BAKHTIN SPEAKING:
A DIALOGIC APPROACH FOR TEACHING
THE BASIC PUBLIC SPEAKING COURSE

by

MELISSA ANN BROECKELMAN

B.A., Kansas State University, 2004

A THESIS

Submitted in partial fulfillment of the

requirements for the degree

MASTER OF ARTS

Department of Speech Communication, Theatre, and Dance
College of Arts and Sciences

KANSAS STATE UNVERSITY
Manhattan, Kansas

2005

Approved by:

Major Professor
LeAnn Brazeal

COPYRIGHT

BAKHTIN SPEAKING:
A DIALOGIC APPROACH FOR TEACHING
THE BASIC PUBLIC SPEAKING COURSE

MELISSA ANN BROECKELMAN

2005

ABSTRACT

Though communication and learning theory suggest that human interaction is a key component that could enhance both processes, little has been done to incorporate these findings into the basic public speaking course. This study is an attempt to develop a dialogic approach for teaching the introductory college public speaking course. Through the incorporation of standardized analytic grading rubrics, instructor feedback prior to the public speaking performance, peer workshops, and peer evaluations of performances, a process-centered teaching approach is developed that has the potential to increase cognitive learning, improve the quality of student speeches, and increase the consistency between public speaking sections.

After implementing this teaching approach for one semester, the results showed an increase in cognitive learning but no improvement in the quality of student speeches or grading consistency. However, a review of other research and the qualitative data collected in this study suggest that there might be greater impacts than could be seen here and that this approach needs to be developed and implemented over a longer period of time for its effects to be fully seen.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

Chapter 1: Introduction

The purpose of the basic public speaking course at Kansas State University is to teach students the basic knowledge and skills for effective public speaking, and according to the course syllabi for SPCH 105 and 106, "the approach followed in this course is to **emphasize speech content and composition** rather than delivery or presentation of the speech" (Kansas State University, 2005a, 2005b, p. 2, emphasis in original). However, despite this stated emphasis and the discussion of the speech writing and revision process in the course textbook, *Creating Speeches,* this course does little to incorporate revision and feedback into the process of developing the speeches that the students actually give in class. This makes it difficult for students to fully understand what is expected of them and limit the levels of learning and quality of speeches that are actually given in the class.

Communication research has led to the development of several models of communication and education research has led to the development of more student-centered pedagogical approaches, yet little has been done to incorporate non-transmission approaches to speaking and teaching in the basic public speaking course. Furthermore, Graduate Teaching Assistants (GTAs) for the basic course at Kansas State University are permitted to use any methods of teaching and evaluation that they choose, so there is a significant amount of variation in the way speeches are graded among sections of the course. Since the basic public speaking course is a requirement at most colleges and universities and is often taught by graduate students, a similar situation can be seen at numerous schools (Gibson, Hanna, & Huddleston, 1985).

Since little research has been done on the process by which students learn to give good public speeches, this study relies on communication theory and research done in composition studies to develop a dialogic approach to teaching public speaking. This study seeks to find ways to incorporate greater revision, development, and feedback into the basic public speaking course through the incorporation of standardized analytic grading rubrics, instructor feedback on outlines prior to speech performances, peer workshops, and peer evaluations. This process-centered dialogic teaching approach has the potential to help increase the level of shared meaning about assignment expectations and evaluations and will help students attain a greater understanding and mastery of the public speaking knowledge and skills that this class aims to teach.

Chapter 2: Review of Literature

When Mikhail Bakhtin (2001b, p. 1215) said, "A word is a bridge thrown between myself and another. If one end of the bridge depends on me, then the other depends on my addressee," he acknowledged the importance of both the speaker and the listener in attributing meaning to what is said. Though shared interpretation of meaning is perhaps one of the most important features of clear communication, processes to check whether the message intended is the message received are rarely incorporated into one of the most basic and widely-taken communication course offered in most universities: public speaking. As instructors, we often lecture over the importance of audience analysis and perhaps even give our class time to do a demographic survey, yet most models for teaching public speaking have little opportunity for students to respond to their instructor's comments in the development of their speeches and do not allow students to interact with one another to get responsive feedback from the audience members, their classmates, to ensure that the message the audience interprets is the same as the one that the speaker is trying to convey. Of twelve public speaking textbooks reviewed (Beebe & Beebe, 2002; DeVito, 2000; Goulden & Schenck-Hamlin, 2002; Gronbeck, German, Ehninger, & Monroe, 1998; Jaffe, 2004; Kearney & Flax, 1996; Lucas, 2001; Nelson & Pearson, 1981; Osborn & Osborn, 1991; Sellnow, 2003; Verdeber & Verdeber, 2003; Zarefsky, 2003), none included any mention of peer workshops or of seeking feedback from others during the speech preparation process. Additionally, we often fail to communicate our expectations for assignments and our means of evaluation

in such a way that students have a clear idea of exactly what they are supposed to be doing.

However, dialogic theory indicates that such classroom interaction could be key to helping students learn to communicate more effectively and increase shared meaning in the classroom. Dialogism contends that a message or utterance is not just a product of the speaker, but is instead co-constructed between speakers as a product of the specific socio-historical context in which it is situated (Bakhtin, 2001a; Bakhtin, 2001b; Bialostosky, 1999; Bizzel & Herzberg, 2001; Ewald, 1993; Stewart, 1978; Todorov, 1984; Zappen, 2004). Thus, it is important to gain a better understanding of dialogic theory, look at its relationship to learning theory, and consider ways that this theory can be incorporated into the basic public speaking classroom through examining research studies that might give insight into how these practical applications will work best.

Dialogism

To gain a thorough understanding of dialogical thought, it is necessary to examine it as part of the socio-historical context in which it emerged. Though dialogism first appeared briefly in ancient Greece, it was quickly overshadowed by rhetoric and dialectic, and it was not until the twentieth century in Russia that it was more fully developed in the writings of Mikhail Bakhtin, largely as a product of and response to four schools of thought: existential and phenomenological philosophy, linguistic structuralism, formalism, and Marxism (Zappen, 2004).

John Stewart (1978) contends that the key characteristics of dialogism are grounded in four philosophical traditions: " the concept of relationship in the

phenomenological notion of relational reality, experientialism in the phenomenological notion of intuition, self-focus in the subjectivity of existentialism, and holism in philosophical anthropology" (p. 185). Many of the dominant philosophers of these traditions were writing just before and at the time of Bakhtin, and the inclusion of many of these ideas and Bakhtin's efforts to identify with Kant's moral philosophy while making distinctions between Kant's ideas and his own "first philosophy" (Bialostosky, 1999) indicates that these philosophical ideas were quite influential.

Second, dialogism is a product of and a reaction to Saussure and linguistic structuralism. Saussure (1992) made a distinction between *langue* (language system) and *parole* (use of language) and emphasized the arbitrary nature of the linguistic sign, which he argued was composed of the "signifier" and the "signified." While Bakhtin writes as a linguist and agrees with many of the definitions and contributions of structural linguistics, he argues that signs are not psychological in nature, as Saussure contended, but instead, that they are part of the material reality and that they are imbued with meaning through their use in social situations (Bizzell & Herzberg, 2001).

Third, Bakhtin's dialogism is a reaction against the Russian formalist school of thought in literary criticism. The Russian formalists were primarily interested in the literary elements of a text, so they examined literature separate from the socio-historical context in which it was written (Trotsky, 1992). Bakhtin, however, had reservations about formalism and systemacity (Bezeczky, 1994; Bizzell & Herzberg, 2001). Instead, just as Marx (1992) believed that literature was largely a product or reflection of the political and cultural structure that rose out of the economic base, Bakhtin (2001b) believed that an utterance was determined by the immediate social situation.

Given the socio-historical context of the intellectual community in which Bakhtin was writing, it is not surprising that these are three of the key components that form the core of his dialogic theory: 1) Dialogue, not monologue, is the most natural form of human speech, 2) Meaning exists as a collaborative construct between speakers, and 3) The context or social situation determines meaning.

First, dialogue, not monologue, is the most natural form of human speech. Lev Petrovich Yakubinsky (1997), whose writings anticipated Bakhtin's more comprehensive study of dialogic interaction (Eskin, 1997), observed that people do not have to be trained to interrupt, but they do have to be trained to listen. Yakubinsky notes:

> Three moments are crucial here: first, that any stimulus or force naturally elicits a reaction from the affected organism; second, that ideas, judgments, and emotions are closely linked to their verbalization; finally, that speech action can elicit speech reaction, which may become reflexive. Just as a question almost involuntarily and naturally gives birth to an answer (owing to the constant association of thought and speech), any verbal stimulus stirs up thoughts and emotions and inevitably solicits a verbal reaction by the affected organism. (p. 249)

He observes that even monologues, such as professional or academic presentations, tend to turn into dialogues as audience members interrupt the speaker and eventually turn the presentation into a conversation if the speaker does not protest. Even if someone in the audience does not speak, seemingly maintaining the artificial monologic presentation form, "his facial expression was nevertheless marked by the

desire to speak… those who kept silent glanced at each other and 'spoke' with their faces; sometimes they murmured to themselves" (Yakubinsky, 1997).

For Bakhtin, this natural dialogue can be conceptualized as a carnival in which everyone is participating and responding to one another instead of trying to mold utterances into an established hierarchical form. Conversation, as a chain of linguistic signs, continuously moves back and forth between speakers, "and this chain of ideological creativity and understanding… is perfectly consistent and continuous…. This ideological chain stretches from individual consciousness to individual consciousness, connecting them together" (Bakhtin, 2001b, p.1212).

This connection of ideas moving between people helps to explain the second component: meaning in language exists as a collaborative construct between speakers. This is somewhat similar to Mead and Blumer's symbolic interactionism, which includes the idea that the meaning of a social act arises from social interaction; no social act is inherently meaningful (Littlejohn & Foss, 2004). However, in speech, the idea or meaning that the speaker is trying to convey through language and the idea or meaning interpreted by the listener are rarely identical. Since the message or utterance is shared between the two, the meaning or theme must be said to exist between the two, not just as a product of either the speaker or the listener. Therefore, the meaning must reside in the linguistic sign. However, because signs are not inherently meaningful (are arbitrary in nature), but instead have ideology imbued on them by the speakers who use them in specific contexts, the meaning (or signified) must constantly be negotiated by the speakers through dialogue so that the meaning (theme) is shared and can accurately convey ideologies. Thus, the theme of any utterance is shaped by both speakers in the

dialogue. The meanings of words are determined both by the giver and the receiver. As Bakhtin argues, "In point of fact, *word is a two-sided act.* It is determined equally by *whose* word it is and *for whom* it is meant. As a word, it is precisely *the product of the reciprocal relationship between speaker and listener, addresser and addressee"* (2001b, p. 1215). This implies that the meaning or ideology does not actually reside in either person, but instead in the signs that serve as the medium of communication between the two. The words are containers that simultaneously hold the meaning implied by the speaker and the meaning understood by the listener at that particular moment.

Because meaning cannot exist without both members of the dialogue, greater emphasis must be placed on "the other." Martin Buber (in Czubaroff, 2000) further investigated this component of dialogue and contended that there were three necessary (but not sufficient) prerequisites for dialogical influence in an existential meeting: 1) "the rhetor must turn toward and attend to the partner's address," 2) "the rhetor must make the partner 'present'," and 3) "the rhetor must respond 'unreservedly' from his or her base of lived truth without 'seeming'" (p. 177). Even if the other is not physically present or immediately responding in the dialogue, as could be the case in written discourse or certain public address situations, the speaker/writer must imagine the other's reality and seek to create genuine conversation with that imagined universal or particular audience (Czubaroff, 2000; Gross, 1999). Without being directed toward an *other*, the words can convey no meaning.

However, the words shared as signs between people cannot in and of themselves hold meaning. Signs change meaning in different contexts, so they cannot exist separately from the specific social contexts in which they are used. This is why it is

important to understand the third component of dialogism: the context or social situation in which the sign is used determines meaning.

In *Freudenism: A Marxist Critique*, published originally under the name Volshinov, Bakhtin (qtd. in Todorov, 1984) contends:

"There is no human being outside society, and therefore not outside objective socioeconomic conditions[….] A human being is not born in the guise of an abstract biological organism, but as a landowner or peasant, a bourgeois or proletarian, and that is of the essence. Then, he is born Russian or French, and finally he is born in 1800 or 1900. Only such a social and historical localization makes man real, and determines the content of his personal and cultural creation." (p. 31)

Just as human beings cannot exist abstractly outside a very specific socio-historical cultural context, it is impossible for messages constructed between them to exist outside that same social context. And just as humans are influenced by the social context in which they find themselves, the messages they co-construct are also influenced by and a product of that social context. As Bakhtin says, *The immediate social situation and broader social milieu wholly determine—and determine from within, so to speak— the structure of an utterance"* (2001b, p. 1215). Any given utterance is a response to the utterances that preceded it and shapes the utterances that will follow in response. All utterances are responses to a concrete situation of persons and objects and should be understood as such (Bialostosky, 1999). Therefore, from a dialogic perspective, all communication should be seen as a part of an active process of responsive understanding.

However, other scholars argue that is not only shared understanding, but also learning, that is enhanced by such dialogue in social contexts. Lev Vygotsky (1978, 1986), whose work has been very influential in educational psychology and developmental theory, argued that knowledge can be reconstructed and co-constructed between people through dialogic interactions in social spaces that he refers to as *zones of proximal development*, or ZPDs (John-Steiner & Meehan, 2000). Lee and Smagorinsky (2000) summarize Vygotsky's theory into the following four assertions:

1.   We first learn through interaction with other people and their cultural artifacts (on the interpsychological plane), then appropriate that learning within our selves (on the intrapsychological plane).

2.   Learning through social interaction occurs in a process known as *scaffolding,* in which more culturally knowledgeable experts mentor and engage in activity with less experienced or knowledgeable people This is a reciprocal process, and "meaning is thus constructed through joint activity rather than being transmitted from teacher to learner" (p. 2).

3.   When constructing meaning, individuals draw on artifacts (concepts, content knowledge, strategies, and technologies) that are constructed historically and culturally and that connect them to cultural history in everyday life. Thus, whether or not others are physically present, learning is inherently social, and "language becomes the primary

medium for learning, meaning construction, and cultural transmission

and transformation" (p. 2).

