirdly, some of its typical symptoms and, lastly, procedures
which must be followed if you ever hope to develop normality in speaking.

The feeling of nervousness in the speech situation has been experienced by professional performers and is not, therefore, restricted to amateurs like yourselves. Some actors, ministers, college professors, and business executives have reported that they have had to live with a tendency to become jittery in speaking. Only a fool believes that practice makes perfect calm. However, we must try to do what we can to help beginners such as you.

Nervousness is a malady which occurs in various kinds of situations. You may never have realized that your "stage fright" is the same kind of affliction as "buck fever," "job fright," "date jitters," or hysteria.

Stage fright is an emotional experience based on fear of incompetence. The common causes of intense fear reactions are, with but a single exception, causes of violet death. The single exception is speaking in public. All emotional responses appear in what is, or has been, for you a crisis situation. When one who is typically immature does not know what to do, he reacts emotionally.

Once you have been strongly conditioned to the emotional reaction, you may continue to have it in similar situations long after the original attack is forgotten.

As a typical emotional reaction, stage fright is
experience with various degrees of intensity. If you have it in only a moderate degree, it may not be harmful to your speaking. If this is true for you, you can be thankful that it is not one of your worst faults. If it is an intense reaction, which so many of this class has evidenced, the memory is inhibited, thinking is frustrated or disorganized, and your mind may even become a "complete blank."

Most people who have stage fright are poor judges of the severity of their own reactions. Many of you underestimate your nervousness while it's possible that a few of you may overestimate your nervousness. Living with such a weakness has helped some persons to inhibit or cover up their emotional reactions, but they are usually people who have the ability and drive to work at it diligently and intelligently, which I doubt if most of this class CAN or will do. Evidence has indicated that some speakers cover up their faults so that they do not appear as nervous as they feel, if that gives you a grain of satisfaction. I should now like to try to give you at least a faint glimmer of the causes of stage fright.

The causes of stage fright reactions you have are complex and varied. We can not say that your condition is the result of any one flaw. You can't hope to make much sense out of the rationalization that it is an unlearned or inherited type of behavior.
To understand the manner in which your fears and quaking have developed you ought to try to learn something of the nature of individual differences in emotional behavior. Some differences in emotional reaction are traceable to a weak bodily system. I mean by this, that our bodies differ in their susceptibility to react emotionally and to suffer emotional reactions. Besides our organic differences we also differ in the embarrassing experiences we have had. Some of these experiences have been accidental and some have been thrust upon us by unkind persons we have had to associate with.

What little relief you have had from your emotional handicaps may have developed through accidental learning and through teaching by others who have tried to knock some sense into you! This combination of differences leads to the conclusion that our emotional reactions are caused by inherited weaknesses and unhappy experiences. The predisposing causes to emotional reactions will be difficult for you to control, primarily because they are too deep rooted to do anything about.

Many psychological handicaps in life result in tendencies to let the emotions run rampant. One such psychological cause is the "sheltered" life in which you have been shielded from stimulation by even mild crisis situations. I have wondered during the last couple of
weeks how many of you have been pampered darlings?

A precipitating cause of nervousness need operate only once to condition you to fear reactions in a speech situation. One disasterous speaking experience is enough to cause you to experience fear, again and again. You seem to me to be the kind of people who can be counted on to have that one disasterous experience. Some of you are affected by one element in the speech situation; some by another element. Various elements which arouse emotional reactions and thus condition you to nervousness in speaking include: failure to anticipate the appearance of a person or the occurrence of an event; the reactions of a member of an audience, such as criticism; sudden awareness of your mistakes or deficiencies; and the failure or imagined failure to do as well as even you know you should be doing.

The nervous reactions for some of you may even have been inflicted on you by such minor factors as a room or type of room, a person or type of person, a speech situation or type of speech activity. When your frail security appears to be threatened, or you have no idea about how to respond, your limited defense against your emotional response is shattered and your emotions bully you!

Failure to understand the nature of your emotional responses causes you to be confused and frustrated about
them. Under these circumstances you become panicky, and your affliction tends to become intensified. This response frequently occurs even to one who speaks reasonably well, but who is unfamiliar with speech standards and therefore unable to judge his speech achievements with objectivity. If you demand a false standard of perfection in your performance and believe that you have failed, you have set the stage for the failure you experience. I hope that familiarity with these stage fright features should bring home to at least a few of you the need for an understanding of the nature of your emotion. It may be too much to hope that you have the ambition and intelligence to act accordingly. Precipitating causes are not so apt to operate when you can understand your emotional responses if you have the capacity to do so.

The symptoms of emotional behavior in stage fright, so unnerving to you can be summed up as follows:

First, withdrawal, a symptom which most sufferers from stage fright exhibit. It breaks out in habits such as looking at the floor, ceiling, out of the window, over the heads of the listeners, leaning backward with the weight principally on one heel, putting the hands in pockets or behind the back hiding behind a table or speaker's stand. All this cowardice simply represents flight from the unpleasant stimulus.
There are also physiological symptoms of stage fright such as pounding of the heart, increase in the rate of heart beat, gasping for breath, dry mouth, perspiration and blushing or blanching. These are all the result of changes in physiological processes associated with all fear reactions including stage fright. The sinking feeling which most of you have felt in the pit of the stomach is likewise associated with these physical changes.

Still another of your symptoms of nervousness in speaking is tension and muscular conflict. When your organism in energized in conflict and then fails to use up this energy in struggle or flight, you tend to use up the energy in tension, in trembling and in fidgeting. This trembling occurs in those regions most responsive which are the antagonistic or opposite muscle pairs - the vocal folds, the finer muscles of the face, the arms, the hands and the knees. This is similar to the vibrations of the fenders of a "Model T" when the motor is raced while the car is stationary. I know from observations that many of you have had this experience and know what this symptom is, at least those of you who have been tense, or trembly, or fidgety.

Nervous reactions in speaking affect voice control in many ways. One of the most common effects is to raise your pitch, which explains why many of you girls speak in
a higher and somewhat more shrill voice than normal, and several of you fellows sound weak and childish when you speak. Since tension in the vocal folds is one of the factors determining the pitch of the voice, it is easy to see how the stress of emotional reactions acts to produce an unusually high pitch. Monotony and harshness of voice are also symptoms of difficulty in controlling the vocal chords under tension.

A final factor, descriptive of the affliction of stage fright is the general emotional feeling of the speaker. You are jittery, embarrassed, mystified, disgusted, apologetic, sheepish, and altogether weepy.

As I have already implied your capacity for emotional response is biological. Your intellectual behavior, however, is something you learn. The ability to thwart or reduce your emotional responses is a form of intellectual behavior. Thus, the two types of behavior in a sense fight for control of your organism.

If your mind is to function at its best, it would seem necessary to keep from blowing your top. This situation leads to what may be called the law of stage fright control:

"Anything which may be done to increase the efficiency of intellectual activity or to reduce the intensity of emotional reaction will help in developing confidence in the speech situation."
Reeducational techniques are often applied to develop control over these symptoms of emotional reaction, to eliminate their causes and to prevent the development of this type of reaction. It should be recognized, however, that there is no single method which will work to control the fears of all of you! Some practices which may help one person might not help you! The best possible method for you is a matter for you to discover as an individual. A reasonable amount of effort intelligently applied can go a long way toward the desired result. Most of this class, however, can be expected to have difficulty in over-coming nervous reactions since you have shown little tendency to put forth enough intelligent effort to conquer your stage fright. There may be persons who are not able to conquer their fears. From what I've observed so far, there might be some of you in this predicament. But even you, if you will, can do something for yourselves in learning to live with your handicap.

You might ask, is there any hope that you can control the nervous reactions that many of you exhibit in speaking. I shall classify the principal suggestions I have to offer under the two parts of the law of stage fright control which I have already mentioned, namely, for those of you who weren't paying attention, reducing the intensity of emotional reactions and increasing the efficiency of
intellectual activity. It should be understood, however, that in many cases these gimmicks overlap in their influence. Some techniques which reduce the intensity of emotion also build up cortical or intellectual control. I shall discuss first those methods which contribute most directly to the reduction of the intensity of the fear reaction.

The first suggestion that I have to offer here would be to study the psychology of emotion. As you have heard many times, "you are afraid of what you don't understand." Thus, to understand stage fright you must understand the psychology of emotion. If you have an ounce of gumption about this matter you should start immediately to read and study the psychology of emotion. I suppose that is too much to expect of most of you.

Secondly, think and talk about your emotions as an objective fact. Remember "confession is good for the soul." This process is sometimes called "mental catharsis" and is often used by psychiatrists.

Still another suggestion would be to learn to make up your minds about your personal conflicts, whether they be imagined or real psychological differences. For instance, your inferiority complexes are often merely imagined or due to irresponsible suggestions of inferiority. Some of our conflicts develop as a result of competition
among our desires -- the desire to excel versus the desire not to appear egotistical, the desire to talk about one's self as opposed to the desire not to brag, are good examples.

A further suggestion might be to fight your unpleasant, frustrating emotions with their opposites. This is called compensation in psychology. Several examples of this reaction are whistling when you are afraid; losing yourself in work as a distraction from grief, and, applied to speech, getting so worked up about your subject that it does seem to make an honest difference to you.

Another suggestion to help reduce the intensity of your emotional reactions in speech would be to develop habits of voluntary relaxation and control of activity. Some methods which have been known to work for those who aren't stupid are yawning, stretching, taking deep breaths and flexing their muscles.

Finally, see if you can exercise enough sense to avoid trying to do the impossible with physical and mental strain. Control your environment as much as you are able. Get your necessary rest before speaking even though many of you are probably not getting enough rest at present. This may help reduce your nervousness.

Now, I am going to dole out to you a few suggestions for increasing the efficiency of what intellectual ability you have.

The first of these is to know what is reasonably to
be expected of a speaker. It's about time you got over bluffing about this. Don't try to please everyone in speaking. You ought to be satisfied with the reasonable expectations of a reasonable audience.

Secondly, you should use devices in speaking which will prompt even a dull memory. Some of these devices are the use of stories, anecdotes, examples, and personal experiences. Using notes to refresh your memory is to be discouraged because lazy people will be inclined to read from them and depend upon them too much.

Still further gimmicks would be to use directed movement to keep the mind active. Ways of accomplishing this would be to use deliberate pauses, to move from one side of the rostrum to the other purposively, to take a drink of water and to repeat an idea previously stated.

Finally, and probably most important, try to get at least some faint idea during the next few weeks as to what effective speaking really should be!
APPENDIX B
PRAISE SPEECH AS DELIVERED BY INSTRUCTOR I* 

A class probably like this one doesn't need a lecture on confidence or stage fright in speaking if its purpose were merely immediate self improvement and I guess it should be. But even good speakers ought to learn enough about it to help others and perhaps to prepare to avoid any unusual reactions which might arise. Since you already feel confident and as I see it enjoy your speaking, you may not realize how frequently it occurs. Persons who lack confidence tremble, gasp for breath and perspire. In a few extreme cases they might have difficulty remembering what they had planned to say and I suspect we have all experienced this in a mild form at least and even fail to remember the ideas they had prepared.

Freedom from this condition is a source of attainment and satisfaction. In a survey of college groups almost seventy-five percent of the students admitted that they were bothered by their lack of confidence in speaking and well over a third of these students considered it a serious problem. The ratio might be better than that I think here, because of you do appear pretty confident now maybe you don't feel it, but at least you appear that way. Even if

* All underlined material was inserted by Instructor I.
some of you might feel that you have lacked confidence or wondered whether or not it is a serious problem. I doubt very much for most of you in here that it is a serious problem. You appear to be very conscientious.

To help you understand this subject thoroughly we shall discuss it from four points of view: First, the general nature of confidence; second, causes which operate to reduce it; thirdly, some of the typical symptoms where it is lacking, and lastly, procedures which may be followed in developing confidence and poise in speaking.

The lack of confidence in the speech situation is experienced as most of you know by many professional speakers and is not, therefore, restricted to the amateur. You should be pleased that you do not lack confidence when speaking in public. Just remember that actors, ministers, college professors and business executives report that they have lived with and struggled to develop confidence in speaking during long careers. Thus, it seems that practice does not assure complete confidence even though it might help increase it.

Lack of confidence appears in various kinds of situations besides speaking. Less confident persons often experience mild forms of such reactions as "buck fever," job and here at Ohio State "date jitters."

Lack of confidence is a typical emotional experience based on fear. The common causes of intense fear are with
but a single exception causes of violent death. The single exception is, happily enough, speaking in public. Emotional responses usually appear in what is, or has been for the individual a crisis situation. When a person does not know what to do, he reacts emotionally. Once a less able person has been strongly conditioned to an emotional reaction, it may continue to appear in similar situations long after the specific crisis situation is forgotten and this is an important rule.

As a typical emotional reaction, lack of confidence is experienced with various degrees of intensity either within yourself or between people. If it appears in only a moderate degree, it may actually pep up the speaker, in other words, mild emotion tone is a good thing, believe it or not. If it appears as an intense reaction, which certainly you have not outwardly manifested, it inhibits the intellectual activities so that memory is disturbed, thinking is frustrated or disorganized and the mind may even become a "complete blank." You may have observed situations like that.

The individual may be a poor judge of the severity of his own reactions. Some of you seem I think perhaps to over-estimate your nervousness. May be because you are a poor judge. It is possible that a few of you may be underestimating it. Training has helped many persons to inhibit or cover up their emotional reactions, but one must work at
it as diligently and intelligently as you do. Evidence has indicated that speakers do not appear as nervous as they feel and I have been telling this to quite a few of you. Now let us turn our thoughts to the causes of a lack of confidence.

The causes are usually complex and varied. We cannot say that nervousness in speaking is the result of any one factor. It is almost inconceivable, I think, that such reactions should be unlearned or inherited types of behavior.

To understand the manner in which speech fears may develop it is necessary that we know something of the nature of individual differences in emotional behavior. Some differences in emotional reaction are traceable to organic differences. We mean by this, that our bodies differ in their capacities to react emotionally and to inhibit emotional reactions. Besides our organic differences we also differ in the experiences we have had which are not perhaps biologically adequate causes of emotional reactions. Now I think some of these experiences have been accidental and some have been thrust upon us by persons in our environment amid this class is a good example of that.

The skills that you acquire in emotional control are developed through incidental learning and through planned teaching by others and, therefore, differ from individual
to individual. This combination of differences leads to the conclusion that our emotional reactions are caused by predisposing (inherent in the body or background) and precipitating (environmental) factors. The predisposing causes to emotional reactions are difficult to control, primarily because we know least about them at the present.

Many psychological predisposing conditions result in tendencies to respond with uncontrolled emotion. One such psychological cause you have heard this talked about a lot is the "sheltered" life, in which the individual has been shielded from stimulation by even mild crisis situations. I don't think we have any sheltered individuals in here do we? So I don't think we have to worry too much about this problem, we can drop it.

A precipitating cause of nervousness need operate only once to condition the individual to fear reactions in a particular situation. One distasteful experience in speaking could thus condition you to experience fear in future speaking situations, although this is not likely to happen to you. Some persons are conditioned by one element in the speech situation; some by another element. Various elements (stimuli) which may arouse emotional reactions and thus condition the speaker to nervousness in speaking include: failure to anticipate the appearance of a person or the occurrence of an event; if you think about it this
could cause a problem, you would expect to see Eisenhower
walk into the room; the reactions of an audience, such as
criticism or manner or behavior; suddenly everybody falls
asleep this could unnerve you - I should hope so; sudden
awareness of a mistake or deficiency; ee gads - I mis-
pronounced that word and this could be enough to unnerve
you, couldn't it?; and the failure or imagined failure to
meet a standard. This class should have little concern
about such items as most of you measure up very well to
high standards.

Nervous reaction may also be conditioned to such fac-
tors as a room or type of room, a person or type of person,
a speech situation or type of speech activity. When the
security of the individual appears to be threatened, or he
does not know how to respond, his defense against his
emotional response is shattered and his emotions take con-
trol and rational thinking goes out the window.

Failure to understand the nature of emotional response
may cause less well adjusted individuals to be mystified
and worried about it. Under these circumstances they be-
come panicky, and their lack of confidence increases.
This response at times occurs even to one who speaks reason-
ably well, but who is unfamiliar with speech standards and
therefore unable to judge his speech achievements with ob-
jectivity. If the speaker demands a false standard or
perfection in his performance and believes that he has failed, he has set the stage for his own unnerving then I think. Familiarity with these characteristics of the stage fright reaction should bring home to you the need for an understanding of the nature of emotion since all of you seem interested in improving your speech. Precipitating causes are not so apt to operate when the speaker understands his emotional responses as well as you apparently do and this is half the battle perhaps.

What are the symptoms of emotional behavior in stage fright which are so mystifying to so many people?

First, withdrawal, a symptom which I think you may have observed in other people. It is manifested in habits such as looking at the floor, ceiling, out of the window, leaning backward with the weight principally on one heel, putting the hands in one's pockets or behind one's back and retreating behind a table or speaker's stand, all represent incipient retreat or flight from the unpleasant stimulus. There are also physiological symptoms of stage fright such as pounding of the heart, increase in the heart beat, gasping for breath, dry mouth, perspiration, and blushing or blanching. These are all results of changes in physiological processes associated with all fear reactions, not just stage fright. The sinking feeling which some people feel in the pit of the stomach is likewise probably associated
with these physiological changes.

Still another symptom of nervousness in speaking is tension and muscular conflict. When the human organism is energized in conflict and then fails to use up this energy in struggle or flight, it tends to use up the energy in tension, trembling and in fidgeting. This trembling occurs in those regions which are most responsive, which are the antagonistic or opposite muscle pairs -- the vocal folds, the finer muscles of the face, the arms, the hands and knees. This is similar to the vibrations of the fenders of a "Model T" when the motor is raced while the car is stationary. You may find this a bit difficult to understand because you have shown so little outward manifestations of these symptoms. If any of you are real tense in here, you cover it up pretty darn well.

Nervous reactions in speaking affect voice control in many ways. One of the most common effects is to raise the pitch which would give the girls a high shrill voice and make the boys sound less mature when they speak. Since tension in the vocal folds is one of the factors determining the pitch of the voice, it is easy to see how the stress of emotional reactions acts to produce an unusually high pitch. Monotony and harshness of voice also arise from the difficulty of controlling the vocal chords under tension.