4.   The capacity to learn constantly shifts and is dependent on 1) what the

individual already knows, 2) "the nature of the problem to be solved or

the task to be learned," 3) "the activity structures in which learning

takes place," 4) "the quality of this person's interaction with others" (p.

2).

Since context and capacity are both important as learning occurs in ZPDs, Vygotsky

argues that "teaching should extend the student beyond what he or she can do without

assistance, but not beyond the links to what the student already knows" (cited in Lee and

Smagorinsky, 2000). This is why Wells (2000) contends that the transmission approach

to education is no longer appropriate and that we need to adopt a collaborative approach

to classroom learning in which the curriculum is a means, not an end, and in which

students can co-construct knowledge together through purposeful activities.

Bereiter (1994, in Wells, 2000) further contends that we need to emphasize a

"*progressive discourse,*" which is a "process by which the sharing, questioning, and

revising of opinions leads to 'a new understanding that everyone involved agrees is

superior to their own previous understanding'" (pp. 72-73). He argues:

[C]lassroom discussions may be thought of as part of the larger ongoing

discourse, not as preparation for it or as after-the-fact examination of the results of

the larger discourse. The fact that classroom discourse is unlikely to come up

with ideas that advance the larger discourse in no way disqualifies it…. The

important thing is that the local discourses be progressive in the sense that

11

understandings are being generated that are new to the local participants and that

the participants recognize as superior to their previous understandings. (qtd. in

Wells, 2000)

According to Wells, the two features of dialogue that support knowledge building in this

progressive discourse are 1) responsivity (see also Bakhtin) and 2) "the attempt to

achieve enhanced understanding" (p. 75).

Application to Public Speaking

Howe and Strauss (2000) point out that most students entering college today have

become accustomed to cooperative and collaborative learning (which can be seen as more

general forms of dialogic teaching methods) because so many elementary and secondary

schools now use such methods. Though such methods are used less frequently in college

classrooms, Johnson, Johnson, and Smith (1998b) reviewed over 305 studies that

examined cooperative learning in college and adult settings and found that such teaching

practices lead to increased individual achievement, increased liking among students,

higher self-esteem, improved social skills, and more positive attitudes about learning and

the college experience, so it only makes sense to begin to incorporate more cooperative

learning opportunities into our university classrooms as well. Furthermore, Jo Sprague

(1993) argued that the communication discipline as a whole has failed to incorporate its

advances in theory into the methods by which communication courses are taught, and we

need to begin finding ways into incorporate our advances in theory in our university

classrooms. Since Broeckelman (2005) found that a higher degree of meaning agreement

about expectations and evaluations exists in forensics than in the university classroom

due to discussion about evaluations and expectations, multiple assessors, and opportunities for revision and development, all of which are features of more dialogic learning methods, this is a good way to begin to incorporate these ideas into our public speaking teaching methods. Thus, this study contends that we should begin to incorporate dialogic theory into the basic public speaking course by increasing both student-teacher and student-student dialogue through utilizing the following four applications: 1) standardized analytic grading rubrics, 2) instructor feedback prior to performance, 3) in-class peer workshops, and 4) peer evaluations. Though little prior research involving the use of these tactics has been done in public speaking courses, they have been tested and proven effective in writing composition courses, and the similarities between the writing and speech-drafting processes suggest that these tactics might be effective in public speaking classes as well.

Student-Teacher Dialogue

Two of the ways in which we can increase dialogue between students and teachers during the speech development process are to use standardized analytic grading rubrics and to give instructor feedback on student outlines prior to the public speaking performance.

Standardized analytic grading rubrics

First, we should incorporate standardized grading rubrics that explicitly detail the expectations for the assignment and tell students exactly how they will be graded. Analytic grading rubrics can maximize shared meaning of assignment expectations by

not only telling students what the expectations are, but also by conveying the relative importance of each component in the grading process. This is a way in which the instructor can open the dialogue about the assignment with the students. The instructor should spend some time discussing the rubric with his or her students to further clarify expectations and the grading criteria, particularly since grades can be one of the greatest sources of misunderstanding and conflict in the classroom.

In fact, a great deal of disagreement exists about what grades should measure and how they should be assigned, yet the grades that students receive can have a major impact in terms of class placement, college or graduate school admission, and communication about a student's abilities with individuals and organizations outside of the classroom. Goulden and Griffin (1995), Guskey (2002), and Lambating and Allen (2002) examined inconsistencies in the perceptions of what grades are and how they should be used.

Goulden and Griffin (1995) used metaphors to identify the perceptions of and meanings ascribed to grades by undergraduate students and faculty members, and found that students are more likely to view grades as subjective judgments, while faculty members are more likely to view grades as objective measurements. Students tend to have more emotional reactions to grades, which, combined with the lack of shared meaning, often leads to miscommunication and conflict about grades.

Frisbie and Waltman (1992, cited in Guskey, 2002, p. 5) identified six purposes of grades, which include "(1) To communicate the achievement status of students to parents and others; (2) To provide information students can use for self-evaluation; (3) To select, identify, or group students for certain educational paths or programs; (4) To provide incentives for students to learn; (5) To evaluate the effectiveness of instructional

programs; and (6) To provide evidence of students' lack of effort or inappropriate

responsibility." Using these six purposes, Guskey investigated the perceptions that

elementary, middle, and high school students, teachers, and parents have of grades. He

found that as grade level increases, all three tend to see the purpose of grading more as a

means of providing feedback to students instead of communicating with parents.

Selection purposes of grades and the incentive value of grades are ranked as less

important by teachers than by students and parents, while communicating a lack of effort

and responsibility is ranked as a more important purpose of grades by students than by

parents and teachers.

Lambating and Allen (2002) also noted that parents and students often have

different beliefs than teachers about what grades should mean and point out that very few

programs actually offer classes about grading to future teachers, which can lead to

inconsistent grading practices between teachers. They show that grades are often

"merged judgments" by teachers of variables reflecting how well students live up to the

teacher's expectation of what a good student is rather than clear measurements of

students' academic achievement, which can lead to "miscommunication, confusion, and a

continuation of the lack of coherence among stakeholders about what a grade represents"

(p. 5). They argue that grades should only reflect the level of achievement or mastery

over the subject matter of the class and that teachers should be trained in grading

practices.

Essentially, the fact that students and teachers view grades differently highlights

the problem that students do not always understand why they are receiving certain grades

or understand for what the teacher is looking. Many have suggested using grading

rubrics as a tool to help overcome this problem (Burch, 1997; Crank, 1999; Huot, 1990; Jackson & Larkin, 2002; Morreale, 1994).

A rubric provides criteria by which a particular assignment will be judged, explains the assignment's requirements and expectations, describes what a good example of the assignments would include, and has some way of communicating the degree to which students met the expectations (Burch, 1997; Crank, 1999; Jackson & Larkin, 2002). Jackson and Larkin further explain that rubrics can either be used to grade holistically, grading based only on a total score, or analytically, grading separate pieces and then combining the scores to obtain a final score (p. 40). Huot (1990) argues that while holistic grading is reliable, it does not meet tests of predictive, concurrent, content, or construct validity and does not actually link the evaluator's overall impression with a set of recognizable skills, so analytic grading rubrics tend to be much more effective and can more easily be generalized beyond the population that generated them. However, Goulden (1989) found that both analytic and holistic speech rating methods have high levels of interrater reliability and concurrent validity, and while analytic scoring has a higher level of interrater reliability, either rating method can be used with confidence. The process by which the evaluation tool is developed, the details included in the rating instrument, and the thoroughness of rater training are more important than whether the rating instrument is analytic or holistic.

Whether holistic or analytic, rubrics can be used both as a form of formative assessment, serving as a guide throughout the project by explaining what is expected ahead of time, and as a form of summative assessment, being used as a set of guidelines

for awarding the final grade (Jackson & Larkin, 2002, p. 40-41). With these purposes in mind, rubrics can be very helpful for both students and teachers.

By compiling lists created by Burch (1997), Crank (1999), and Jackson and Larkin (2002), the following benefits of rubrics for students emerge:

- Rubrics clarify the teacher's expectations for students before they begin the assignment and allow students to understand the degree to which each element will impact the final grade.

- Rubrics allow students to monitor their own progress throughout the assignment process and serve as a final checklist before they turn in the assignment.

- Rubrics help students identify their errors, find better ways to approach an assignment, and learn what they were supposed to from the assignment.

- Rubrics provide language that helps students distinguish between and become more aware of levels of achievement and quality of work on an assignment.

- Rubrics explain and justify grades to students, parents, and administrators.

- Rubrics increase consistency in grading so that grades are a more meaningful measurement and means of comparison.

- Rubrics motivate students to increase their efforts and strive for better performances by clearly defining the elements of excellence for an assignment.

Likewise, rubrics force teachers to become more consistent in their grading practices, reducing differences in the standards by which students in the same class are

graded on the same assignment and minimizing differences among grading procedures of various teachers of a particular subject (Crank, 1999; Marshall, 2002). Furthermore, Crank explains that rubrics can make grading easier and more meaningful because they help balance the time demands of the grading process by streamlining the response sequence and allowing more time to write individual comments. Since the scores on the rubric show specific areas in which students failed to meet expectations of excellence, teachers have increased freedom to focus on the positive aspects of the assignment in the comments.

Despite this, rubrics are not without drawbacks. Burch (1997) points out that rubrics have the potential to stifle student creativity by objectifying the assignment too much. Jackson and Larkin (2002) also identified the following common problems with grading rubrics: 1) "Students do not understand assessment criteria (unclear language);" 2) "Students do not understand the differences among gradations of quality;" and 3) "Students do not understand how to obtain a total score or the meaning of a score" (p. 44).

However, these drawbacks can be avoided if certain guidelines are considered during the writing of rubrics. O'Brien (1992) cautions that rubrics should reflect the actual characteristics of the assignment and should be shared with classes before they are assessed. Jackson and Larkin (2002) suggest the following methods of overcoming the problems described above: 1) Use descriptive language, define terms used on the rubric, articulate gradations of quality, and ask students to interpret and clarify the criteria used; 2) Define gradations of quality in measurable and observable terms with definite distinctions and equal point values distributed between each; and 3) Define meanings of

and directions for achieving all possible total scores (p. 44). Additionally, they suggest introducing students to the rubrics and helping them understand how to use them. Crank (1999) points out the importance of revising rubrics for each assignment and group of writers to fit the specific assignment and context. She also suggests having students help design the rubrics to gain a better understanding of the assignment and evaluation process. Likewise, Burch (1997) suggests having students help define grading criteria and recommends that the actual rubric sheet be designed to fit on a single page, use headings, and include room for comments. Morreale's (1994) eight public speaking competencies and criteria for assessment can serve as a good model and starting point when creating a public speaking rubric, but these studies suggest that it should be modified and made more specific for each assignment instead of used as a standardized assessment for all speeches.

However, teachers need to be concerned not only with the design of the rubric, but also with what kind of feedback they give when evaluating speeches. Even in a process-centered approach, as Matott (1976) argues, teachers should still certainly be concerned with the final product, not just the process or person that produced it. Thus, the instructor should take special care to genuinely respond to the product (whether it is a written composition or a speech presentation), and in so doing, will be responding to the person (p. 30).

Thus, rubrics can be used not only to help the teacher communicate expectations for an assignment to students before they begin working on the assignment and to serve as a checklist to help students make sure they are meeting those expectations before they hand in their work, but as the teacher uses the rubrics to provide feedback to the student

19

and assign a grade after the assignment (in this case a speech) is complete, they also

become a tool with which the teacher responds to student work in order to create even

greater understanding of the course material and its applications. Rubrics can help

provide students with direction for revisions, help teachers give more clear critiques, and

help students critically evaluate their own work through a better understanding of the

criteria that determine the quality of a performance (Booth-Butterfield, 1989). Clear

critiques with detailed, objective feedback help students take responsibility for their

presentation and use the feedback to help improve future performances.

Instructor feedback prior to performance

Besides using rubrics, the second way that public speaking teachers can use

dialogic methods to enhance a responsive understanding is to incorporate instructor

feedback prior to the public speaking performance. Puhr and Workman (1992)

recommend keeping grading out of the writing process for as long as possible to

encourage students to continue to revise and improve their work, and this is one way that

instructors can provide this valuable feedback without "officially" evaluating the

students' work. Since students are often more apprehensive and therefore less able to

respond to feedback when they are being evaluated for a grade (Ayres & Raftis, 1992;

Richmond & McCrosky, 1998), it will also be beneficial for students to receive instructor

feedback while they are in the process of developing their speeches and are able to more

easily respond to comments. By giving students written comments on outlines,

instructors can respond to their students work one more time during the speech

development process and give the students another chance to respond to the instructor's

comments through revision before the final speaking performance. Furthermore, this

feedback can help the instructor check to make sure that the student did not

misunderstand the assignment and might help alleviate student apprehension about giving

the speech by reassuring them that their work is meeting the expectations (Ellis, 1995).

Also, it will allow the instructor to give students specific suggestions for revision that

will bring their work into even closer alignment with the assignment expectations and

will allow the instructor to individualize instruction and give students feedback that will

help push them to the next level of understanding, as Vygotsky (1978, 1986) suggests,

regardless of the students' differing levels of expertise and experience. However, it is

important that the instructor make it clear to the students that the comments on the

outlines are focused on only a few of the most significant changes that will improve the

quality of the speech; the comments are not comprehensive, and making only the

suggested changes does not necessarily guarantee the student an A.

Thus, the use of the rubrics and instructor feedback on outlines prior to

performance provide a way for the instructor and student (or the expert and novice, to put

it into a Vygotskian context) to incorporate responsive understanding into the classroom

and allows the use of scaffolding through very individualized instruction. A basic outline

of the dialogue between the student and instructor looks something like this: 1) the

instructor initiates the conversation by assigning the speech and using the rubric to help

clarify the assignment, 2) the student responds to the assignment by creating the first

draft of his or her speech outline, 3) the teacher responds to the outline by providing

individualized comments and suggestions for revision on the students' outline, 4) the

student responds by revising their speech and then presents the speech in class, 5) the

teacher responds to the speech by giving comments and a grade on the grading rubric, and 6) the student responds to rubric by incorporating what he or she learns from the comments into his or her next speech.

Student-Student Dialogue

Vygotsky contends that it is not just the interaction between the teacher and student (or expert and novice), but also the interaction with other students that allows the reconstruction and co-construction of knowledge. By working together to develop their ideas, students will learn from one another and push each other to greater levels of mutual understanding. That is why it is important to incorporate the third and fourth steps of this process: peer workshops and peer evaluations.