A final factor descriptive of the state of stage
fright may be referred to as the psychological feelings of the speaker in his condition. The speaker may be jittery, embarrassed, mystified, disgusted, apologetic, sheepish and altogether unhappy.

As we have already implied man's capacity for emotional response is biological. Man's intellectual behavior, however, is something he learns. The ability to inhibit or lessen emotional responses is a form of intellectual behavior. Thus, the two types of behavior in a sense compete for control of the human organism. If intellectual reactions are to function at their best, it would seem necessary to inhibit intense emotional reactions. This situation leads to what we may call the law of stage fright control:

anything which may be done to increase the efficiency of intellectual activity or to reduce the intensity of emotional reaction will help in developing confidence in the speech situation.

Reeducational techniques are often applied to develop control over these symptoms of emotional reaction, to eliminate their causes and to prevent the development of this type of reaction. It should be recognized, however, that there is no simple method which will work for all persons in developing confidence. Some practices help one persons but do not help another. The best possible method is a matter for individual discovery. For most individuals the reasonable amount of effort which you have applied
will go a long way toward the desired result.

There are occasionally persons who do not seem to be able to conquer their fears. But even these rare persons, if they will, can do something for themselves in learning to live reasonably happy in spite of their condition. What you have done I think others can do.

Now let me offer a few suggestions by which you may help others in controlling any nervous reactions they may have in speaking. We shall classify the principal suggestions offered under the two parts of the law of stage fright control which we have already mentioned. Namely, reducing the intensity of emotional reactions and increasing the efficiency of intellectual activity. It should be understood, however, that in many cases they overlap. Some techniques which reduce the intensity of emotion also build up cortical or intellectual control. We shall consider first those methods which contribute most directly to the increase in self-confidence.

The first suggestion I would like you to consider would be to study the psychology of emotion. As you have no doubt heard, "we are afraid of what we don't understand." Thus, to understand stage fright we must understand the psychology of emotion. If we are really serious about this matter and I don't know how many of you are, we should start immediately to read about the psychology of emotion.
Secondly, the speaker should think and talk about his emotions as an objective fact. Remember, "confession is good for the soul." This process is sometimes called "mental catharsis" and is often used by psychiatrists.

Still another suggestion would be to resolve personal conflicts, by this we mean both imagined and real psychological differences. For instance, inferiority complexes whatever they are, are often merely imagined or due to irresponsible suggestions of inferiority. Some persons' conflicts develop as a result of competition among their desires. Desire to excel versus desire not to appear egotistical, desire to talk about one's self as opposed to desire not to brag, are excellent example.

A further suggestion might be to fight unpleasant, frustrating emotions with pleasant stimulating emotions. This is called compensation in psychology. Some examples of this reaction are: whistling when afraid; losing oneself in work as a distraction from grief, and, applied to speaking, getting worked up about a subject.

Another suggestion to help reduce the intensity of emotional reactions in speech would be to develop habits of voluntary relaxation and control of activity. Some methods which have proved successful are yawning, stretching, taking deep breaths and flexing your muscles.

Finally, advise such people to not submit unneces-
sarily to severe mental and physical strain while speaking. They should control the environment and get necessary rest before speaking. Most of you, apparently know how to do this.

Now, let us turn our attention to a few suggestions for aiding in increasing the efficiency of intellectual activity.

The first of these is to know what is reasonably to be expected of a speaker. A speaker shouldn't try to please everyone in speaking. He should only be concerned with the reasonable expectations of a reasonable audience.

Secondly, use devices in speaking which will facilitate memory for speech materials. Some of these devices would be, the use of stories, anecdotes, examples, and personal experiences. A speaker may use notes to refresh his memory but should not read from them or depend upon them too much.

Still a further suggestion would be to use directed movement to keep the mind active. Ways of doing this would be the use of deliberate pauses, moving from one side of the rostrum to the other purposively, taking a drink of water.

Finally, and probably most important, you should try to develop in others the effective philosophy for speaking which you so ably demonstrated.
What I want to talk about as most of you already know is stage fright. That is a problem which has bothered me, I think altogether too many people and it has been a long time since I have had a class with quite so many people I think who have seen so much as you are. It might be interesting to see what you think of some of my ideas and other peoples' ideas on this subject. If you have realized, most of you at least, that this is one of those things that is giving you trouble and I suspect you may never understand it. You tremble, gasp for breath, and perspire. In some cases actually, your thoughts become disorganized, and I guess I don't have to tell you this, you forget what you have planned to say, and I think we have quite a few cases where the mind has gone almost completely blank. But then again maybe that is natural for this class. I don't know.

This condition should be a source of embarrassment, I think, or even acute distress. In a survey of various college groups about sixty percent of the students admitted that they were bothered by their nervousness in speaking but only slightly over a third of these students considered it a serious problem. I would guess that this ratio would *All underlined material was inserted by Instructor I.*
be much higher probably in this class since many of you have already exhibited nervousness in speaking. I have determined, therefore, to try to straighten out if I can, some of these problems.

I shall discuss the topic from four points of view: first, the general nature of this neurotic tendency, I think we can call it a neurotic tendency; secondly, causes which operate to infect you with it; thirdly, some of its typical symptoms and, lastly, procedures which must be followed, I think, if you ever hope to develop what we might call normality in speaking.

The feeling of nervousness in the speech situation has been experienced by professional performers and is not, therefore, restricted to amateurs like yourselves. Some actors, ministers, college professors, and business executives have reported by actual survey that they have had to live with a tendency to become jittery in speaking, I think. Only a fool believes that practice makes perfect calm. However, we must try to do what we can to help beginners and I think practice does help.

Nervousness is a malady which occurs in various kinds of situations. You may never have realized that your "stage fright" is the same kind of affliction as "buck fever," "job fright," "date jitters," or hysteria.

Stage fright is an emotional experience based on fear
of incompetence. The common causes of intense fear reactions are, with but a single exception, happily enough public speaking causes of violent death. All emotional responses appear in what is, or has been, for most of you a crisis situation. When one who is typically immature does not know what to do, he reacts emotionally rather than rationally.

Once you have been strongly conditioned to the emotional reaction, you may continue to have it in similar situations long after the original attack is forgotten.

As a typical emotional reaction, this stage fright is experienced with various degrees of intensity, as you know. If you have it in only a moderate degree, it may not be harmful at all to your speaking. It may even help. If this is true for you, you can be thankful then that it is not one of your worse faults. Now if it is a rather intensive reaction, and I think that many of you have evidenced that it might be then as you know, memory is inhibited, thinking is frustrated or disorganized, and your mind may even become a "complete blank."

Most people who have stage fright really we find are judges of the severity of their own reactions. Many of you underestimate your nervousness while it's possible that a few of you may overestimate your nervousness. Living with such a weakness has helped some persons to inhibit or cover
up their emotional reactions, but they are usually people who have the ability and drive to work at it diligently and intelligently. And of course that is a big if for this bunch here. I don't know if you can do it or if you can do it if you did do it. Evidence has indicated that some speakers cover up their faults so that they do not appear as nervous as they feel, this should give you a grain of satisfaction, I guess. I should now like to try to give you at least a faint glimmer of the causes of stage fright.

The causes of stage fright reactions you have are complexed and varied. We can not say that your condition is the result of any one flaw. You can't hope to make much sense out of the rationalization that it is an unlearned or inherited type of behavior, I don't think.

To understand the manner in which your fears and quaking have developed you ought to try to learn something of the nature of individual differences in emotional behavior. Some differences in emotional reaction are traceable to a weak bodily system. I mean by this, that our bodies actually differ in their susceptibility to react emotionally and to suffer emotional reactions, we are built differently glandularly, I guess. Besides our organic differences we also differ in the embarrassing experiences we have had, these are environmental. Some of these experiences have been accidental and some have been thrust upon us by unkind persons we have had to associate with perhaps.
What little relief you have had from your emotional handicaps may have developed through accidental learning and through teaching by others who have tried to knock some sense into you. This combination of differences leads to the conclusion that our emotional reactions are caused by inherited weaknesses and unhappy experiences. The predisposing causes to emotional reactions will be difficult, I think, for you to control, primarily because they are so darn deep rooted it is tough to do anything about them.

Many psychological handicaps in life result in tendencies to let emotions run rampant. One such psychological cause that you have all heard about is the "sheltered" life in which you have been shielded from stimulation by even mild crisis situations. I have wondered maybe we have some pampered darlings in here, this could get you into trouble.

A precipitating cause of nervousness need operate only once to condition you to fear reactions in a speech situation. One disastrous speaking experience is enough to cause you to experience fear, again and again. I don't know, you are the type of people who, - I think I can count on. Most of you as having had at least one disastrous experience other than having been born. There must have been something else that was disastrous. Some of you are affected by one element in the speech situation; some by another element. Various elements which arouse emotional
reactions and thus condition you to nervousness in speaking include: failure to anticipate the appearance of a person or the occurrence of an event, and this can frighten the daylights out of all of us; the reactions of a member of an audience, such as criticism, this hurts once in a while; sudden awareness of your mistakes or deficiencies; and the failure or imagined failure to do as well as even you know you should be doing.

The nervous reactions for some of you may even have been inflicted on you by such minor factors as a room or type of room, a person or type of person, a speech situation or type of speech activity. When your frail security appears to be threatened, or you have no idea about how to respond, your limited defense against your emotional response is shattered and your emotions bully you.

Failure to understand the nature of your emotional responses causes you to be confused and frustrated about them, I am sure. Under these circumstances you become panicky, and your affliction tends to become intensified. This response frequently occurs even to one who speaks reasonably well, but who is unfamiliar with speech standards and therefore unable to judge his speech achievements with objectivity, and that's why if you can gain some objectivity some of your fright will be gone. If you demand false standard of perfection in your performance and believe that you have failed, then you are practically
liicked, you have set the stage for your own unnerving. I hope that familiarity with these stage fright features should bring home to at least a few of you the need for an understanding of the nature of your emotion. It may be too much to hope that you have the ambition and intelligence to act accordingly. Precipitating causes are not so apt to operate when you can understand your emotional responses if you have the capacity to do so.

The symptoms of emotional behavior in stage fright which I think are so unnerving to you can be summed up as follows:

First, withdrawal, a symptom which most sufferers from stage fright exhibit. It breaks out in habits such as looking at the floor, ceiling, out of the window, over the heads of the listeners, leaning backward with the weight principally on one heel, putting the hands in pockets or behind the back hiding behind a table or speaker's stand. And this simply represents flight from the unpleasant stimulus, and forms of cowardicy I suspect.

There are also physiological symptoms of stage fright, which you are well aware of, such as pounding of the heart, increase in the rate of heart beat, gasping for breath, dry mouth, perspiration and blushing or blanching. These are all the result of changes in physiological processes associated with all fear reactions. The sinking feeling
which most of you have felt in the pit of the stomach is likewise associated with these physical changes.

Still another of your symptoms of nervousness in speaking is tension and muscular conflict. When your organism is energized in conflict and then fails to use up this energy in struggle or flight, you tend to use up the energy in tension, in trembling and in fidgeting. This trembling occurs in those regions most responsive which are the antagonistic or opposite muscle pairs -- the vocal folds, the finer muscles of the face, the arms, the hands and the knees. This is similar to the vibrations of the fenders of a "model T" when the motor is raced while the car is stationary.

Nervous reactions in speaking affect voice control in many ways. One of the most common effects is to raise your pitch, which, probably, explains why our two girls speak in a higher pitch once in awhile perhaps then normally and I suspect if improvement comes this will come down a little bit. And several of you fellows in here have a tendency to speak a little high and maybe you are worried about it, sound weak and childish when you speak. Since tension in the vocal folds is one of the factors determining the pitch of the voice, it is easy to see how the stress of emotional reactions acts to produce an unusually high pitch. Monotony and harshness of voice are also symptoms of difficulty in controlling the vocal chords
under tension.

A final factor, descriptive of the affliction of stage fright is the general emotional feeling of the speaker. You are jittery, embarrassed, mystified, disgusted, apologetic, sheepish, and altogether unhappy and maybe even weepy.

As I have already implied your capacity for emotional response is biological. Your intellectual behavior, however, is something you learn. The ability to thwart or reduce your emotional responses is a form of intellectual behavior. Thus, the two types of behavior in a sense fight for control of your organism.

If your mind is to function at its best, it would seem necessary to keep from blowing your top. This situation leads to what may be called the law of stage fright control:

"anything which may be done to increase the efficiency of intellectual activity or to reduce the intensity of emotional reaction will help in developing confidence in the speech situation."

Reeducational techniques are often applied to develop control over these symptoms of emotional reaction, to eliminate their causes and to prevent the development of this type of reaction. It should be recognized, however, that there is no single method which will work to control the fears of all of you. Some practices which may help one
person might not help you. The best possible method for you is a matter for you to discover as an individual. A reasonable amount of effort intelligently applied can go a long way toward the desired result. Most of this class, I think, can be expected to have difficulty in over-coming nervous reactions since you have shown little tendency to put forth enough intelligent effort to conquer your stage fright. There may be persons, who are not able to conquer their fears. I don't know. From what I've observed so far, there might be some of you in this predicament. I think you can do something for yourselves in learning to live with your handicap, if it is one.

You might ask, is there any hope that you can control the nervous reactions that many of you exhibit in speaking? I shall classify the principal suggestions I have to offer under the two parts of the law of stage fright control which I have already mentioned, namely, for those who weren't paying attention, reducing the intensity of emotional reactions and increasing the efficiency of intellectual activity. It should be understood, however, that in many cases these gimmicks overlap in their influence. Some techniques which reduce the intensity of emotion also build up cortical or intellectual control. I shall discuss first those methods which contribute most directly to the reduction of the intensity of the fear reaction.
The first suggestion that I have to offer here would be to study the psychology of emotion. As you have heard many times, "you are afraid of what you don't understand." Thus, to understand stage fright you must understand the psychology of emotion, and this may be a big job. If you are really concerned about the matter, you should start immediately to read and study the psychology of emotion. I suppose that is too much to expect of most of you.

Secondly, think and talk about your emotions as an objective fact. Remember "confession is good for the soul." This process is sometimes called "mental catharsis" and is often used by psychiatrists.

Still another suggestion would be to learn to make up your minds about your personal conflicts, whether they be imagined or real psychological differences. For instance, your inferiority complexes are often merely imagined or due to irresponsible suggestions of inferiority. I think there are a lot of people in that particular category right here. Some of our conflicts develop as a result of competition among our desires -- the desire to excel versus the desire not to appear egotistical, the desire to talk about one's self as opposed to the desire not to brag, are good examples, I think.

A further suggestion might be to fight your unpleasant, frustrating emotions with their opposites. This is
called compensation in psychology. Several examples of this reaction are whistling when you are afraid; losing yourself in work as a distraction from grief, and, applied to speech, getting so worked up about your subject that it does seem to make an honest difference to you.

Another suggestion to help reduce the intensity of your emotional reactions in speech would be to develop habits of voluntary relaxation and control of activity. Some methods which have been known to work for those who aren't stupid are yawning, stretching, taking deep breaths and flexing their muscles.

Finally, see if you can exercise enough sense to avoid trying to do the impossible with physical and mental strain. Control your environment as much as you are able. Get your necessary rest before speaking even though many of you are probably not getting enough rest at present. This may help reduce your nervousness.

Now, I am going to dole out to you a few suggestions for increasing the efficiency of what intellectual ability you have.

The first of these is to know what is reasonably to be expected of a speaker. It's about time you got over bluffing about this. Don't try to please everyone in speaking. This is the surest way I know to drive yourself into an emotional crisis. You ought to be satisfied with
the reasonable expectations of a reasonable audience.

Secondly, you should use devices in speaking which will prompt even a dull memory. Some of these devices are the use of stories, anecdotes, examples, and personal experiences. Using notes to refresh your memory, I think, is to be discouraged because lazy people will be inclined to read from them and depend upon them too much.

Still further gimmicks would be to use directed movement to keep the mind active. Ways of accomplishing this would be to use deliberate pauses, to move from one side of the rostrum to the other purposively, to take a drink of water and to repeat an idea previously stated.

Finally, and probably most important, try to get at least some faint idea during the next few weeks as to what effective speaking really should be. This will go a long ways toward objectifying some of your problems.
PRAISE SPEECH AS DELIVERED BY INSTRUCTOR II*

A class as good as this one doesn't need a lecture on confidence in speaking if its purpose were merely immediate self improvement. But even good speakers ought to learn enough about it to help others and perhaps to prepare to avoid any unusual reactions which might arise. Since you already feel confident and enjoy your speaking, you may not realize how frequently the opposite kind of situation occurs. Persons who lack confidence tremble, gasp for breath and perspire. In a few extreme cases they might have difficulty remembering what they had planned to say and this is quite an extreme case and even fail to remember the ideas they had prepared.

Freedom from this condition of stage fright is a source of attainment and satisfaction. In a survey of college groups almost seventy-five percent of the students admitted that they were bothered by their lack of confidence in speaking and well over a third of these students considered it a serious problem. The ratio might be better in this class since in general you have exhibited real confidence in your speaking. Even if some of you might feel that you have lacked confidence or wondered whether or not it is a serious problem, it probably isn't for you.

* All underlined material was inserted by Instructor II.
To help you understand this subject of stage fright more thoroughly we shall discuss it from four points of view: First, the general nature of confidence; second, causes which operate to reduce it; thirdly, some of the typical symptoms where it is lacking, and lastly, procedures which may be followed in developing confidence and poise in speaking.

The lack of confidence in the speech situation is experienced by many professional speakers and is not, therefore, restricted to the amateur. You should be pleased that you do not lack confidence when speaking in public. Just remember that actors, ministers, college professors and business executives report that they have suffered with this very problem. Thus, it seems that practice does not assure complete confidence even though it might help increase it.

Lack of confidence appears in various kinds of situations besides speaking. Less confidence persons often experience mild forms of such reactions as "buck fever," job or "date jitters."