Peer workshops

We should consider using peer workshops to increase the responsive understanding and dialogue between students. In traditional classroom situations, the teacher does most of the speaking and outlines the guidelines that the students should follow in completing assignments. Though some classroom discussion might ensue, it is usually directed toward and controlled by the teacher, giving students little interaction or opportunity for responsive understanding with one another. However, by breaking students into small workshop groups in which all must actively participate, greater heteroglossia will be seen as individual voices are given greater opportunity to be heard (Ritchie in Ewald, 1993). Because all students are equal participants shaping the dialogue, a more democratic carnivalesque environment will be achieved, as compared to a much more controlled classroom structure in which all "dialogue" is determined by the

teacher. Perhaps most importantly, though, by entering discussion with the other (in this case classmates who are audience members), students will have the opportunity to respond to one another and negotiate shared meaning. In other words, by talking to members of their particular audience, students will have a chance to develop and clarify their ideas together and to make sure that the message interpreted by the audience is the same as the message the speaker intended before the students deliver their speech presentations.

Though peer workshops have not previously been used in most public speaking classes, they have become an integral part of most writing courses and a great deal of research exists about using peer workshops in composition classes. Since composition and speaking are both modes of human discourse that involve similar processes (Goulden, 1989), it is appropriate to turn to composition research to establish initial guidelines for conducting peer workshops in public speaking courses. Though speaking and writing differ in some respects[1], the basic elements and development processes for speeches and written compositions are very similar, so we should expect similar results.

Composition research has shown that students produce better work when they use peer workshops to get feedback. When students use rubrics to evaluate each other's work, they gain a greater understanding of the grading procedures and standards, and then begin to apply those standards to their own work (Reeves, 1997; Shaw, 2001). It creates a network between the students and causes them to learn from and compete

---

[1]In their public speaking textbook, *Confidence in Public Speaking,* Nelson and Pearson (1981) provide a chart that shows the main differences between speech and essay composition (p. 132). They point out that speeches are usually only heard once, have more attention-getters, incorporate more repetition, use shorter sentences, have more repetition, invite simplification, and sound spontaneous. Essays can be read often, have fewer attention-getters, use longer sentences, incorporate less repetition, allow complexities, and are obviously premeditated.

against each other, ultimately leading to better assignments because they want to impress their peers (Shaw, 2001). It causes students to become more reflective about the writing process, and through improvements seen as they repeatedly critique and refine their work, helps them to see that writing is a learned process and refinable skill, not just a natural gift that only certain people have (Charney, Newman, & Palmquist, 1995; Mondock, 1997; Reeves, 1997). Clear critiques, whether from peers in a workshop or from the instructor, help cause students to make internal attributions rather then external ones, which "caus[es] them to take responsibility of the performances and undertak[e] appropriate change" (Booth-Butterfield, 1989). It puts students at the level of the instructor and helps them become better critical thinkers capable of making scholarly decisions and professional judgments (Shaw, 2001). Finally, the use of a workshop process, especially one in which students also receive feedback from their instructors, leads to a decrease in public speaking anxiety (Ellis, 1995).

However, simply putting students into groups and asking them to work together to improve their speeches can be counterproductive. Baker and Campbell (2005) point out that cooperative learning "can actually reinforce wrong thinking when group members misunderstand concepts or procedures" (p. 5). To be successful, any type of group work must be carefully planned and monitored by the instructor. In order to make any cooperative learning effort effective in an undergraduate class, Baker and Campell (2005) suggest that teachers 1) assign groups, including a mixture of students who have high levels of ability and students who have high levels of self-efficacy in each group, 2) provide immediate feedback through assignments, discussion, and listening to group

discussions, and 3) monitor group processes to make sure they are working, providing help when they are not, and reward performance.

Peer workshops for written compositions and speeches require even more specialized planning and monitoring than other group work in classes. Karen Spear (1993) and Nancie Atwell (1998) provide a great deal of practical advice for teachers who are trying to incorporate peer workshops into their classes. Both emphasize the importance of creating a comfortable classroom environment and developing feelings of trust, safety, and camaraderie so that students will be more responsive to one another. Both suggest using role-playing or modeling exercises before the first "real" workshop to facilitate discussion about what types of comments are and are not helpful. Atwell and Spear suggest listing rules for workshops together as a class and recommend developing a vocabulary to talk *about* writing (or in our case, speaking) from the beginning of the class and constantly utilizing that vocabulary. They also highlight the importance of assigning workshop groups rather than letting students choose their own groups, suggest having students provide both written and oral feedback, and emphasize the importance of having the instructor circulate through the classroom to confer with students during the workshop. While commenting on the value of peer workshops in the student learning process, Atwell (1998) says:

> In the day-to-day workings of a workshop, kids ask for help, make decisions, set plans and goals, and form judgments. They learn how to look at what they've done and what they need to do next. They learn how to articulate what they understand and recognize where they're still on shaky ground. (p. 301)

Through using peer workshops in public speaking classes, students will work together to develop a greater understanding of what constitutes a good speech and will be better able to internalize and apply that understanding in their work to produce better speeches.

Peer evaluations

The responsiveness between students should extend beyond the peer workshop, which is why peer evaluations of the actual speech performances should also be incorporated into the public speaking course. This will allow students to respond to each other's speeches after they have been revised, will allow them receive feedback from a diversity of perspectives, and will force them to be more attentive and reflective as they listen to one another speak. This also extends the classroom dialogue between peers through the entire speech development process instead of limiting formal dialogue to a single class session.

Conclusion

By utilizing specific analytic grading rubrics, instructor feedback on outlines prior to the speech performance, peer workshops, and peer evaluations in the basic public speaking classroom, we will be able to utilize dialogic learning methods that should both increase the quality of student speeches and increase their cognitive learning of the material. Furthermore, Recchio (in Ewald, 1993) argues that the instructor should find ways to help students find a dialogic way of connecting different modes of discourse, and the use of these dialogic methods should bring greater continuity to the classroom experience and help students establish connections between the text and what they learn

from one speech to the next, allowing them to develop as speakers by using a process-centered rather than a product-centered approach to teaching public speaking.

However, we should also note that the use of these dialogic methods will re-situate the speech presentations in the public speaking classrooms. It is important to emphasize the collective nature of authorship and to recognize that a speech performance is a response to the ideologies, events, and people in a specific context situated in a certain time and place. The speech presentation is one utterance that responds to utterances that have come before it and that will be responded to by future utterances. However, this does not mean that a speech presentation should not be distinguished from other types of utterances. Martin Buber (in Czubaroff, 2000) pointed out that there are three forms of dialogue: technical dialogue, one-way dialogical relations, and fully mutual dialogic relations. While workshop sessions might be viewed as fully mutual dialogic relations, the speech performances can more accurate be viewed as technical or one-way dialogue. Bialotsky (1999) explains that for Bakhtin, there was a difference between the "what is once-occurent" act and the "once and for all act" (p. 16). The "once-occurent" acts are the rough drafts of a composition, or in public speaking, the rough draft outlines of speeches that are being revised. The "once and for all" act is the final composition or speech presentation. However, as Bialotsky points out, "What is at stake [in a once and for all act] is not getting the last word but *saying something,* actualizing an answerable act or word and waiting for the answers to it rather than languishing in indecision among contingent possibilities of action and utterance" (p. 17).

Ultimately, the use of dialogic teaching methods in the basic public speaking course will help students learn more and will bring greater continuity to the course, both

between the different elements of the course and between the course and the outside

world. By giving greater consideration to both ends that hold up the communication

bridge, we will help our students clarify their messages so that the meaning constructed

can be the one they intended to convey and will help them develop the skills with which

to do so. Thus, the following three hypotheses emerge:

1) The use of dialogic teaching methods will increase cognitive learning in the basic
   public speaking course.

2) The use of dialogic teaching methods will improve the quality of the speeches
   given in the basic public speaking course.

3) The use of a standardized analytic grading rubric will increase grading
   consistency among public speaking GTAs.

Chapter 3: Method

The purpose of this study is to examine whether incorporating increased revision and feedback into the speech planning and evaluation process in SPCH 105: Public Speaking IA and 106: Public Speaking I classes at Kansas State University helped undergraduate students attain greater understanding and mastery of the public speaking knowledge and skills that this class aims to teach as well as to see whether such methods increased consistency among GTAs. The classes in the experimental group were taught using a dialogic approach, which included the incorporation of standardized specific analytic grading rubrics and instructor feedback on student outlines prior to public speaking performances to increase responsive dialogue and enhance shared meaning between student and teachers, as well as the incorporation of structured peer workshops and revised peer evaluations of speech performances that allowed students to respond to one another as they co-constructed knowledge and developed a greater understanding of the material. The results were evaluated through a comparison of final speeches given by randomly selected students from the control and experimental groups, through a comparison of examination grades in the control and experimental groups, and through a survey of GTAs who participated in the study.

Changes in Course for Experimental Group

The classes in the experimental group used the same textbook, major assignments, quizzes, and final exam as the classes in the control group, and the deadlines and exam

dates for the control and experimental groups were kept as close together as possible to ensure that conditions not related to the experimental changes were kept the same.

The three major changes included the use of a standardized analytic grading rubric, instructor feedback on student outlines prior to speech performances, and in-class peer workshops. Additionally, new peer evaluation sheets were developed that more closely mirrored the language of the textbook and grading rubrics, and one of the outside speech report assignments was removed from the experimental group syllabus in order to help compensate for the additional amount of time that instructors spent grading and commenting on outlines.

Grading Rubrics

Since a thorough understanding of the criteria and instructor expectations for each assignment is crucial to understanding and mastering the public speaking knowledge and skills that this class aims to teach, analytic grading rubrics were developed for each speech given in the public speaking courses. (See Appendix A for grading rubrics developed for the experimental study. See Appendix B for the final speech grading sheet included in the textbook.) The criteria on these rubrics were written to match the language and vocabulary of the textbook as much as possible in order to reinforce connections between the material students were learning from the text and in lecture and what they were doing when they constructed and presented speeches. The goal of the rubrics was to enhance shared meaning between the instructor and student by first specifying what a good speech should include before students began developing their

speeches, and by second helping students understand more clearly why their speech performance received a specific grade.

One side of these rubrics included very detailed criteria and listed the number of points allotted to each category into which the criteria were placed, along with space to write comments about each specific part of the speech. Each category was assigned a specific number of points to help students understand the importance placed on each component of the speech in the grading process and to help standardize evaluation procedures across different sections of the course. The purpose for this side of the rubric was to outline the grading criteria and to help instructors provide very specific feedback about each component of the speech that would help them explain and justify the grade assigned.

Since each speech should be seen as part of the learning and development process in which students are learning how to construct and present speeches, the other side of the rubrics included space for instructors to choose two or three (depending on the speech) specific strengths and areas for improvement. The purpose of this side of the rubric was to help students focus on the most significant strengths and weaknesses of their speech and to consider how they could work to improve in these areas on their next speech. This allowed each speech evaluation to be part on an ongoing dialogic process throughout the semester in which students could respond to instructor comments on rubrics by incorporating the suggested changes into their next speech. Instructors could respond to the development of the students' public speaking skills through comments on the grading rubrics.

Copies of these rubrics were included in the student syllabus that could be purchased at the bookstore or downloaded from the public speaking website. Instructors were asked to talk about the grading rubrics when they assigned each speech and to encourage students to read through the criteria and use the criteria as a checklist to help them ensure that their speeches met the expectations of the assignment. Instructors were also asked to discuss expectations of quality and point out to students that simply meeting the requirements was not enough to warrant an A; gradations of quality would be considered when points were allotted in each grading category. Instructors were also asked to discuss the rubrics with their students when returning graded speeches and to encourage students to think about how they could use the comments and what they learned from this speech to help them improve future speeches. Throughout the remaining sections, these rubrics will be referred to as the study grading rubrics, and the grading sheets that were included in *Creating Speeches* will be referred to as the textbook grading sheets.

Instructor feedback

For the comparison, argument, and final/composite speeches, students were required to turn in a complete sentence outline of their speech to their instructor at least two class periods before the first speeches were given in the class. The instructors then wrote comments on the outlines and returned them to each student at least one class period before that student was assigned to give the speech. This gave instructors the opportunity to check student topics and to make sure that each student understood the fundamental structure and ideas before giving the speech, which was another way to help

the instructors and students establish shared meaning about what a good speech should

include. It also gave the instructor the opportunity to give specific individualized

feedback to help students in the areas where they needed the most guidance, allowing a

very personal level of Vygotsky's scaffolding principle (Lee & Smagorinsky, 2000), and

to help affirm the students' work so that there would be less uncertainty and apprehension

when being evaluated on their speech performances (Ellis, 1995).

Peer Workshops

In one or two class periods before giving the comparison, argument, and

final/composite speeches, peer workshops were held in class to allow students to receive

feedback from their classmates and to develop ideas for speech revision. Just as Atwell

(1998) and Spear (1993) suggest, the instructor was asked to lead a modeling exercise

during the first workshop session of the semester in which students role played various

roles in a sample workshop and discussed what was and was not helpful in a peer

workshop. The class then brainstormed a list of workshop dos and don'ts before splitting

into their assigned workshop groups for the day. On subsequent workshop days,

instructors were asked to discuss workshop guidelines with students and generate a list of

helpful and unhelpful workshop comments and behaviors on the chalkboard before

splitting students into groups. (See Appendix F in Instructors' Manual for more

information about workshop modeling exercise.)

During the workshop sessions, students were required to fill out the peer

workshop evaluation (Appendix C), which was also included with their syllabus, to offer

specific written feedback to one another and to hold students accountable for their work

in the workshop session. This workshop evaluation, modeled partially on the peer evaluation guides included in *The Allyn and Bacon Guide to Writing* (Ramage & Bean, 2000) and those included in Nancie Atwell's *In the Middle* (1998), provided written instructions for the session and asked students to respond to questions about the speech and offer suggestions for improvement. Students were also encouraged to discuss the speeches and their suggestions, but were asked to write down any important comments so that it would be easier for the speaker to remember all of the ideas after leaving the classroom. These workshops allowed students to check to see whether other students were interpreting their speeches as they had hoped and allowed them to attain a greater understanding what a good speech should include by allowing them to respond to one another, both giving and receiving advice as the groups co-constructed this knowledge and understanding together.