Lack of confidence is a typical emotional experience based on fear. The common causes of intense fear are, with but a single exception, causes of violent death. The emotional responses usually appear in what is or has been for the individual a crisis situation. When a person does not know what to do, he reacts emotionally. Once a less
able person has been strongly conditioned to an emotional reaction, it may continue to appear in similar situations long after the specific cause situation is forgotten.

As a typical emotional reaction, lack of confidence is experienced with various degrees of intensity. If it appears in only a moderate degree, it may actually pep up the speaker. If it appears as an intense reaction, which certainly you have not outwardly manifested, it inhibits the intellectual activities so that memory is disturbed, thinking is frustrated or disorganized and the mind may even become a "complete blank."

The individual may be a poor judge of the severity of his own reactions. **Most of you in fact tend** to overemphasize your nervousness. It is possible that a few of you may be underestimating it. Training has helped many persons to inhibit or cover up their emotional reactions, but one must work at it as diligently as you do. Evidence has indicated that speakers do not appear as nervous as they feel. Now let us turn our thoughts to the cause of a lack of confidence.

The causes are usually complex and varied. We can not say that nervousness in speaking is the result of any one factor. It is almost inconceivable that such reactions should be unlearned or inherited types of behavior.

To understand the manner in which speech fears may
develop it is necessary that we know something of the nature of individual differences in emotional behavior. Some differences in emotional reaction are traceable to organic differences. We mean by this, that our bodies differ in their capacities to react emotionally. Besides our organic differences we also differ in the experiences we have had which are not biologically adequate causes of emotional reactions. Some of these experiences have been accidental and some have been thrust upon us by persons in our environment.

The skills that you acquire in emotional control are developed through incidental learning and through planned teaching by others and, therefore, differ from individual to individual. This combination of differences leads to the conclusion that our emotional reactions are caused by predisposing (inherent in the body or background) and precipitating (environmental) factors. The predisposing causes to emotional reactions are difficult to control, primarily because we know least about them at the present.

Many psychologically predisposing conditions result in tendencies to respond with uncontrolled emotion. One such psychological cause is the "sheltered" life, I am sure you have heard the term, in which the individual has been shielded from stimulation by even mild crisis situations. This could not be a factor influencing the speech
of members of this class since you seem to take things in good stride.

A precipitating cause of nervousness need operate only once to condition the individual to fear reactions in a particular situation. One distasteful experience in speaking could thus condition you to experience fear in future speaking situations, although this is not likely to happen to you. Some persons are conditioned by one element in the speech situation; some by another element. Various elements (stimuli) which may arouse emotional reactions and thus condition the speaker to nervousness in speaking include: failure to anticipate the appearance of a person or the occurrence of an event; the reactions of an audience, such as criticism or manner of behavior; sudden awareness of a mistake or deficiency; and the failure or imagined failure to meet a standard. This class should have little concern about such items. As a group you measure up pretty well.

Nervous reaction may also be conditioned to such factors as a room or type of room, a person or type of person, a speech situation or type of speech activity. When the security of the individual appears to be threatened, or he does not know how to respond, his defense against his emotional response is shattered and his emotions take control.
Failure to understand the nature of emotional response may cause less well adjusted individuals to be mystified and worried about it. Under these circumstances they become panicky, and their lack of confidence increases. This response at times occurs even to one who speaks reasonably well, but who is unfamiliar with speech standards which are required by that particular audience and therefore unable to judge his speech achievements with objectivity. If the speaker demands a false standard of perfection in his performance and believes that he has failed, he has set the stage for his own unnerving. Familiarity with these characteristics of the stage fright reaction should bring home to you the need for an understanding of the nature of emotion since all of you seem intelligent and interested in improving your speech. Precipitating causes are not so apt to operate when the speaker understands his emotional responses as well as you apparently do.

What are the symptoms of emotional behavior in stage fright which are so mystifying to some?

First, withdrawal, a symptom which you may have observed in other people. It is manifested in habits such as looking at the floor, ceiling, out of the window, leaning backward with the weight principally on one heel, putting the hands in one's pockets or behind one's back and
retreating behind a table or speaker's stand, all represent incipient retreat or flight from what is conceived to be the unpleasant stimulus. There are also physiological symptoms of stage fright such as pounding of the heart, increase in the heart beat, gasping for breath, dry mouth, perspiration, and blushing or blanching. These are all results of changes in physiological processes associated with all fear reactions, not just stage fright. The sinking feeling which some people feel in the pit of the stomach is likewise probably associated with these physiological changes.

Still another symptom of nervousness in speaking is tension and muscular conflict. When the human organism is energized in conflict and then fails to use up this energy in struggle or flight, it tends to use up the energy in tension, trembling and in fidgeting. This trembling occurs in those regions which are most responsive, which are the antagonistic or opposite muscle pairs -- the vocal folds, the finer muscles of the face, the arms, the hands and knees. This is similar to the vibrations of the fenders of a "Model T" when the motor is raced while the car is stationary. You may find this difficult to understand because you have shown so little outward manifestations of these symptoms. If a few of you are tense you certainly have learned how to handle the situation well.
Nervous reactions in speaking affect voice control in many ways. One of the most common effects is to raise the pitch which would give the girls a high shrill voice and make the boys sound less mature when they speak. Since tension in the vocal folds is one of the factors determining the pitch of the voice, it is easy to see how the stress of emotional reactions acts to produce an unusually high pitch. Monotony and harshness of voice also arise from the difficulty of controlling the vocal chords under tension.

A final factor descriptive of the state of stage fright may be referred to as the psychological feelings of the speaker in his condition. The speaker may be jittery, embarrassed, mystified, disgusted, apologetic, sheepish and altogether unhappy.

As we have already implied man's capacity for emotional response is biological. Man's intellectual behavior, however, is something he learns. The ability to inhibit or lessen emotional responses is a form of intellectual behavior. Thus, the two types of behavior in a sense compete for control of the human organism. If intellectual reactions are to function at their best, it would seem necessary to inhibit intense emotional reactions. This situation leads to what we may call the law of stage fright control:
anything which may be done to increase the efficiency of intellectual activity or to reduce the intensity of emotional reaction will help in developing confidence in the speech situation.

Reeducational techniques are often applied to develop control over these symptoms of emotional reaction, to eliminate their causes and to prevent the development of this type of reaction. It should be recognized, however, that there is no simple method which will work for all persons in developing confidence. Some practices help one person but do not help another. The best possible method is a matter for individual discovery. For most individuals the reasonable amount of effort which you have applied will go a long way toward the desired result.

There are occasionally persons who do not seem to be able to conquer their fears. But even these rare persons, if they will, can do something for themselves in learning to live reasonably happy in spite of their condition. What you have done others can do. What others have done, you can do.

Now let me offer a few suggestions by which you may help others in controlling any nervous reactions they may have in speaking. We shall classify the principal suggestions offered under the two parts of the law of stage fright control which we have already mentioned. Namely, reducing the intensity of emotional reactions and increasing the efficiency of intellectual activity. It should be
understood, however, that in many cases they overlap. Some techniques which reduce the intensity of emotion also build up cortical or intellectual control. We shall consider first those methods which contribute most directly to the increase in self confidence.

The first suggestion I would like you to consider would be to study the psychology of emotion. As you have no doubt heard, "we are afraid of what we don't understand." Thus, to understand stage fright we must understand the psychology of emotion. If we are really serious about this matter we should start immediately to read about the psychology of emotion.

Secondly, the speaker should think and talk about his emotions as an objective fact. Remember, "confession is good for the soul." This process is sometimes called "mental catharsis" and is often used by psychiatrists.

Still another suggestion would be to resolve personal conflicts, by this we mean both imagined and real psychological differences. For instance, inferiority complexes are often merely imagined or due to irresponsible suggestions of inferiority which are not true. Some persons' conflicts develop as a result of competition among their desires. Desire to excel versus desire not to appear egotistical, desire to talk about one's self as opposed to desire not to brag, are excellent examples.
A further suggestion might be to fight unpleasant, frustrating emotions with pleasant stimulating emotions. This is called compensation in psychology. Some examples of this reaction are: whistling when afraid; losing oneself in work as a distraction from grief, and, applied to speaking, getting worked up about a subject the way many of you are able to do.

Another suggestion to help reduce the intensity of emotional reactions in speech would be to develop habits of voluntary relaxation and control of activity. Some methods which have proved successful are yawning, stretching, taking deep breaths and flexing your muscles.

Finally, advise such people to not submit unnecessarily to severe mental and physical strain while speaking. They should control the environment and get necessary rest before speaking. Most of you, apparently know how to do this.

Now, let us turn our attention to a few suggestions for aiding in increasing the efficiency of intellectual activity.

The first of these is to know what is reasonably to be expected of a speaker. A speaker shouldn't try to please everyone in speaking. He should only be concerned with the reasonable expectations of a reasonable audience.

Secondly, use devices in speaking which will facili-
tate memory for speech materials. Some of these devices, and these you could name yourself I am sure, would be, the use of stories, anecdotes, examples, and personal experiences. A speaker may use notes to refresh his memory but should not read from them or depend upon them too much.

Still a further suggestion would be to use directed movement to keep the mind active. Ways of doing this would be the use of deliberate pauses, moving from one side of the rostrum to the other purposively, and repeating a previously stated idea.