Instructors were asked to roam through the classroom throughout the workshop session so that students would be more likely to ask questions and would be more likely to stay on task. Additionally, this allowed the instructor to make sure that the students were developing a better understanding of what the speeches should include rather than misleading one another and making suggestions that would decrease rather than increase the quality of the speeches (Baker & Campbell, 2005). At the end of the workshop session, students were asked to write down three specific revisions that they intended to make. This was done to help them focus on specific suggestions from the workshop, provide a plan of action to increase the likelihood that they would actually make changes based on the workshop session, and to ensure that they had written down the most significant ideas from the workshop so that they would have a written reminder and

would not forget the suggestions by the time they began working on the speech again. The researcher suggested that instructors check to make sure that students actually wrote down their intended revisions before allowing students to leave the classroom, both to hold the students accountable for showing that they accomplished the intended tasks in their workshop groups and to make the students accountable for making the intended changes before giving their speeches in class.

Peer evaluations

New peer evaluation sheets (Appendix D) were developed for students to use to evaluate classmates' speech performances that more closely resembled the workshop evaluations and grading rubrics used. Many of the questions asked were similar to those on the peer evaluations in *Creating Speeches*, but the evaluations used in this study ask students to comment on the two greatest strengths and areas for improvement for peer speeches, forcing them to think more critically about the speech performance. Additionally, the peer evaluations for the comparison, argument, and final speeches asked students to outline their peers' speeches as they listened in order to further increase their awareness of the presence and importance of structure in their own and other speeches.

Experimental Design

In order to minimize the threat of the diffusion of treatment, a quasi-experimental design was used for this study. Previous experience of other researchers in the department had shown that information traveled quickly between GTAs, that students in different sections of the course talked to one another, and that GTAs who felt forced to

participate in a study and use specific teaching methods did not always apply the treatment in their classes as uniformly as they were supposed to. Therefore, instead of randomizing GTAs and their students to the control and experimental groups during a single semester, this study was conducted over a period of two semesters. During the first semester, all of the classes were part of the first control group, except for the classes taught by three GTAs that comprised a small pilot study. During the second semester, all of the classes were taught using the experimental dialogic teaching approach, except for the classes taught by the four GTAs that comprised the second control group.

Control Groups

In this study, there were two control groups. The first control group included all of the students enrolled in public speaking during the fall semester except for the students enrolled in sections taught by the three instructors who participated in the pilot study. The second control group included the students who were enrolled in public speaking in the spring semester who were taught by the four instructors who did not use the experimental method. The four instructors for the second control group were selected based on their responses on a survey conducted near the end of the fall semester in which they indicated that they would prefer to not use analytic grading rubrics that were prepared for them by someone else (Broeckelman, 2004). In all of the sections of public speaking that were part of the control group, the instructors were permitted to use whatever speech grading forms they liked, whether they were the grading sheets from the textbook or grading sheets that were designed by the instructor, since that was the policy of the basic course director in previous semesters.

Pilot study

As a preliminary test of the experimental method, a pilot study was conducted during the fall semester. Three instructors (including a second-year GTA, a new GTA who was unfamiliar with the materials, and a first-year GTA who was familiar with the materials and was conducting this research project) were asked to participate in the pilot study, in which they used all of the experimental methods outlined in this thesis and met periodically to discuss revisions that should be made before using these methods for the experimental group.

Experimental group

The experimental group included all of the students enrolled in public speaking during the spring semester except for those who were enrolled in courses taught by the four GTAs in the second control group.

Training

Near the end of the fall semester, the Director of Public Speaking briefly introduced the experimental study to the GTAs during their weekly meeting in SPCH 090: Teaching Public Speaking. During the next week, the researcher contacted the four GTAs selected for the second control group to ask them to be part of the control group. In the next meeting of SPCH 090, the researcher gave copies of the instructors' manual to all GTAs participating in the experimental group and discussed the purpose of the study and the changes that would be incorporated into the public speaking classes. Participation in the study was encouraged but voluntary, so GTAs were given the choice

to opt out of the experimental group, but nobody requested a change. In subsequent meetings of SPCH 090 in which GTAs were trained to use the dialogic teaching methods, the members of the control group were not present.

During the first meeting of SPCH 090 in the spring semester, the researcher discussed the components, purpose, and use of the rubrics and gave guidelines for using them in the classroom. The initial plan was to have GTAs practice using the rubrics by grading a videotaped narration speech, and then spend time discussing the use of the rubrics, but because of technical difficulties, this was postponed until the following week.

During the third meeting of SPCH 090, the researcher led a discussion to get initial responses from GTAs about their experiences using the rubrics in class for the narration speeches and to answer any questions that had surfaced. Next, the GTAs in the experimental group discussed comparison speeches and the researcher talked briefly about using the rubrics for the comparison speeches. Everyone was asked to take a few minutes to read through the criteria on the grading rubric before watching and grading a videotaped comparison speech. Afterward, a discussion was held about the scores assigned and any GTA concerns using the rubric.

Plan of Evaluation

The effectiveness of the experimental methods was evaluated by surveying the public speaking instructors, by comparing the final exam scores of the control and experimental groups, and by comparing scores assigned by GTAs and faculty to randomly selected speeches from the control and experimental groups.

Instructor survey

At the end of the spring semester, after most instructors had experience teaching with their own grading procedures and with the experimental teaching method proposed here, instructors were asked to fill out a survey that included items on a 7-point Likert scale, yes/no forced response items, and open-ended questions. (See Appendix E.) The purpose of this survey was to find out whether instructors perceive a difference in effectiveness of teaching materials and methods and quality of speeches given when the experimental methods were used. The goal of this survey was also to find out whether instructors thought the new methods were helpful, to find out whether they plan to use these methods in classes that they will teach in the future, to find out what they felt the benefits and drawbacks of each component were, and to get suggestions for changes.

Though the researcher considered surveying the students to see whether they thought they learned more when taught using the dialogic teaching methods than if they had been taught using a more typical or traditional approach to the course, it was decided that such a survey would yield little helpful information for two reasons. First, research shows that students tend to overestimate the amount that they actually learned, particularly from immediate teachers (Hess & Smythe, 2001), and the dialogic teaching approach increases the likelihood of immediacy. Second, a survey conducted in many of the same classrooms used in this study during the fall semester showed that most students in the basic course had little experience with various teaching and grading methods, so when asked about the effectiveness or helpfulness of a particular grading form, they were actually evaluating their instructor (Broeckelman, 2004).

Comparison of final exam grades

The same final exam was given to all students during both semesters, and the mean exam scores were compared. The purpose of this comparison was to see whether these new methods, which emphasized the use of the language from the book in the materials used in speech development and evaluation, helped to reinforce the ideas from the text and improve the cognitive learning of the material taught in the course. The final exam scores are one of the best ways to objectively measure cognitive learning and to see whether students and teachers have achieved a higher level of shared meaning about what good speeches look like and should include because measures of student perceptions of learning are not always accurate (Hess & Smythe, 2001).

Comparison of final speeches

Thirty speeches from the control group and thirty speeches from the experimental group were randomly selected from the audiotapes of the final/composite speeches given in all of the public speaking courses. This sample of speeches was then randomly ordered onto compact disks on which each speech was identified only by a number indicating its order on the CD.

A group of graduate teaching assistants and faculty were then asked to grade the speeches on the audiotapes, assigning a point value on a 100-point grading scale. GTAs who were a part of the experimental group and had previously used the grading rubrics were asked to use the rubrics to grade the speeches. GTAs who were part of the second control group during the spring semester and faculty who had not used the rubrics were

asked to grade the speeches using the textbook grading sheet provided in *Creating*

Speeches.

Afterward, the scores assigned to each speech were analyzed to see whether the

quality of student speeches improved when they were taught using the dialogic teaching

methods outlined in this study. Multiple graders with varied levels of experience using

one of two grading forms were used so that the results would reflect the actual quality of

the speech. This allowed us to minimize differences that would have been seen in

classroom grades due to varied levels of grader leniency, biases that might result from the

instructor perceptions of a particular student, or grades that were more a reflection of a

"merged judgment" (Lambatting & Allen, 2002) that included factors other than the

quality of the speech itself.

Chapter 4: Results

A quasi-experimental design was used for this study in order to minimize threats to internal validity from diffusion of treatment. Past experience had and research showed that students in different sections of public speaking often talk to one another and compare the ways that the course is being taught. GTAs also often talk to one another and share teaching ideas, so it would have been very difficult to prevent the control group from adopting some of the dialogic teaching methods and to prevent the experimental group from failing to fully implement the dialogic teaching methods if they were to perceive that they were being required to do more work than GTAs in the control group. To minimize this threat, most of the control and experimental data was collected in two different semesters, so subjects were not randomly assigned to the control and experimental groups.

Since subjects were not randomly assigned to the control and experimental groups and the data was collected at two different times, two control groups were used so that it would be possible to check and see that any potential differences that might be found were not due to maturation of the subjects or time. The first control group, hereafter referred to as Control 1, was comprised of all of the students taking Public Speaking I or IA in the fall semester, excluding the students who were in the courses taught by the three GTAs who participated in the pilot study. The second control group, hereafter referred to as Control 2, was comprised of all of the students enrolled in the sections of Public Speaking I and IA taught by the four GTAs who did not use the dialogic teaching

methods in the spring semester. The students who were taught by these four GTAs during the fall semester are a subset of Control 1 and will be referred to as Control 1A.

To find out whether any external conditions affected the quality of students and teaching between the fall and spring semesters, the comparison speech grades and final exam grades of all students in Control 1A and Control 2 were compared. These two groups were compared because they were taught by the same instructors, so the classrooms and leniency of grading (how "easy" or "hard" the instructor grades) were nearly identical.

First, an independent samples t-test was run to compare the comparison speech grades of Control 1A and Control 2. The comparison speech was selected because it is the first complex speech that students give and because it is given around the middle of the semester. For Control 1A, the mean score for the 246 students was 62.517 with a standard deviation of 7.470. For Control 2, the mean score for the 200 students was 62.9000 with a standard deviation of 5.807. (See Table 1.) The t-value for these two groups was –0.59, which shows that there is no significant difference at the .05 level between the comparison speech grades of the two groups.

Table 1. Comparison Speech Grades of Control 1A and Control 2		
	Control 1A	Control 2
Mean	62.517	62.900
Std Dev	7.470	5.807
N	246	200
df	444	
t	-0.59	

Second, an independent samples t-test was run to compare the final exam scores of Control 1A and Control 2. For Control 1A, the mean score for the 248 students was 78.671 with a standard deviation of 10.435. For Control 2, the mean score for the 192 students was 78.583 with a standard deviation of 11.132. (See Table 2.) The t-value for these two groups was 0.09, which shows that there was no significant difference at the .05 level between the final exam grades of Control 1A and Control 2.

Table 2. Final Exam Scores of Control 1A and Control 2		
	Control 1A	Control 2
Mean	78.671	78.583
Std Dev	10.435	11.132
N	248	192
df	338	
t	0.09	

Since there was no significant difference between the students in Control 1A and Control 2 in the mean comparison speech grades and final exam grades and since both of these groups were evaluated by the same instructors using the same evaluation tools each semester, we can conclude that there was no significant difference in the students taking Public Speaking I and IA in the fall and spring semesters. With that established, it is clear that we can validly compare the control and experimental groups to discover whether the dialogic teaching methods impacted student learning in the basic public speaking course.

Hypothesis 1: The use of dialogic teaching methods will increase cognitive learning in the basic public speaking course.

Hypothesis 1 can be measured by comparing the final exam scores of the students in the control and experimental groups. The final exam scores are a good way to measure cognitive learning and retention of information because the final exam is comprehensive, measures learning at all cognitive levels (as described by Bloom, 1956), and was identical for all students each semester. Even though this experiment did not use a pre-test to find out what level of mastery students might have had before taking the course, making it impossible to know exactly how much learning occurred throughout the semester, we can be confident that any difference seen in the final exam scores between the control and experimental groups actually reflects a difference in the amount learned in the course because we have shown that there was no significant difference in the students in each group.

To find out whether there was a difference in the final exam scores between the control and experimental groups, an independent samples t-test was run. Since there was no difference between the students in Control 1 and Control 2, all of their final exam scores are included in this analysis. For the control group, the mean score for the 1273 students was 78.181 with a standard deviation of 9.960. For the experimental group, the mean score for the 876 students was 81.573 with a standard deviation of 9.520. (See Table 3.) The t-value for these two groups was –7.90, which shows that the final exam scores of the students in the experimental group were significantly higher than the students in the control group. This supports Hypothesis 1, indicating that the dialogic teaching methods in this study did increase cognitive learning.

Table 3. Final Exam Scores of Students in Control and Experimental Groups		
	Control	Experimental
Mean	78.181	81.573
Std Dev	9.960	9.520
N	1273	876
df	2149	
t	-7.90	

This finding was also supported by the responses of GTAs on the instructor

survey conducted at the end of the year. When asked, "Do you think that your students

learned more when you used the rubrics, gave feedback on outlines, and had

workshops?" ten of the thirteen (76.9%) respondents said yes. When asked why or why

not, one of the respondents said, "They could see how the content of the book actually fit

into a real speech when they saw it highlighted in the rubrics or I made comments on

their speeches when that information was not there. Also, the workshops required the

evaluator to apply the information learned in the book to an evaluation." Another replied,

"For feedback and outlines, yes. I know for a fact that many students read what I had to

say and sometimes what their peers wrote to help them. Again, rubrics could help, but

students used them more to understand their grades than to improve future speeches."

Yet another GTA said, "Students learned more from seeing the rubrics and knowing what

they were leaving out or needed to work on. Students did not learn anything from the

workshops because they were not particularly focused on judging someone's outline.

Yes, they learned a large amount from feedback on outlines because they could easily see

what was strong, what could be improved, and what was missing altogether." One of the

GTAs who disagreed that this process helped students learn more said, "I think the

information remained the same, but workshops allow for more work on their speeches."

While the overall responses supported Hypothesis 1, the open-ended responses indicated that GTAs did not entirely agree about what was most important in contributing to the increased cognitive learning.

Hypothesis 2: The use of dialogic teaching methods will improve the quality of the speeches given in the basic public speaking course.

To find out whether the results support Hypothesis 2, thirty speeches from the control group and thirty speeches from the experimental group were randomly selected and burned onto compact disks in one of two random orders (to control for time order effects). Four faculty members and nine GTAs graded these speeches. If they had been part of the experimental group and used the study grading rubric to grade speeches in their classes throughout the semester, the graders used the study grading rubric (Appendix A) to grade these speeches, and if they were GTAs in Control 2 or were faculty members who had never used the study grading rubric, the graders used the textbook grading sheet to grade these speeches (Appendix B).

A t-test was run to compare the mean scores of the speeches in the control and experimental groups. The speeches in the control group were assigned a total of 385 grades and received a mean score of 80.85 with a standard deviation of 9.931. The speeches in the experimental group were assigned a total of 382 grades and received a mean score of 81.30 with a standard deviation of 10.606. (See Table 4. The difference in the number of scores assigned in each group is due to receiving an incomplete set of scores from one of the GTAs.) The t-value was –0.609, which indicates that there is not

enough evidence at the .05 level to support the hypothesis that the dialogic teaching

approach improved the quality of student speeches in Public Speaking I and IA.

Table 4. Grades Assigned by Faculty and GTAs to Randomly Selected Speeches		
	Control	Experimental
Mean	80.85	81.30
StdDev	9.931	10.606
N	385	382
df	765	
t	-0.609	

However, the responses on the instructor survey indicate that the GTAs perceived

that students produced a better quality of speeches when using the dialogic teaching

methods. When asked whether students gave better speeches when using this teaching

approach, eleven of the thirteen (84.6%) GTAs that responded said yes, and when asked

whether specific components of the method were helpful, the responses were also very

positive. When asked why or why not, some of the open-ended responses included the

following: "Most of my students, the ones who took the time to really look at the rubric

sheets, did better because they were able to have all of the requirements. They may not

have been executed strongly, but the requirements were there, which I think is

important." "I think that the workshops were more helpful in this regard because

sometimes students just don't look at the rubrics before giving other speeches. The

rubrics were more helpful in getting students to understand why they got the grade they

did." "Those who put out the effort and took suggestions to heart and followed the rubric

did much better on their speeches." "Yes, because they were already ahead of where they

would have been, so it really was a speech and not a rough draft for points."

Even though many GTAs commented that the dialogic teaching methods required more work from the instructor, most said that, if given the choice for speech classes they teach in the future, they would use all of the components again.

Eleven of thirteen (84.6%) responded that they would use the grading rubrics from this study. When asked why, one GTA said, "I found it very easy to justify the score they were given. I also thought that it helped the students understand why they were given the grade. It helped me be a fair judge." Another said, "I think the grading rubrics give the students an idea of what you're looking for, thus helping them to develop speeches based on instructor expectations. By showing them a copy of a rubric (either the one developed for this study or otherwise), they understand what elements of speech-building are most important (as is indicated by higher point totals), as well as those aspects of the speech that are less significant. This is extremely important for students; we want them to know how to develop and organize a speech, so it makes sense that they understand that speech organization is more important than the type of signpost they wish to use. Additionally, by showing students a copy of the grading rubric, it helps instructors to justify the grades students receive." Yet another said, "I think they make my job easier in that I can 'fill-in-the-blanks' for things I always comment on, and it makes my comments easier for students to understand."

Interestingly, even the two GTAs who said that they would not use the study rubrics again indicated that they would use a modified version of the rubrics. One said, "I would not use the grading rubric exactly as is. I don't think the grading rubric is bad; however, I believe the points need to be more completely developed. More specifically, I believe that the points need to be more evenly distributed and that there needs to be more

specific reasons or identification of what points are more. Otherwise, if this was

different, I would use the grading rubric again." The other said, "I prefer my rubrics. I

think the way I articulated my expectations was more effective. My major beef with the

rubric was rhetorical sensitivity not being listed on them."

When asked whether they would use the peer workshops again, ten of twelve

(83.3%) responders indicated that they would. One GTA said, "I think that they helped

the students learn to analyze speeches more thoroughly and learn the content of the book

better. During the workshop, they had to consider terminology and information

highlighted in the book. They could look at someone else's speech, give suggestions on

that speech, and then realize their speech could have some of those same improvements.

It also helped the speaker get feedback from their peers, not just their teacher." Another

GTA responded, "I think that the students are more apt to accept constructive criticism

from their peers, and these workshops force them to prepare ahead of time." A third

GTA said, "I like that peers give feedback. It helps to build a sense of community in my

classroom." Yet another said, "I thought they were helpful for two of my classes…. I

asked my students before the composite workshop if they didn't like anything about the

workshop and what else could be changed to make it better. They thought that it helped

them learn the information more because they had to look in the book to make sure they

were looking at the right components. They also felt that it helped with coming up with

better support material or ideas."

When asked whether they would give feedback on student outlines before

students gave speeches in class, twelve of thirteen (92.3%) GTAs who responded

indicated that they would. When asked why, one said, "That is the best way for students

to fully understand what I mean when I comment on that part of the outline. Plus, I can find problem areas or topics ahead of speech day." A second GTA said, "Yes, because I think it really helps them develop speech content, and ultimately, helps them learn the material better. The only disadvantage, however, is the time commitment it takes to fill out the outlines." Another said, "My comments usually just pushed them to the next level of speech giving. If they followed my comments, it would usually turn out to be a very good speech. If they ignored them, then the speech might be ok, but not exceptional. It helped them to know how they could make the speech better, and then they could choose if they wanted to put that extra effort into it." The GTA who said that he would not comment on outlines said, "No, because I feel that it undermines my students' need to listen to lectures. If I am going to tell them what needs to happen on their outline, why listen to the lectures that I give? Also, I think it inflates grades."

Hypothesis 3: The use of a standardized analytic grading rubric will increase grading consistency among public speaking GTAs.

In order to test the third hypothesis, the grades assigned to the randomly selected speeches by those using the study grading rubric and those using the textbook grading sheet were compared using an independent samples t-test. The standard deviation of the grades assigned to each speech by each group of graders was found, and the mean of those standard deviations was calculated. For example, the standard deviation of all of the grade assigned to speech one by graders using the study grading rubric was calculated, then the standard deviation of all of the grades assigned to speech two by graders using the study grading rubric was calculated, and so on for each speech. The

mean and standard deviation of the standard deviations of all of the speeches was then calculated for the graders using the study grading rubric, and then the same procedure was followed for graders using the textbook grading sheet. Those calculations were then compared. For the graders using the study grading rubric, the mean standard deviation for each speech was 7.618, and the standard deviation of the deviations was 4.223. For the graders using the textbook grading sheet, the mean standard deviation for each speech was 5.687, and the standard deviation of the deviations was 2.226. (See Table 5.) The t-value of 7.77 indicates that the graders using the textbook grading sheet were more consistent than those using the study grading rubric, which does not support Hypothesis 3.

Table 5. Standard Deviation of Grades Assigned to Each Speech		
	Graders using study grading rubric	Graders using textbook grading sheet
Mean	7.618	5.687
StdDev	4.223	2.226
N	407	360
df	765	
t	7.77	

The post-hoc analysis revealed that there was also a difference in the actual grades assigned by the graders using each type of grading sheet, not just in the consistency among the graders. For graders using the study grading rubric, the mean score was 79.95 with a standard deviation of 11.415. For graders using the textbook grading sheet, the mean was 82.36 with a standard deviation of 8.632. (See Table 6.) The t-value was 7.77, which indicates that grades assigned by the graders using the textbook grading sheet were significantly higher than the grades assigned by the graders using the study grading rubric.

Table 6. Mean Grades Assigned by Graders Using Each Type of Grading Sheet		
	Graders using study grading rubric	Graders using textbook grading sheet
Mean	79.95	82.36
StdDev	11.415	8.632
N	407	360
t	-3.319	

Post-hoc analysis also showed that grader experience had an impact on the grades assigned when experience is considered with respect to two other variables: years of teaching and forensics experience. Second-year GTAs assigned significantly higher grades to the speeches than first-year GTAs did, and graders who had competed in and/or coached forensics assigned significantly higher grades than those who had not competed in and/or coached forensics. (See Tables 7 and 8.)

Table 7. Mean Grades Assigned by First-year and Second-year GTAs		
	First-year GTAs	Second-year GTAs
Mean	80.24	82.77
StdDev	11.818	9.963
N	347	180
t	-2.916	

Table 8. Mean Grades Assigned by Graders With and Without Forensics Experience		
	Forensics Experience	No Forensics Experience
Mean	81.73	79.53
StdDev	10.799	8.708
N	540	227
t	2.957	

Consideration of the time limit is another factor that is affecting the consistency of grades assigned to the speeches. The standard deviations of the grades for each speech are much lower for speeches that met the time requirements (seven to ten minutes) than

for speeches that did not meet the time requirements (were either too short or too long). (See Table 9.) Furthermore, it is interesting to note that while the graders using the study grading rubric were less consistent than those using the textbook grading sheet, it is especially important to note that there was a difference of 4.024 deviations between the mean standard deviation of grades assigned by graders using the study grading rubric for speeches that met and did not meet the time requirements. (See Table 10.) This indicates that differences in the treatment of the time limit were a large factor impacting the consistency of grades assigned using the study grading rubric.

Table 9. Mean Standard Deviations for Grades Assigned to Each Speech Based on Whether or Not They Met the Time Requirements		
	Met time requirements	Too short or too long
Mean	5.641	8.663
StdDev	1.997	3.195
N	410	357
df	765	
t	-15.91	

Table 10. Mean Standard Deviations for Grades Assigned to Each Speech Based on Whether or Not They Met the Time Requirements for Study Grading Rubrics Only		
	Met time requirements	Too short or too long
Mean	5.740	9.764
StdDev	2.718	4.642
N	218	189
df	395	
t	-10.84	

Chapter 5: Discussion and Conclusions

Even though only one of the hypotheses was supported, there is evidence to suggest that the dialogic approach to teaching public speaking is having a positive impact on student learning and that it is increasing the level of shared meaning between teachers and students. Through a discussion of the results and of the limitations and implications of this study, as well as suggestions for future research, we can conclude that this teaching approach should be investigated further because it has the potential to have a greater impact on student learning if it is developed and implemented over a longer period of time.

Discussion

Both the results of the final exam (the quantitative data) and the survey responses of the GTAs (the qualitative data) supported the first hypothesis, which predicted that dialogic teaching methods would lead to an increase in cognitive learning. This increase in cognitive learning is important because it shows that the students have a better understanding of the speech development process and can recognize the components of a good speech, even if they are not yet able to actually incorporate that understanding into a better performance. There are several reasons that help explain why this increase in learning was seen. First, the use of the vocabulary and language from the textbook increased student exposure to the material through repetition and enhanced their ability to see the information applied. Second, the workshops increased student understanding of the material and led to a greater level of critical thinking about the assignments (Reeves,

1997; Shaw, 2001). Third, the workshops made students more accountable among their peers and gave them a motivation to increase the quality of their work, as students are more likely to try to impress their peers than their instructor (Shaw, 2001). Finally, the feedback from the instructor and other classmates throughout the speech development process and after the speech performance helped students gain a greater understanding and level of shared meaning and helped them make internal attributions that caused them to take responsibility for their work (Booth-Butterfield, 1989). Skills must be understood and learned at the cognitive level before they can be executed at the performance level, so this is a good first step and indicates that the dialogic teaching methods are having a positive impact on students in the classroom.

Even though there was not enough evidence from the scores given to the randomly selected speeches to support the second hypothesis and indicate that the dialogic teaching methods improved the quality of student speeches, the comments from the GTAs indicated that they believed that the students who participated in the dialogic teaching methods learned more and gave better speeches. For example, one GTA said, "I definitely saw a difference in speeches with those that turned in complete outlines and those that turned in partial outlines." However, several comments indicated that there might have been problems with the implementation of the process, the participation levels in some classes, and the evaluation of the results. Even though the numbers don't show a significant difference in the quality of the speeches, there is enough evidence to suggest that the dialogic methods might have had more of an impact on the quality of student speeches than the results indicate and suggest that more research should be done to investigate this further.

The results did not support the third hypothesis, which predicted that the standardized analytic grading rubrics would increase grading consistency among public speaking GTAs. The graders using the textbook grading sheet were actually more consistent, but they also gave significantly higher grades. It is possible that the grades assigned by graders using the textbook grading sheet are more consistent simply because they are experiencing a ceiling effect; because the grades assigned are higher and the maximum score is 100, there is less room for variation.

It is also probable that grader experience was a factor influencing the consistency of the grades given by each grader group. The group using the study grading rubric included six first-year GTAs and one second-year GTA, while the group using the textbook grading sheet included four faculty members and two second-year GTAs. This group composition was necessary because it was important to ensure that the graders were assigned to groups that were consistent with their previous experience with the study grading rubric, but this might be a confounding variable that is masking or skewing actual differences in grading consistency among GTAs in the classroom. The post-hoc analysis showed that experience was a factor that caused significant differences in grades assigned by GTAs when it was looked at in terms of forensics experience and whether the grader was a first or second year GTA. In each of these cases, those with greater experience assigned higher grades. Those using the textbook grading sheet also had more teaching and grading experience, as they were all either second year GTAs or faculty members, so it is very likely that this was skewing the results.

The post-hoc analysis also showed that graders varied in their treatment of the time limit, which was causing the scores assigned to each speech to be less consistent

57

than they might have otherwise been. Currently, all GTAs are permitted to establish their

own rules regarding the treatment of the time limit in their grading, and the graders in this

study were asked to grade the speeches just as they would in their classes, which included

their policy regarding point deductions for failing to meet the time requirements. Though

a section of the rubric used in this study includes the time limit, many GTAs have

separate policies in which they deduct a predetermined number of points from any speech

that does not meet the time limit, some of which are based on the number of seconds the

speech is over or under the time limit and some of which are not. The higher variance in

grades assigned to speeches that did not meet the time requirements indicates that this is

one area that is creating inconsistency between sections of public speaking.

Thus, the confounding variables of grader experience and inconsistent treatment

of the time limit make it impossible to confidently draw any conclusions about whether

the study grading rubrics might improve grader consistency in the regular public speaking

classroom. Though the forensics involvement and number of years of experience each

grader has cannot be modified in the regular classroom setting, the treatment of the time

limit in grading can be standardized. This suggests that a standardized policy regarding

the treatment of time limit infractions when assigning speech grades should be

implemented and that any modifications of the study grading rubric or any other form of

grading sheet used in this course should account more clearly for the time limit.