Finally, and probably most important, you should try to develop in others the effective philosophy for speaking which you so ably demonstrated.
I'm going to talk to you about a problem which appears to bother members of this class more than most. I don't really recall teaching a class in which there were so many people who had some form of "stage fright." If you have not realized that this is one of the things that's wrong with you, then you probably never will. You trem­ble, gasp for breath, and perspire. Your thoughts become disorganized, you forget what you had planned to say, and in some cases your mind appears to turn a complete blank.

This condition should be a source of embarrassment or even acute distress. In a survey of various college groups about sixty per cent of the students admitted that they were bothered by their nervousness in speaking but only slightly over a third of these students considered it a serious problem. I would guess that this class' ratio is higher since many of you have already exhibited nervousness in speaking. I have determined, therefore, to try to straighten you out on these problems.

I shall discuss the topic from four points of view: first, the general nature of this neurotic tendency, secondly, causes which operate to infect you with it; thirdly, some of its typical symptoms, and lastly, procedures which must be followed if you ever hope to develop
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normality in speaking.

The feeling of nervousness in the speech situation has been experienced by professional performers and is not, therefore, restricted to amateurs like yourselves. Some actors, ministers, college professors, and business executives have reported that they have had to live with a tendency to become jittery in speaking. Only a fool believes that practice makes for perfect calm. However, we must try to do what we can to help beginners such as you.

Nervousness is a malady which occurs in various kinds of situations. You may never have realized that your "stage fright" is the same kind of affliction as "buck fever," "job fright," "date jitters," or hysteria.

Stage fright is an emotional experience based on fear of incompetence. The common causes of intense fear reactions are, with but a single exception, causes of violent death. The single exception is speaking in public. When one who is typically immature does not know what to do, he reacts emotionally.

Once you have been strongly conditioned to the emotional reaction, you may continue to have it in similar situations long after the original attack is forgotten.

As a typical emotional reaction, stage fright is experienced with various degrees of intensity. If you have it in only a moderate degree consider yourself fortun-
ate, it may not be harmful to your speaking. If this is true be very thankful for it. If it is a rather intense reaction, which so many of this class has evidenced, the memory is inhibited, thinking is frustrated or disorganized, and your mind may even become a "complete blank."

Most people who have stage fright are poor judges of the severity of their own reactions. Many of you underestimate your nervousness while it's possible that a few of you may overestimate your nervousness. Living with such a weakness has helped some persons to inhibit or cover up their emotional reactions, but they are usually people who have the ability and drive to work at it diligently and intelligently which many of you apparently for some reason or other are not so inclined to do at the moment. Evidence has indicated that some speakers cover up their faults so that they do not appear as nervous as they feel, this may give you a grain of satisfaction.

The causes of stage fright reactions you have are complex and varied. We can not say that your condition is the result of any one flaw. You can't hope to make much sense out of the rationalization that it is an unlearned or inherited type of behavior.

To understand the manner in which your fears and quaking have developed you ought to try to learn something of the nature of individual differences in emotional be-
havior. Some differences in emotional reaction are traceable to a weak bodily system. I mean by this, that our bodies differ in their susceptibility to react emotionally and to suffer emotional reactions. Besides our organic differences we also differ in the embarrassing experiences we have had. Some of these experiences have been accidental and some have been thrust upon us by unkind persons we have had to associate with.

What little relief you have had from your emotional handicaps may have developed through accidental learning or through some specific teaching experience. This combination of differences leads to the conclusion that our emotional reactions are caused by inherited weaknesses and unhappy experiences. The predisposing causes to emotional reactions will be difficult for you to control, primarily because they are too deep rooted to do anything about.

Many psychological handicaps in life result in tendencies to let the emotions run rampant. One such psychological cause is the "sheltered" life in which you have been shielded from stimulation by even mild crisis situations. No doubt some of you fit in this class sometimes.

A precipitating cause of nervousness need operate only once to condition you to fear reactions in a speech situation. One disastrous speaking experience is enough to cause you to experience fear, again and again.
pect that most of you have had this one disastrous experience. This obviously will account for your nervousness. Some of you are affected by one element in the speech situation; some by another element. Various elements which arouse emotional reactions and thus condition you to nervousness in speaking include: failure to anticipate the appearance of a person or the occurrence of an event; the reactions of a member of an audience, such as criticism; sudden awareness of your mistakes or deficiencies; and the failure or imagined failure to do as well as even you know you should be doing.

The nervous reactions for some of you may even have been inflicted on you by such minor factors as a room or type of room, a person or type of person, a speech situation or type of speech activity. When your frail security appears to be threatened, or you have no idea about how to respond, your limited defense against your emotional response is shattered and your emotions bully you.

Failure to understand the nature of your emotional responses causes you to be confused and frustrated about them. Under these circumstances you become panicky, and your affliction tends to become intensified. This response frequently occurs even to one who speaks reasonably well, but who is unfamiliar with speech standards and therefore unable to judge his speech achievements with objectivity.
If you demand a false standard of perfection in your performance and believe that you have failed, you have set the stage for the failure you experience. I hope that familiarity with these stage fright features should bring home to at least a few of you the need for an understanding of the nature of your emotion. It may be too much to hope that you have the ambition to act accordingly. Precipitating causes are not so apt to operate when you can understand your emotional responses if you have the capacity to do so.

The symptoms of emotional behavior in stage fright so unnerving to you can be summed up as follows:

First, withdrawal, a symptom which most sufferers from stage exhibit. It breaks out in habits such as looking at the floor, ceiling, out of the window, over the heads of the listeners, leaning backward with the weight principally on one heel, putting the hands in pockets or behind the back, hiding behind a table or speaker's stand. All this cowardice simply represents flight from the unpleasant stimulus.

There are also physiological symptoms of stage fright such as pounding of the heart, increase in the rate of heart beat, gasping for breath, dry mouth, perspiration and blushing or blanching. These are all the result of changes in physiological processes associated with all fear reactions including stage fright. The sinking feeling which
most of you have felt in the pit of the stomach is likewise associated with these physical changes.

Still another of your symptoms of nervousness in speaking is tension and muscular conflict. When your organism is energized in conflict and then fails to use up this energy in struggle or flight, you tend to use up the energy in tension, in trembling and in fidgeting. This trembling occurs in those regions most responsive which are the antagonistic or opposite muscle pairs - the vocal folds, the finer muscles of the face, the arms, the hands and the knees. This is similar to the vibrations of the fenders of a "model T" when the motor is raced while the car is stationary. I know from observations right in this class that many of you have had this experience and know what this symptom is, at least those of you who have been tense, or trembly, or fidgety.

Nervous reactions in speaking affect voice control in many ways. One of the most common effects is to raise your pitch, which explains why many of you girls speak in a higher and somewhat more shrill voice than normal, and several of fellows speak in a somewhat more immature manner. Since tension in the vocal folds is one of the factors determining the pitch of the voice, it is easy to see how the stress of emotional reactions acts to produce an unusually high pitch. Monotony and harshness of voice are
also symptoms of difficulty in controlling the vocal chords under tension.

A final factor, descriptive of the affliction of stage fright is the general emotional feeling of the speaker. You are jittery, embarrassed, mystified, disgusted, apologetic, sheepish, and altogether weepy.

As I have already implied your capacity for emotional response is biological. Your intellectual behavior, however, is something you learn. The ability to thwart or reduce your emotional responses is a form of intellectual behavior. Thus, the two types of behavior in a sense fight for control of your organism.

If your mind is to function at its best, it would seem necessary to keep from losing control. This situation leads to what may be called the law of stage fright control:

anything which may be done to increase the efficiency of intellectual activity or to reduce the intensity of emotional reaction will help in the developing confidence in the speech situation.

Reeducational techniques are often applied to develop control over these symptoms of emotional reaction, to eliminate their causes and to prevent the development of this type of reaction. It should be recognized, however, that there is no single method which will work to control the fears of all of you! Some practices which may help one person might not help you! The best possible method for
you is a matter for you to discover as an individual. A reasonable amount of effort intelligently applied can go a long way toward the desired result. Most of this class, however, can be expected to have difficulty in over­coming nervous reactions since you have shown little tendency to put forth enough effort to conquer your stage fright. There may be persons who are not able to conquer their fears. From what I've observed so far, there might be two or three of you in this predicament. But even you, if you will, can do something for yourselves in learning to live with your handicap.

You might ask, is there any hope that you can control the nervous reactions that many of you exhibit in speaking? I shall classify the principal suggestions I have to offer under the two parts of the law of stage fright control which I have already mentioned, namely, for those of you who weren't paying attention, reducing the intensity of emotional reactions and increasing the efficiency of intellectual activity. It should be understood, however, that in many cases these gimmicks overlap in their influence. Some techniques which reduce the intensity of emotion also build up cortical or intellectual control. I shall discuss first those methods which contribute most directly to the reduction of the intensity of the fear reaction.

The first suggestion that I have to offer here would be to study the psychology of emotion. As you have heard
many times, "you are afraid of what you don't understand." Thus, to understand stage fright you must understand the psychology of emotion. If you have any ambition at all about this matter you should start immediately to read and study the psychology of emotion. I suppose that is too much to expect of most of you.