Limitations

Even though the results did not show as much of an impact from the dialogic

teaching methods as had been hoped, there is evidence to suggest that there might have

been more of an impact than the quantitative data shows and that there is enough

potential for these methods to improve the basic course that further investigation should

be done. Three of the factors that limited this study include the following: 1) This was an

implementation of a long-term process rather than a single element of that process, 2)

Various factors might have masked actual differences, and 3) The generalizability of this

study is limited.

Implementation of a long-term process

First, this study was limited because it was a test of the implementation of an

entire process rather than the test of a single element of that process. Because of the way

this study was set up, it is impossible to know whether a particular part of the process had

a more significant impact or whether there were interaction effects among components of

the study. Though the research cited in the literature review suggests that each

component used in this study should have significant, positive effects on student learning,

some of the GTA responses indicated that they felt that some components were less

helpful than others. However, the results do not allow us to conclude which components

were most helpful and which were least helpful.

Furthermore, the time restraints within which this study was conducted limit our

ability to see its long-term effects. A process such as this one that changes so many

components of a course that is being taught by new teachers takes a long time to fully

develop and implement, but this study only examined the effects after a single year of

development and included only one semester of implementation. If, even with a much

greater volume of research on how students learn writing and with over twenty-five years

of teaching experience and process development, Atwell (1998) still considered herself a

learner of how to teach using the workshop process, even though countless secondary

education and college writing programs had been modeled on her and others' similar

work, it would be foolish to believe that it would be possible to develop and implement a

perfect process for using similar methods for teaching public speaking over the course of

a single year. To truly see whether this dialogic approach will impact the quality of

student speeches and improve the quality of the public speaking course, it will probably

take several years of implementing it into the curriculum, refining each element,

developing more comprehensive training procedures, and allowing GTAs to gain enough

experience using each component so that they can become "experts" capable of passing

that understanding on to novice teachers. By adapting the study and collecting data over

a period of years, it would be possible to more accurately assess the effects of this

teaching approach.

Factors masking actual differences

Second, several factors could have masked actual differences in the results,

including student attendance and preparation, personal and environmental factors,

unreliable technology, and inadequate training.

First, an individual student's attendance and preparation would have been crucial

in determining whether or not the dialogic teaching approach made any difference in the

quality of that student's speeches. If a student did not come to class or bring a complete

outline to class when it was due, that student would not have received instructor feedback

or been able to participate effectively in a peer workshop session. Likewise, if a student

did not actually read the grading rubric before preparing his or her outline or read the instructor comments after the speech had been evaluated, that student would not have benefited at all. Only the students who put forth the effort to come to class, prepared outlines, participated in the workshops, used the feedback they received to revise their speeches, gave thoughtful critiques of others' speeches, and read the evaluations of their instructor and their peers were actually utilizing the dialogic teaching methods. Therefore, it is only these students who were true subjects in the experimental group, but when speeches were selected from the tapes for inclusion in the study, no differentiation was made between students who did and did not attend class and participate.

Second, it is possible that personal and environmental factors masked results. The dialogic teaching methods as well as the traditional approach to teaching this course place primary emphasis on speech content and the speech development process with minimal emphasis on delivery. It is well-documented that many students have communication apprehension (CA) and that this anxiety often has a detrimental effect on a students' ability to deliver speeches effectively, even if the speech was well-prepared beforehand (Richmond & McCroskey, 1998). Students usually have higher levels of apprehension when they are being evaluated (Ayres & Raftis, 1992), particularly just before and during the first minute of speaking (Behnke & Sawyer, 2004; Ellis, 2004). It is possible that student apprehension, distractions in the classroom, fatigue, illness, poor memory, or other factors prevent some students from delivering as good of a speech as they had prepared. If this is the case, it might be possible that students are writing better speeches, but not carrying this improved quality through in the speech performance.

Third, unreliable technology might have masked some of the results. Though these problems were a uniform source of random error for both the control and experimental groups and would not have biased the results, they made it difficult for graders to perceive real differences that might have existed. Those who evaluated the randomly selected speeches only had an audio recording of each speech performance by which to evaluate the quality of each speech. However, many of the recordings were of very poor quality and a few tapes were not even useable, which made it difficult to accurately assess the quality of each performance. Additionally, visual cues such as gestures, movement, posture, and facial expression are often used to help convey meaning and to emphasize key points in a speech, but these elements were lost in the audio recordings.

Finally, inadequate training might have prevented the GTAs from implementing the dialogic teaching methods uniformly in all sections of the course. GTAs indicated that they felt the training procedures for learning to use the rubrics, conducting the peer workshops, and commenting on student outlines were adequate. They gave mean rankings of 5.46, 5.46, and 5.54 on the adequacy of the training for using each component on a 7-point Likert scale, with 1 meaning "not adequate" and 7 meaning "definitely adequate." However, questions raised and comments made during informal discussion as well as some of the comments on the GTA survey indicate that some GTAs might not have completely understood all of the details of how each component needed to be implemented, particularly for the peer workshops, or that some might not have actually done everything they were asked to do, even if they did understand what they were supposed to do. In the survey, one GTA even said that "being a little unsure in

conducting some of the new methods" was the worst thing about participating in the study, and when asked what they would like changed, another GTA said, "More prep for the teachers! More interactive workshops." This indicates that the application of these methods might have been less consistent than they should have been, which would have masked the potential results.

Generalizability

The third limitation of this study is that it cannot be generalized to all public speaking programs because it was conducted at a single university that has some unique course features. The basic public speaking course at Kansas State University is taught by graduate students who are pursuing master's degrees in Speech Communication, Theater, and Speech Pathology, so there is greater variation in the amount of prior knowledge and experience that the GTAs have when they begin teaching the course than would be found in the basic course at some universities. Additionally, the course is taught using Goulden and Schenck-Hamlin's textbook, *Creating Speeches*, which was developed specifically for the basic course at Kansas State University. Thus, the dialogic teaching methods and materials in this study were developed specifically for the assignments and textbook at this university. To be used at another university or in correlation with another textbook, the dialogic teaching methods and materials will need to be modified to fit the assignments in that particular course. Because these modifications were not tested in this study, we cannot predict the outcomes with absolute certainty.

Implications

Even though the results did not show as much of an impact for the dialogic teaching methods as had been hoped, the lack of more significant results is not surprising considering the large scope of changes that were incorporated in such a relatively short time period. The increase in cognitive learning seen in this study and the results of other studies cited in the literature review indicate that we should continue to implement these dialogic teaching methods and investigate their long-term effects. Additionally, the positive response that the GTAs had to the incorporation of these methods in their classes is especially encouraging, as GTAs have the opportunity to see the day to day impacts of their classroom practices on their students and are able to observe the degree to which these methods affect students with differing levels of involvement in the process. It is likely that the GTAs were actually distinguishing between which students did and did not participate in the components of the dialogic learning process when they were responding to items on the survey, whereas the quantitative data did not. Though we cannot draw any definite conclusions based on this supposition, it is probable that there was greater improvement in the quality of speeches than the results show. If so, this would indicate that students being taught with a dialogic approach would have a higher degree of shared meaning with their instructors.

Furthermore, this teaching also approach caused GTAs to be more involved in the speech developing process, which might have given them a greater investment in seeing their students succeed. One GTA said, "I loved to see the improvement students showed from their first outline to their final product. It was very rewarding! I also liked participating in the peer workshops and helping students to help each other."

By writing individual comments on student outlines and rubrics as well as circulating through the classroom and answering questions or giving suggestions while students were conducting peer workshops, the GTAs were also engaged in specific immediacy behaviors. Previous research has identified specific verbal and nonverbal immediacy behaviors and has shown that it can increase student affect, participation, and learning (Andersen & Andersen, 1982; Mehrabian, 1981; Gorham & Zakahi, 1990). While too much teacher immediacy can distract students from the actual content and negatively impact student learning (Titsworth, 2004), the particular behaviors emphasized in this study are ones that encourage students to focus on specific parts of their speeches and are part of classroom practices in which students are highly involved (as opposed to classroom practices that require less student involvement, such as lecturing), so it is likely that these immediacy behaviors will enhance rather than distract student interest from the content. Furthermore, these dialogic methods require students to begin working on their speeches earlier, to engage in a speech development and revision process, and to respond to one another, which requires students to be more invested in their own and others' speeches.

This highly structured, standardized approach to incorporating dialogic teaching methods into the basic course might work better in some departments than in others. German (1993) points out that course standardization has many advantages and disadvantages, and that one of the key variables that must be considered is the level of experience of those who are teaching the course. Nyquist and Sprague (1992) explain that there should be three phases in the training of TAs that reflect three stages of experience: Senior Learner, Colleague in Training, and Junior Colleague (pp. 104-105).

At K-State, the experience of GTAs most closely resembles the role of Colleague in Training, in which GTAs are assigned to teach their own sections of the public speaking in a structured course and meet in a weekly seminar designed to "clarify content issues and emphasize practice of specific instructional skills such as lecturing, leading discussions, criticizing speeches, and constructing examinations" (p. 105).

In a situation such as the one encountered at K-State in which GTAs are generally teaching for the first time and have varying degrees of familiarity with the course material, which is true of most MA programs, the standardized approach for implementing the dialogic teaching methods that was used in this study might be particularly effective. Even though the primary goal of the study was to increase shared meaning between instructors and students in order to improve student learning, a secondary outcome seems to have been that the materials and training for implementing the dialogic teaching methods might have led to a higher degree of meaning agreement between GTAs, which in turn might have led to a greater consistency of the assignments across sections of the course. The specific criteria on the grading rubrics helped to define each speech assignment for the GTAs so that they could in turn help their students understand each assignment. The training sessions for using the rubrics, commenting on outlines, and conducting peer workshops served to further increase the consistency of the teaching practices across sections of the course.

If the GTAs had received this material and training at the beginning of their first semester of teaching, it might have had a stronger impact. The consistency of the assignments and grading might have been hampered by the fact that the GTAs had taught for a semester prior to participating in this experiment. During that time, they had

developed their own expectations for each assignment out of necessity when teaching for the first time, so the criteria on the grading rubrics and the approach outlined in the instructors' manual might or might not have impacted their already internalized expectations for each assignment. However, if the grading rubrics and instructors' manual were given to GTAs in their first semester of teaching before they had a chance to develop their own interpretations of each assignment, it is possible that these materials might have a greater impact the consistency of the assignments, teaching, and grading across sections of the course.

However, in departments in which the course is taught by GTAs or faculty members who are already familiar with the course content and who already have teaching experience, this approach might be less appropriate. For example, in a program in which the course is taught by advanced doctoral students or young faculty members that would be better described as Junior Colleagues than as Colleagues in Training, such a standardized approach might limit the instructor's ability to incorporate other effective teaching strategies. Nonetheless, it is possible for instructors to incorporate dialogic teaching methods into their course by modifying the tactics outlined in this study to fit their own teaching approach and increase shared meaning between the teacher and students.

Future Research

As the dialogic approach for teaching public speaking is developed in future research, there are adaptations and changes that should be considered regarding training,

rubric revision, student accountability, evaluation techniques, and the implementation of the process.

Training

As these dialogic teaching methods are incorporated into the basic public speaking course, more comprehensive training procedures should be developed. First, training needs to include more specific detail. For example, the trainer needs to give the GTAs specific things to say about the rubric to illustrate how it should be used to help explain the assignment and needs to be more specific about how many times the rubric should be talked about before and after each speech assignment.

Second, the workshop training should include an actual workshop in which the GTAs must participate. To improve the consistency of assignment expectations across sections and to give GTAs a better understanding of how to conduct a workshop session, GTAs should bring their own outlines for the speeches to the training session and actually workshop their own speeches after the workshop modeling exercise instead of just talking about how to proceed with a workshop. Ideally, this should be done before each speech workshop in class. Additionally, as these methods are implemented over time, newer GTAs should observe those who are experienced and especially skilled at conducting workshop sessions in the classroom.

Finally, the training sessions should include the opportunity to grade more sample speeches and more discussion about grading throughout the entire semester. Instead of watching two or three speeches at the beginning of the semester, all of which exemplify "good" speeches, GTAs should grade several speeches of varying degrees of quality

before grading each type of speech in class. They should also spend time discussing how each speech should be graded and come to consensus on what grade each speech should receive in order to calibrate the grading several times throughout the semester. This will help standardize the speaking assignments and grading across the sections of the course and will make it possible to ensure that inconsistent application of the dialogic teaching methods across sections does not skew or mask differences in the quality of the speeches. This will make it possible to see the impacts of these methods more clearly and will make it easier for new GTAs to incorporate these methods into their own courses.

Rubric revision

Experienced GTAs should be involved in revising the grading rubrics to fit the speeches. Crank (1999) suggested that rubrics should be revised to fit each assignment to ensure that the rubric clearly communicates the expectations and criteria for each assignment. Since some GTAs indicated that there were modifications that they would like to see made, it would be valuable for experienced GTAs to work together to modify these rubrics to match what they believe the assignment expectations should be. For example, one of these revisions should include more clear criteria for penalizing time limit infractions. By collaborating to do this, the GTAs would be more likely to have an even greater level of shared meaning about each assignment, which could further increase consistency in the course. Furthermore, by having several GTAs scrutinize the grading rubrics and revise them to make them clearer, it is likely that the criteria will even more clearly communicate the assignment expectations to students and increase shared meaning.

Student accountability

Even though there were points built into the syllabus to account for student participation in the dialogic learning process, many students failed to turn in assignments and actively participate in the workshop sessions. Some of the GTA comments indicated that this was a common problem. One GTA said, "Yes, [they gave better speeches,] but only when they took it seriously. A few students brought in incomplete outlines. Obviously, the workshops, etc., could not benefit them. But ultimately, it did help students because they were able to see how others viewed their speech and learn how to fix problems. Also, students learned what I was looking for as the instructor, as well as what their peers were looking for (which aligns them with normative guidelines for persuasion!)." Another replied, "They do help, but it ultimately depends on student effort." This suggests that it might be helpful to give students greater motivation for being prepared and for actively participating and putting thought into the feedback they offer in the peer workshops. Johnson, Johnson, and Smith (1998a) argue that one of the essential elements of cooperative learning is positive interdependence, which is the idea that students must "sink or swim together" and that "one cannot succeed unless everyone succeeds" (p. 1:20). Since students generally want to impress one another (Shaw, 2001), it might be possible to increase student motivation and participation by making part of their grade dependent on one another. Instead of just giving points for workshop participation, it would be worthwhile to consider making each student's workshop grade contingent on the grades given to the speeches of the other students in their workshop group. This would hold them accountable for the quality of feedback that they give to

one another and would give them additional motivation for actually making the suggested revisions.

Evaluation techniques

Since some of the GTAs indicated in their survey responses that they thought that students prepared better speeches but did not deliver better speeches, it would be helpful to include a comparison of the quality of student outlines to see whether this is truly the case. This would allow us to see improvements in content without having confounding variables such as communication apprehension, classroom distractions, inadequate technology for recording the speeches, or other personal or environmental factors mask the results.

Implementation

Since this is a teaching process that takes time to implement effectively, results should be collected over a period of several years. This will allow us to monitor the effects of the dialogic teaching approach as it is being implemented so that we can see whether it has a significant impact on speech quality after it has used in a department for a longer period of time. It will also allow us to find out how much time is needed before the effects can be more clearly seen. It would also be valuable to implement these methods in courses at multiple universities using different textbooks in order to predict whether the results can be generalized to all basic public speaking courses. Over time, it would also be helpful to isolate each component of this teaching approach and to test

71

various combinations of the components to find out how much impact each component has and whether there are interaction effects.

Conclusion

Of the following three hypotheses, there was only enough evidence in the results to support the first one:

1) The use of dialogic teaching methods will increase cognitive learning in the basic public speaking course.

2) The use of dialogic teaching methods will improve the quality of the speeches given in the basic public speaking course.

3) The use of a standardized analytic grading rubric will increase grading consistency among public speaking GTAs.

This shows that students are learning more, which is an encouraging first step since cognitive understanding of a teachable skill such a public speaking must precede the ability to actually execute that skill and give better speech performances. This is a good first step that indicates that the dialogic approach is having some positive impact and suggests that this approach should be refined and further investigated.

Regardless of the impacts the dialogic approach might have on the GTAs, the potential for these methods to impact learning is primarily determined by the students. Teachers can and should create a good classroom environment that is conducive to learning, but ultimately, it is student effort that determines how much is learned and what quality of speeches are given. If students have poor attendance, do not come to class prepared, fail to incorporate the recommendations of others into their speeches, and do

not put forth the effort required to learn the material, no teaching method will improve

performances. While teachers should seek to maximize learning potential in their

classrooms, the students are ultimately the ones accountable for doing the assignments

and responsible for their education. As Boehrer and Evans (2000) put it:

> More important than the teacher's delivering the product of his or her own
>
> learning is the function of creating and maintaining an environment in which
>
> students will learn to work.... Learning is, after all, the students' problem, not
>
> because their progress and welfare do not concern us, but simply because they
>
> alone can actually solve it. The more centrally we can engage them in the
>
> learning process, the more personally we can involve them in it, the more
>
> teaching we will be able to do. (p. 182)

However, the dialogic approach to teaching public speaking is one way to engage

students and to create a more conducive learning environment that encourages student

effort. It has the potential to increase the amount learned and improve the quality of the

performances given by students who participate as well as to help new GTAs, so further

investigation is certainly warranted.

References

Andersen, P., & Andersen, J. (1982). Nonverbal immediacy in instruction. In L. Barker (Ed.), *Communication in the classroom* (pp. 98-120). Engelwood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Atwell, N. (1998). *In the middle: New understandings about writing, reading, and learning* (2nd ed.). Portsmouth, NH: Boynton/Cook.

Ayres, J. & Raftis, S. M. (1992). The impact of evaluation and preparation time on high public speaking anxious speakers' thoughts, behavior, and state-communication apprehension. *Southern Communication Journal, 57*(4), 323-327.

Baker, D. F. & Campbell, C.M. (2005). When is there strength in numbers? A study of undergraduate student groups. *College Teaching, 53*(1), 14-18.

Bakhtin, M. (2001a). From *The problem of speech genres* (McGee, V. W., Trans., 1986). In P. Bizzell & B. Herzberg (Eds.), *The rhetorical tradition* (pp. 1227-1245). Boston, MA: Bedford/St. Martin's. (Original work published in 1953.)

Bakhtin, M. (2001b). From *Marxism and the philosophy of language* (Matejka, L. & Titunik, I. R., Trans., 1973). In P. Bizzell & B. Herzberg (Eds.), *The rhetorical tradition* (pp. 1210-1226). Boston, MA: Bedford/St. Martin's. (Original work published in 1929.)

Beebe, S. A. & Beebe, S. J. (2002). *Public speaking: An audience-centered approach* (4th ed.). Boston, MA: Allyn and Bacon.

Behnke, R. R., and Sawyer, C. R. (2004). Public speaking anxiety as a function of sensitization and habituation processes. *Communication Education. 53* (2), 164-173.

Bezeczky, G. (1994). Contending voices in Bakhtin. *Comparative Literature, 46*(4), 321-345.

Bialostosky, D. (1999). Bakhtin's "rough draft": Toward a philosophy of the act, ethics, and composition studies. *Rhetoric Review, 18*(1), 6-25.

Bizzell, P. & Herzberg, B. (2001). Mikhail Bakhtin. *The rhetorical tradition* (pp. 1206-1210). Boston, MA: Bedford/St. Martin's.

Bloom, B. S. (1956). *Taxonomy of educational objectives: The classification of educational goals.* New York: D. McKay Co., Inc.

Boehrer, J. & Evans, D. (2000). Spectators and gladiators: Reconnecting students with the problem. In R. F. Stein & S. Hurd (Eds.), *Using student teams in the classroom* (pp. 179-183). Bolton, MA: Anker.

Booth-Butterfield, M. (1989, April). The interpretation of classroom performance feedback: an attributional approach. *Communication Education, 38*(2), 119-131.

Broeckelman, M. A. (2004). *Exploration of student and instructor preferences regarding analytic and holistic grading approaches in the basic public speaking course.* Unpublished manuscript.

Broeckelman, M. A. (2005). An analysis of the meaning of individual events forensics ballots based on judge and competitor metaphors. *The Forensic, 90*(1), 3-18.

Burch, C. B. (1997). Creating a two-tiered portfolio rubric. *The English Journal, 86*(1), 55-58.

Charney, D., Newman, J. H., and Palmquist, M. (1995). "I'm just no good at writing":

Epistemological style and attitudes toward writing. *Written Communication,*

12(3), 298-329.

Chesser, R.J. (2000). Enhancing performance in small groups. In R. F. Stein & S. Hurd

(Eds.), *Using student teams in the classroom* (pp. 165-177). Bolton, MA: Anker.

Crank, V. (1999). Chasing objectivity: How grading rubrics can provide consistency and

context. *Journal of Teaching Writing, 17,* Part 1/2, 56-73.

Czubaroff, J. (2000). Dialogical rhetoric: An application of Martin Buber's philosophy

of dialogue. *Quarterly Journal of Speech, 86*(2), 168-189.

DeVito, J. A. (2000). *The elements of public speaking* (7th ed.). New York: Addison

Wesley Longman.

Ellis, K. (1995). Apprehension, self-perceived competency and teacher immediacy in

the laboratory-supported public speaking course: Trends and relationships.

Communication Education, 44(1)*,* 64-77.

Eskin, M. (1997). Translator's introduction. *PMLA, 112*(2), 243-248.

Ewald, H.R. (1993). Waiting for answerability: Bakhtin and composition studies.

College Composition and Communication, 44(3), 331-348.

German, K. M. (1993). The advantages and disadvantages of standardization. In L. W.

Hugenberg, P. L. Gray, & D. M. Trank (Eds.) *Teaching & directing the basic*

communications course. (pp. 149-154). Dubuque, IA: Kendall/Hunt.

Gibson, J. W., Hanna, M. S., & Huddleston, B.M. (1985). The basic speech course at

U.S. colleges and universities: IV. *Communication Education, 34*(4), 281-292.

Gross, A. (1999). A theory of the rhetorical audience: Reflections on Chaim Perelman. *Quarterly Journal of Speech, 85,* 203-211.

Gorham, J., & Zakahi, W. (1990). A comparison of teacher and student perceptions of immediacy and learning: Monitoring process and product. *Communication Education, 39*, 354-368.

Goulden, N. R. (1989). A comparison of reliability and validity of holistic and analytic methods of scoring classroom speeches (Doctoral dissertation, Northern Arizona University, 1989). *Dissertation Abstracts International. 51-05A,* 1441.

Goulden, N. R. & Griffin, C. J. G. (1995). The meaning of grades based on faculty and student metaphors. *Communication Education, 44*(2)*,* 110-125.

Goulden, N. R. & Schenck-Hamlin, W. (2002). *Creating Speeches: A Decision-Making Approach* (2nd ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill.

Gronbeck, B. E., German, K., Ehninger, D. & Monroe, A. H. (1998). *Principles of speech communication* (13th brief ed.). New York: Addison-Wesley.

Guskey, T. R. (2002, April). Perspectives on grading and reporting: Differences among teachers, students, and parents. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New Orleans, LA.

Hess, J. A., & Smythe, M. J. (2001). Is teacher immediacy actually related to student cognitive learning? *Communication Studies, 52*(3), 197.

Howe, N. & Strauss, W. (2000). *Millennials rising: The next great generation.* New York: Vintage.

Huot, B. (1990). Reliability, validity, and holistic scoring: What we know and what we need to know. *College Composition and Communication, 41*(2), 201-213

Jackson, C. W. & Larkin, M. J. (2002). RUBRIC: Teaching students to use grading

rubrics. *Teaching Exceptional Children,* 35(1), 40-44.

Jaffe, C. (2004). *Public speaking: Concepts and skills for a diverse society* (4th ed.).

Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.

Johnson, D. W., Johnson, R. T., & Smith, K. A. (1998a). *Active learning: Cooperation

in the college classroom* (2nd ed.). Edina, MN: Interaction Book Company.

Johnson, D. W., Johnson, R. T., & Smith, K. A. (1998b). Cooperative learning returns to

college. *Change, 30*(4), 26-35.

John-Steiner, V. P. & Meehan, T. M. (2000). Creativity and collaboration in knowledge

construction. In C. D. Lee & P. Smagorinsky (Eds.), *Vygotskian perspectives on

literacy research: Constructing meanings through collaborative inquiry* (pp. 31-

48). New York: Cambridge University Press.

Kansas State University. (2005a, Spring). *SPCH 105, Public Speaking IA Two-Credit

Syllabus.* (Available at http://k-state.edu/sctd/sp_comm/ps1.html).

Kansas State University. (2005b, Spring). *SPCH 106, Public Speaking I Three-Credit

Syllabus.* (Available at http://k-state.edu/sctd/sp_comm/ps1.html).

Kearney, P. & Flax, T. G. (1996). *Public speaking in a diverse society.* Mountain View,

CA: Mayfield.

Lambating, J. & Allen, J. D. (2002, April). How the multiple functions of grades

influence their validity and value as measures of academic achievement. Paper

Presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research

Association, New Orleans, LA.

Lee, C. D. & Smagorinsky, P. (2000). Introduction: Constructing meaning through

    collaborative inquiry. In C. D. Lee & P. Smagorinsky (Eds.), *Vygotskian*

    perspectives on literacy research: Constructing meanings through collaborative

    inquiry (pp. 1-15). New York: Cambridge University Press.

Littlejohn, S. W. & Foss, K. A. (2004). *Theories of human communication* (8th ed.).

    Belmont, CA: Thompson Wadsworth.

Lucas, S. E. (2001). *The art of public speaking* (7th ed., annotated instructor's ed.).

    Boston, MA: McGraw Hill.

Marshall, T. A. II. (2002, October). How do we know we're doing it right? Assessing

    outcomes in core business communications courses. Paper presented at the

    Annual Meeting of the Association for Business Communication, Cincinnati, OH.

Marx, K. (1992). "From *A contribution to the critique of political economy."* In H.

    Adams (Ed.) *Critical theory since Plato* (2nd ed., pp. 625-628). Singapore:

    Thomson Learning, Inc. (Reprinted from *Literature and art, by Karl Marx and*

    Frederick Engels: Selections from their writings, 1947, International Publishers

    Co., Inc. Original work published in 1859).

Matott, G. (1976). In search of a philosophical context for teaching composition.

    College Composition and Communication, 27(1), 25-31.

Mehrabian, A. (1981). *Silent messages: Implicit communication of emotions and*

    attitudes (2nd ed.). Belmont. CA: Wadsworth Publishing Company, Inc.

Mondock, S. L. (1997). Portfolios—the story behind the story. *The English Journal,*

    86(1), 59-64.

Morreale, S.P. (1994). Public speaking. In W.G. Christ (Ed.) *Assessing communication*

   education: A handbook for media, speech, and theatre educators. (pp. 219-236).

   Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Nelson, P. & Pearson, J. (1981). *Confidence in public speaking* (5th ed., annotated

   instructor's ed.). Dubuque, IA: Wm. C. Brown Communications, Inc.

Nyquist, J. D. & Sprague, J. (1992). In J. D. Nyquist & D. H. Wulff (Eds.) *Preparing*

   teaching assistants for instructional roles: Supervising TAs in communication.

   (pp. 100-113). Annandale, VA: Speech Communication Association.

O'Brien, C. W. (1992). A large-scale assessment to support the process paradigm. *The*

   English Journal, 81(2), 28-33.

Osborn, M. & Osborn, S. (1991). *Public speaking* (2nd ed.). Boston: Houghton Mifflin.

Puhr, K. & Workman, G. (1992). Monitoring student progress through a conferenced

   writing program. *The English Journal, 81*(2), 49-50.

Ramage, J. D. & Bean, J. C. (2000). *The Allyn and Bacon guide to writing* (2nd ed., brief

   ed.). Needham Heights, MA: Allyn & Bacon.

Reeves, L.L. (1997). Minimizing writing apprehension in the learner-centered

   classroom. *The English Journal, 86*(6), 38-45.

Richmond, V. P., and McCroskey, J.C. (1998). *Communication apprehension,*

   avoidance, and effectiveness (5th ed.). Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Saussure, F. (1992). From *Course in general linguistics."* In H. Adams (Ed.) *Critical*

   theory since Plato (2nd ed., pp. 718-726). Singapore: Thomson Learning, Inc.

   (Original work published in 1913).