Secondly, think and talk about your emotions as an objective fact. Remember "confession is good for the soul." This process is sometimes called "mental catharsis" and is often used by psychiatrists.

Still another suggestion would be to learn to make up your minds about your personal conflicts, whether they be imagined or real psychological differences. For instance, your inferiority complexes are often merely imagined or due to irresponsible suggestions of inferiority. Some of our conflicts develop as a result of competition among our desires - the desire to excel versus the desire not to appear egotistical, the desire to talk about one's self as opposed to the desire not to brag, are good examples.

A further suggestion might be to fight your unpleasant, frustrating emotions with their opposites. This is called compensation in psychology. Several examples of this reaction are whistling when you are afraid; losing yourself in work as a distraction from grief, and, applied to speech, getting so worked up about your subject that it does seem to make an honest difference to you.
Another suggestion to help reduce the intensity of your emotional reactions in speech would be to develop habits of voluntary relaxation and control of activity. Some methods which have been known to work for those who aren't completely stupid are yawning, stretching, taking deep breaths and flexing their muscles.

Finally, see if you can exercise enough judgment to avoid trying to do the impossible with physical and mental strain. Control your environment as much as you are able. Get your necessary rest before speaking not when you come to class. This may help reduce your nervousness.

Now, I am going to dole out to you a few suggestions for increasing the efficiency of what intellectual ability you have.

The first of these is to know what is reasonably to be expected of a speaker. It is about time you faced facts about this. Don't try to please everyone in speaking. You ought to be satisfied with the reasonable expectations of a reasonable audience.

Secondly, you should use devices in speaking which will prompt even a dull memory. Some of these devices are the use of stories, anecdotes, examples, and personal experiences. Using notes to refresh your memory is to be discouraged because lazy people will be inclined to read from them and depend upon them too much.
Still further gimmicks would be to use directed movement to keep the mind active. Ways of accomplishing this would be to use deliberate pauses, to move from one side of the rostrum to the other purposively, to take a drink of water and to repeat an idea previously stated.

Finally, and probably most important, try to get at least some faint ideas during the next few weeks as to what effective speaking really should be.
INFORMATION QUIZ ON LECTURES

1. In a survey of various college groups the percent who admitted that they were bothered by nervousness in speaking is over:
   a. 20
   b. 30
   c. 40
   d. 50
   e. 60

2. The individual may be a poor judge of the severity of his own lack of confidence because:
   a. Other speakers do not feel as nervous as they appear.
   b. Observers may not be able to see how successfully another speaker covers up his fears.
   c. Observers can ordinarily tell when a speaker feels nervous.
   d. We have no knowledge of the frequency with which speakers experience fear.
   e. The speaker can not see himself as others see him.

3. A nervous reaction similar to stage fright is
   a. Work fatigue
   b. Headache
   c. Date jitters
   d. Indigestion
   e. Mental catharsis
4. Stage fright reactions are
   a. Acquired or learned reactions
   b. Biological or unlearned reactions
   c. Sometimes acquired and sometimes biological reactions
   d. Neither acquired or biological reactions
   e. Mainly organic reactions

5. The cause of lack of confidence are
   a. Simple and obvious
   b. Complex and varied
   c. Vague and unknown
   d. Concrete and explainable
   e. Mysterious and unknown

6. According to the lecture the common causes of fear reactions, with but a single exception, arise from fear of
   a. Social unacceptability
   b. Economic ruin
   c. Vocational failure
   d. Violent death
   e. Academic failure

7. According to the lecture the single exception among the common causes of fear reactions
   a. Meeting new people
b. Applying for a job
c. Talking with superiors
d. Making new friends
e. Speaking in public

8. Indirectness of eye contact may be explained best as
   a. A withdrawal reaction
   b. A physiological reaction
   c. A muscular reaction
d. An organic reaction
e. Biological reaction

9. Trembling is a function of the need for
   a. A withdrawal reaction
   b. Resolving a conflict between intellectual and emotional behavior.
   c. Getting necessary rest before speaking
d. Release of excess muscular energy
e. More systematic preparation

10. The nervous system which determines intellectual control is the
    a. Cerebro-spinal nervous system
    b. Thalamic nervous system
e. Cortical nervous system
d. Autonomic nervous system
e. Cranial nervous system
11. The reeducation of emotions usually is
   a. A simple method which will work pretty well for all people
   b. A more rapid process than their education
   c. A complex method which will work pretty well for everybody
   d. A matter which is best handled on individual basis
   e. An impossible process to put into effect

12. A speaker sets the stage for his own lack of confidence when he demands:
   a. A false standard of perfection in speaking
   b. Little attention from his audience
   c. A speaking environment with which he is familiar
   d. A lower standard than he is capable of accomplishing
   e. Only the preparation he can give the particular speech

13. Trembling usually occurs in those regions of the body most responsive to:
   a. The autonomic nervous system
   b. Physiological reactions
   c. Conflicts of the more responsive opposite muscle pairs
   d. Conditioning
   e. Reeducational techniques
14. Man's capacity for emotional response is primarily
   a. Environmental
   b. Educational
   c. Social
   d. Biological
   e. Cultural

15. The effort to control emotional response is a form of:
   a. Intellectual behavior
   b. Animal behavior
   c. Social behavior
   d. Atypical behavior
   e. Immature behavior

16. One of the most common vocal effects of the lack of confidence is:
   a. To lower the pitch
   b. To raise the pitch
   c. To increase the quality
   d. To lessen the rate
   e. To develop more inflection
17. The conflict between the wish to excel and the wish not to appear egotistical is a good example of:

a. Conflicts developing as a result of competition among our desires
b. Fighting unpleasant emotions with pleasant
c. Developing an effective philosophy for speaking
d. A speaker demanding a false standard of perfection
e. Psychological reactions of the speaker to his feelings

18. Counting to ten when one is angry is a good example of attempting:

a. Mental catharsis
b. Compensation
c. Inferiority complexes
d. Cortical control
e. Emotional frustration

19. Such reactions as being jittery, embarrassed, disgusted, apologetic, sheepish, or weepy are all indicative of

a. A speaker's psychological reactions to his condition
b. The precipitating nature of the stage fright stimulus
c. The amount of experience a speaker has had
d. The degree of preparation a speaker has made
e. The biologically adequate nature of the stimulus.
20. Evidence indicates that most speakers appear
   a. About as nervous as they feel
   b. More nervous than they feel
   c. Less nervous than they feel
   d. More or less nervous to different people
   e. More nervous at one time than another.

21. One of the best methods of reducing the intensity of emotional reactions in speaking is to
   a. Develop an effective intellectual philosophy for speaking
   b. Know what is reasonably to be expected of a speaker
   c. Use notes to refresh your memory
   d. Study the psychology of emotions
   e. Prepare as thoroughly as possible

22. Talking about your emotions as an objective fact is a form of:
   a. Compensation techniques
   b. Motivation techniques
   c. Identification techniques
   d. Projection techniques
   e. Mental catharsis techniques
23. According to the lecture lack of confidence in the speech situation is:
   a. Experienced by many professional speakers
   b. Experienced only by beginning speakers
   c. Experienced by very few speakers
   d. Experienced by a minority of amateur speakers
   e. Experienced more by college men than women

24. The predisposing causes of emotional reactions are difficult to control because:
   a. They are different in every individual.
   b. We know least about them at the present time
   c. They are easily camouflaged.
   d. They are matters for medical doctors
   e. We can not measure them

25. The two types of behavior which compete for control of one's organism when speaking in public are emotional behavior and:
   a. Social behavior
   b. Mature behavior
   c. Intellectual behavior
   d. Purposive behavior
   e. Cultural behavior
26. Anything which can be done to increase the efficiency of intellectual activity or reduce the intensity of emotional response is
   a. A symptom of stage fright
   b. A principle of stage fright control
   c. A precipitating cause of stage fright
   d. An over-simplification of the procedure involved in developing confidence
   e. A crutch to be avoided in the development of confidence

27. The telling of a humorous anecdote to aid in the development of confidence best illustrates the technique of
   a. Talking about your emotions as an objective fact
   b. Resolving personal conflicts
   c. Using voluntary relaxation techniques
   d. Controlling emotion with emotion
   e. Using directed movement to keep the mind active

28. Among the predisposing causes of stage fright we may not find
   a. Chemical imbalance in the body
   b. The existence of psychological conflicts and uncertainties
   c. The appearance of disturbing stimuli which are biologically adequate causes of emotion
d. A sheltered life in which one has no experience in meeting crisis situations

e. A sudden awareness of a mistake or deficiency

29. Which of the following recommended is not a part of decreasing undesirable tensions for speaking:

a. Yawning

b. Stretching

c. Deep breathing

d. Flexing muscles

e. Taking a sedative

30. A principle which does not apply to the development of confidence is

a. The efficiency of one's intellectual activity should be increased.

b. The intensity of one's emotional response should be reduced.

c. One should discuss his emotions objectively.

d. One can be assured of perfect calm by practice.

e. One should develop an effective intellectual philosophy for speaking.

31. Which one of the following elements is least likely to be cited as a stimulus which would arouse emotional reactions in a speaker

a. The failure to anticipate the appearance of a person or the occurrence of an event.

b. The reactions of members of the audience.
c. A sudden awareness of a mistake.

d. A real or imagined failure to meet a standard

e. The speaker's failure to cover all the points he had planned.

32. Which of the following is not a method of increasing the efficiency of intellectual activity:

   a. Knowing what is reasonably to be expected of a speaker

   b. Developing an effective philosophy for speaking

   c. Using directed movements to keep the mind active

   d. Talking about your lack of confidence as an objective fact

   e. Using devices which will facilitate memory for speech materials.

33. The condition which is least descriptive of the overall feeling of many speakers experiencing stage fright is:

   a. Embarrassed

   b. Disgusted

   c. Apologetic

   d. Indifferent

   e. Sheepish

34. Which of the following devices is not used to facilitate memory in speaking

   a. Organization of material

   b. Knowing what is expected of one as a speaker
c. Using ideas from personal experience

d. Arranging material in a story form

e. Using notes to refresh memory
## CLASSROOM SPEECH RATING SCALE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rater</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Speech attitudes and adjustments |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| Voice and Articulation |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| Bodily Postures and Action |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| Language |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| Content |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| Organization |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| Audience Interest and Adaptation |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| General Effectiveness |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| Total |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |

Rank order of all speakers of the day

Turn sheet sidewise and write in any comments
ATTITUDES, BEHAVIOR AND PROCEDURE TO BE ADOPTED IN PERMISSIVE, AND RESTRICTIVE CLASSES

ATTITUDES

RESTRICTIVE - REPROOF

I. Disciplinary - Punishing
   A. Negatively critical
      1. Blameful (faultfinding)
      2. Discouraging
   B. Indifference
      1. With individual problems
      2. More concern for subject matter
   C. Austerity
   D. Dominance
   E. Severity
      1. In respect to criticism and
      2. Demands and requirements

PERMISSIVE - PRAISE

I. (Disciplinary) Rewarding
   A. Positively critical
      1. Praise (virtue seeking)
      2. Encouraging
   B. Concern - High degree
      1. For individual problems
      2. Less concern for subject matter
   C. Gentle - helpful
   D. Submissiveness
   E. Lenity
      1. In respect to criticism and
      2. Demands and requirements

BEHAVIOR

I. Negatively Critical
   A. Criticism based on finding fault
      1. Use of reproof
      2. Use of disapproval
      3. Use of sarcasm and ridicule

II. Establishing a distinct barrier between teacher and class
    1. By use of dignity, austerity and formality
    2. Insistence upon use by the class of title (Mr., Dr., Prof.)

I. Positively Critical
   A. Criticism based on finding good
      1. Use of praise
      2. Use of encouragement

II. Establishing a friendly, cooperative rapport between teacher and class
    1. By being friendly and helpful
    2. An attempt to discourage use of titles as Dr. or Prof.
RESTRICTIVE - REPROOF

III. Establishing a formalized classroom atmosphere

1. Adherence to a rigid set of rules of procedure

PERMISSIVE - PRAISE

III. Establishing a relaxed classroom atmosphere

1. Lack of a rigid set of rules

PROCEDURE TO BE FOLLOWED IN TEACHING

ASSIGNMENTS

I. Negatively presented
   A. Based on threats of punishment and/or dire consequences

II. Rigidly adhered to
   A. Assignments due on time
      1. No excuses accepted
      2. No exceptions
      3. No variation

I. Positively presented
   A. Based on benefits and rewards to be desired

II. Laxity
   A. Based on understanding of individual differences
      1. Legitimate excuses accepted
      2. Sympathy for individual problems

RESTRICTIVE - REPROOF

Speaking Order

I. Speaking order set by instructor
   A. Several days to a week in advance

PERMISSIVE - PRAISE

I. Students volunteer for order
   A. Everyone in class should be encouraged to fulfill each speaking assignment
Criticism

I. Negatively presented
   A. Emphasis on instructor ratings
      1. Based on reproof
         a. Fault finding
         b. Blame stressed
      2. Praise kept to a minimum
   II. Publicly given in front of whole class

I. Positively presented
   A. Emphasis on student ratings
      1. Based on praise
         a. Virtue finding
         b. Praise stressed
      2. Reproof kept to a minimum
   II. Individually or privately given
DIRECTIONS FOR COMPLETING THE QUESTIONNAIRE

I. Please do not write on the typed questionnaire.

II. Mark in the appropriate column opposite each item number on the answer pad the degree to which your instructor has exhibited the type of behavior described by that number in the typed sheet. Use the following scale to indicate the degree you believe appropriate for each type of behavior indicated by the item.

1. Barely evident, exhibited very little by instructor
2. Seldom evident, exhibited to a small extent by instructor
3. Sometimes evident, exhibited to some extent by instructor
4. Often evident, exhibited to a considerable extent by instructor
5. Very evident, exhibited to a great extent by instructor

For example, for the following type of behavior you might consider that your instructor exhibited it to a considerable extent (often evident), therefore, you would mark the corresponding item on the answer sheet thusly:

Answer Pad

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Behavior</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Neat in dress and appearance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

III. Please mark every item.

IV. Make erasures clean and your corrections definite

V. Do not sign this questionnaire or the answer sheet.
SCALE OF REACTIONS TO THE BEHAVIOR OF SPEECH INSTRUCTORS AND THE ENVIRONMENT OF DIFFERENT CLASSES

1. Criticism is constructive and inclined to praise
2. Respect is shown for students' opinion and suggestions
3. Cross, crabby, grouchy
4. Has a sense of humor
5. Minimizes mistakes and misfortunes of class
6. Superior, aloof, haughty, or overbearing
7. Inconsiderate of pupils' feelings
8. Makes use of ridicule and sarcasm
9. Criticism inclined to blame, negatively constructed around fault finding
10. Friendly in manner, tone of voice and actions toward class
11. Alert to individual weaknesses and problems
12. Strict authority maintained and no questions allowed
13. Not superior or aloof in manner
14. Insists on order and strict obedience to rules
15. Inspires responses from pupils thus causing many to participate
16. Permits no incomplete or late work
17. Interest shown in all pupil effort no matter how small
18. Not tied excessively to rules or routine
19. Not helpful with work, problems, and assignments
20. Uses democratic procedures: promotes democracy as a way of life in the classroom
21. Dominates class, demands respect
22. Sympathetic to individual problems
23. Helpful with work, problems and assignments
24. Severely criticizes pupils in the presence of class
25. Human friendly, companionable, "one of us"
26. Appears interested in pupils and to understand them
27. Assignments reasonable
28. Helpful with students' problems, including matters outside of class work
29. Unreasonable assignments and homework
30. Is strict and arbitrary
31. Does not respect individual differences in students
32. Gives students a fair chance to make up work
33. Mean, unreasonable, hardboiled and intolerant
34. Very exacting, gives no chance to make up work
35. Friendly in discipline, maintains control of class without demanding respect
36. Changeable, inconsistent, unreliable
37. Reproves and condemns mistakes
38. Assignments are given in a vague and routine fashion
39. Disrespectful of students' opinions
40. Stifles students response thus restricting class discussion
41. Makes assignments interesting and challenging
42. Uses threats of poor grades and other punishments for motivating assignments
43. Encourages and motivates students to work for more grades
44. Does not encourage initiative
INTERVIEW SCHEDULE

I. Name, age, college, rank, standing in high school.

II. Point hour ratio.

III. How do you like Speech 401?

IV. How would you rate the instructor--strong, weak, average?

V. During the first five weeks of this course would you say that the instructor was:
   1. Easy or hard Why?
   2. Fair or unfair Why?
   3. Dictatorial or democratic Why?
   4. Friendly or cold Why?
   5. Critical or kind Why?
   6. Encouraging or discouraging Why?
   7. Understanding or indifferent Why?
   8. Fault finding or praiseful Why?
   9. Reasonable or Unreasonable Why?
  10. Lenient or rigid Why?

VI. During this same period of time did you find the class:
   1. Interesting or dull. Explain
   2. Dictatorial or democratic. Explain
   3. Formal or informal. Explain
   4. Enjoyable or miserable. Explain
   5. Challenging or stifling. Explain
   6. Different or average
VII. Did the class or instructor bother you in any way during this period? Explain.

VIII. Did you suffer any personal ill effects or discomfort from this class during this time?

IX. Do you feel that you can do your best work in this type of class and under this type of instructor?

X. Would you rather have an instructor who makes you "toe the mark" or one who allows a good deal of freedom.

XI. A. Considering the instructors or teachers you have experienced, which of the above types do you think taught you the most?

B. Which did you do your best work under?

C. Which did you enjoy the most?

XII. A. Do you believe that an effective teacher must require strict adherence to rules, assignments, etc. with no exceptions, or

B. Do you believe that an effective teacher takes into account individual differences, modifying the rules as they apply to individuals?

XIII. Which of the following types of instructors would you respect the most?

A. One who always maintains his dignity thereby creating a distance between himself and students.

B. One who at times forgets his dignity and comes down to the level of his students.

C. One who never assumes a dignity and becomes "one of the gang."

XIV. Are you motivated to work harder for an instructor who praises your efforts or finds fault with them?

XV. Are you motivated to do your best work by threats of punishment or promises of rewards?
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