Sellnow, D. D. (2003). *Public speaking: A process approach* (Instructor's media ed.)

    Belmont, CA: Wadsworth/Thomson.

Shaw, V. N. (2001). Training in presentation skills: An innovative method for college

    instruction. *Education, 122*(1), 140-144.

Spear, K. (1993). *Peer response groups in action: Writing together in secondary*

    schools. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

Sprague, J. (1993). Retrieving the research agenda for communication education:

    Asking the pedagogical questions that are "embarrassments to theory."

    Communication Education, 42(2), 106-122.

Stewart, J. (1978). Foundations of dialogic communication. *The Quarterly Journal of*

    Speech, 64(2), 183-201.

Titsworth, B.S. (2004). Students' notetaking: The effects of teacher immediacy and

    clarity. *Communication Education, 53,* 305-320

Todorov, T. (1984). *Mikhail Bakhtin: The dialogic principle* (Godzich, W., Trans.).

    Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Trotsky, L. (1992). The formalist school of poetry and Marxism. In H. Adams (Ed.)

    Critical theory since Plato (2nd ed., pp. 792-799). Singapore: Thomson Learning,

    Inc. (Reprinted from *Literature and revolution*, 1960, Rose Strumsky, Trans.,

    Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press. Original work published in 1924).

Verderber, R. F. & Verderber, K. S. (2003). *The challenge of effective speaking* (12th

    ed., annotated instructor's ed.). Belmont, CA: Wadworth/Thomson.

Vygotsky, L. S. (1978). *Mind in society: The development of higher psychological processes* (M. Cole, V. John-Steiner, S. Scribner, & E. Souberman, Eds.). Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Vygotsky, L. (1986). *Thought and language* (A. Kozulin, Trans.). Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Wells, G. (2000). Dialogic inquiry in education: Building on the legacy of Vygotsky. In C. D. Lee & P. Smagorinsky (Eds.), *Vygotskian perspectives on literacy research: Constructing meanings through collaborative inquiry* (pp. 51-85). New York: Cambridge University Press.

Yakubinsky, L. P. (1997). On dialogic speech (Eskin, M., Trans.). *PMLA, 112* (2), 249-256. (Original work published in 1923).

Zappen, J. P. (2004). *The rebirth of dialogue: Bakhtin, Socrates, and the rhetorical tradition.* Albany: State University of New York Press.

Zarefsky, D. (2005). *Public speaking: Strategies for success* (4th ed.). Boston, MA: Pearson.

Appendix A

Study Grading Rubrics

Narration Speech Grading Rubric

Name: _____   **Date:** _____

Topic: _____   **Speaking Time:** _____

Points: _____ /50

Strengths

1.

2.

Areas for Improvement

1.

2.

Narration Speech Grading Rubric

	- ✓ +	Comments	Points Earned
Written Materials (5) • Turned in speech planning sheet • If note card was used, it did NOT have the entire speech written out word for word • Turned in other written materials requested by the instructor			
Introduction (5) • Opener aroused interest and was relevant to the topic • Included relevant background information and audience "need to know" • Gave clear, identifiable thesis or claim			
Components of Narration (10) • Narration had a clear plot. • Characters and their relationships were identified. • Information about the setting was included so that the audience knew when and where the story took place.			
Elements of Narration (5) • The characters of the story were developed underwent some type of change. • Progress of events through time was logical and easy to follow.			
Conclusion (5) • Summed up the story and its relevance to the audience • Restated thesis or claim • Included a memorable, strong closer			
Delivery (5) • Used concrete, specific language • Used note card only minimally; did not read speech from notes • Maintained a natural, conversational delivery style • Maintained eye contact and used appropriate gestures to emphasize important points • Refrained from distracting voice and body behaviors			
Quality of Narration (5) • Narration was an appropriate choice for supporting the claim/thesis.			
Overall Quality (10) • Meets time limit of assignment • Connected well with the audience • Utilized creativity and originality in approach to topic			

Definition Presentation Grading Rubric

Names: _____   **Date:** _____

_____   **Speaking Time:** _____

Word: _____   **Grade:** _____

Strengths

1.

2.

3.

Areas for Improvement

1.

2.

3.

Definition Presentation Grading Rubric

	- ✓ +	
Written Materials • Turned in complete outline • Each member of the group turned in note card with ONLY keywords		
Introduction • Opener aroused interest and was relevant to the topic • Included clear "need to know" statement • Gave clear, identifiable thesis or claim that clearly stated what was being defined • Included preview of main points		
Main Point #1 • Correctly stated whether definition was descriptive or prescriptive • Used both classification and differentiation in definition • Used at least one other definition strategy (verbal example, sensory example, secondary definition) • If sources were used, they were cited		
Main Point #2 • Correctly stated whether definition was descriptive or prescriptive • Used both classification and differentiation in definition • Used at least one other definition strategy (verbal example, sensory example, secondary definition) • If sources were used, they were cited		
Main Point #3 • Correctly stated whether definition was descriptive or prescriptive • Used both classification and differentiation in definition • Used at least one other definition strategy (verbal example, sensory example, secondary definition) • If sources were used, they were cited		
Conclusion • Restated thesis or claim • Reviewed/summarized main points • Included a memorable, strong closer		
Delivery • Used concrete, specific language • Used notecard only minimally; did not read speech from notes • Maintained a natural, conversational delivery style • Maintained eye contact and used appropriate gestures to emphasize important • Refrained from distracting voice and body behaviors		• Speaker 1 • Speaker 2 • Speaker 3 • Speaker 4
Overall Quality • Meets time limit of assignment • Connected well with the audience • Utilized creativity and originality in approach to topic • All group members contributed to the presentation of the speech • Each main point was about a separate definition for each word • Followed overall speech plan of introduction, development, and conclusion		

Description Presentation Grading Rubric

Name: _____ **Date:** _____

Topic: _____ **Speaking Time:** _____

Grade: _____

Strengths

1.

2.

3.

Areas for Improvement

1.

2.

3.

Description Presentation Grading Rubric

	- ✓ +	Comments	Points Earned
Written Materials • Turned in speech planning sheet and sentence and keyword outlines • Outlines used proper numbers, symbols, etc.			
Introduction • Opener aroused interest and was relevant to the topic • Included relevant background information and audience "need to know" • Gave clear, identifiable thesis or claim			
Description • Included properties related to several senses			
Organization • Used one of the four patterns of organization (spatial categories; parts, whole, and relationship; sensory; time order) • Used appropriate structure in the introduction, body, and conclusion			
Conclusion • Restated thesis or claim • Included a memorable, strong closer			
Delivery • Used concrete, specific language • Used notecard only minimally; did not read speech from notes • Maintained a natural, conversational delivery style • Maintained eye contact and used appropriate gestures to emphasize important points • Refrained from distracting voice and body behaviors			
Overall Quality • Meets time limit of assignment • Connected well with the audience • Utilized creativity and originality in approach to topic • Left audience with a clear mental picture			

Comparison Speech Grading Rubric

Name: **Date:**

Topic: **Speaking Time:**

                                                        Points: /75

Strengths

1.

2.

3.

Areas for Improvement

1.

2.

3.

Comparison Speech Grading Rubric

	-✓+	Comments	Points Earned
Written Materials (5) • Turned in complete sentence outline that used proper outline structure • If used, note card had only a keyword outline • Turned in all previous outlines, workshop evaluations, and workshop notes • Turned in a copy of all sources • Any other materials requested by your instructor			
Introduction (5) • Opener aroused interest and was relevant • Introduction transition included relevant background information and "need to know" • Gave clear, identifiable thesis statement • Clearly previewed main points			
Organization (15) • Used either alternating or divided pattern of organization • Used internal transitions that included a summary and preview between all main points • Thesis and main points were mutually inclusive • Main points were separate			
Support Materials (15) • Properly cited at least one recent, credible source that was relevant and supported the point being made • Each main point is described or explained precisely, using at least one type of support material that shows how the point clearly pertains to the thesis			
Conclusion (5) • Restated thesis • Reviewed main points • Included a memorable, strong closer			
Delivery (10) • Used concrete, specific language • Used note card only minimally; did not read speech from notes • Maintained a natural, conversational delivery style • Maintained eye contact and used appropriate gestures to emphasize important points • Refrained from distracting voice and body behaviors			
Quality of Comparison (10) • Utilized one of the three categories of comparison • Selected two items that had an appropriate relationship for comparison • Comparison showed insight and creativity			
Overall Quality (10) • Meets time limit of assignment • Connected well with the audience • Utilized creativity and originality in approach to topic			

Memorization Presentation Grading Rubric

Names: _____   **Date:** _____

_____   **Speaking Time:** _____

Topic: _____   **Points:** _____ **/25** _____

Strengths

1.

2.

3.

Areas for Improvement

1.

2.

3.

Memorization Presentation Grading Rubric

	- ✓ +	Comments	Points Earned
Outline (4) • Turned in complete outline for group • Each member of the group turned in note card with ONLY keywords			
Introduction (4) • Opener aroused interest and was relevant to the topic • Explained where the content would fit into a complete speech • Included relevant background information • Included clear audience "need to know" • Gave clear, identifiable thesis or claim • Previewed subpoints			
Body (5) • Utilized at least three memorization strategies to teach the information to the audience • Each main point was well developed and supported • If any sources were used, they were cited properly			
Conclusion (3) • Restated thesis or claim • Summed up main points • Included a memorable, strong closer			
Delivery (4) • Used concrete, specific language • Used notecard only minimally; did not read speech from notes • Maintained a natural, conversational delivery style • Maintained eye contact and used appropriate gestures to emphasize important points • Refrained from distracting voice and body behaviors		• Speaker 1 • Speaker 2 • Speaker 3 • Speaker 4	
Overall Quality (5) • Meets time limit of assignment • All group members participated in the presentation • Utilized creativity and originality in approach to topic			

Argument Speech Grading Rubric

Name: _____   **Date:** _____

Topic: _____   **Speaking Time:** _____

Points: _____ /75

<u>Strengths</u>

1.

2.

3.

<u>Areas for Improvement</u>

1.

2.

3.

Argument Speech Grading Rubric

	- ✓ +	Comments	Points Earned
Written Materials (5) • Turned in complete sentence outline that used proper outline structure • If used, note card had only a keyword outline • Turned in all previous outlines, workshop evaluations, and workshop notes • Turned in a copy of all sources • Any other requested materials, including rubric			
Introduction (10) • Opener aroused interest and was relevant • Included relevant background information • Included audience "need to know" • Gave clear, identifiable thesis statement • Clear preview of main points			
Organization (15) • Had clear pattern of organization appropriate for the argument being made • Used internal transitions that included a summary and preview between all main points • Each main point was stated clearly • Thesis and main points were mutually inclusive. Each main point clearly supported the argument being made.			
Support Materials (10) • Properly cited at least two recent, credible sources that were relevant and supported the argument (including the name of the person, periodical or book title; date of publication or interview; and reputation, position, or field of expertise). • Used a variety of supporting materials, such as narration, definition, description, comparison, memorization strategies, evidence, and argument			
Conclusion (5) • Restated thesis • Reviewed main points • Included a memorable, strong closer			
Delivery (10) • Used concrete, specific language • Used note card only minimally; did not read speech from notes • Maintained a natural, conversational delivery style • Maintained eye contact and used appropriate gestures to emphasize important points • Refrained from distracting voice and body behaviors			
Quality of Argument (10) • Chose an appropriate, strong argument topic about a significant issue relevant to the audience • Data met the evidence tests (relevancy, accuracy, expertise, recency, consistency) • Arguments were valid and sound			
Overall Quality (10) • Met time limit of assignment • Connected well with the audience • Utilized creativity and originality in approach to topic			

Impromptu Argument Speech Grading Rubric

Name: _____ **Date:** _____

Topic: _____ **Speaking Time:** _____

Points: _____/15

Strengths

1.

2.

Areas for Improvement

1.

2.

	- ✓ +	Comments	Points Earned
Written Materials (1) • Speech planning sheet was completed • If used, note card was turned in			
Introduction (2) • Opener aroused interest and was relevant • Included relevant background information • Included audience "need to know" • Gave clear, identifiable thesis statement • Gave clear preview of main points			
Organization (3) • Had two sub-arguments • Sub-arguments clearly supported the main argument (thesis) • Used internal transition between the sub-arguments • Each sub-argument was stated clearly			
Support Materials (2) • Each sub-argument was supported by at least one piece of support • Each sub-argument was developed and supported			
Conclusion (2) • Restated thesis • Reviewed main points • Included a memorable, strong closer			
Delivery (2) • Used concrete, specific language • Used note card only minimally; did not read speech from notes • Maintained a natural, conversational delivery style • Maintained eye contact and used appropriate • Refrained from distracting voice and body behaviors			
Overall Quality (3) • Met time limit of assignment • Connected well with the audience • Utilized creativity and originality in approach to topic			

Final Speech Grading Rubric

Name: **Date:**

Topic: **Speaking Time:**

Points: /100

Strengths

1.

2.

3.

Areas for Improvement

1.

2.

3.

Final Speech Grading Rubric

	- ✓ +	Comments	Points Earned
Written Materials (5) • Turned in complete sentence outline that used proper outline structure • If used, note card had only a keyword outline • Turned in all previous outlines, workshop evaluations, and workshop notes • Turned in a copy of all sources • Any other requested materials, including rubric			
Introduction (10) • Opener aroused interest and was relevant • Included relevant background information • Included audience "need to know" • Gave clear, identifiable thesis statement • Clear preview of main points			
Organization (20) • Had clear pattern of organization appropriate for a persuasive or informative speech. • Thesis and main points were mutually inclusive. • Each main point was clearly stated and supported the argument being made. • Used internal transitions that included a clear summary and preview between all main points			
Support Materials (25) • Properly cited at least two recent, credible sources that was relevant and supported the argument (including the name of the person, periodical or book title; date of publication or interview; and reputation, position, or field of expertise). • Used a variety of supporting materials, such as narration, definition, description, comparison, memorization strategies, evidence, and argument • Evidence met tests of relevancy, accuracy, expertise, recency, consistency • Arguments were valid and sound			
Conclusion (10) • Restated thesis • Reviewed main points • Included a memorable, strong closer			
Delivery (15) • Used concrete, specific language • Used note card only minimally; did not read speech from notes • Maintained a natural, conversational delivery style • Maintained eye contact and used appropriate gestures to emphasize important points • Refrained from distracting voice and body behaviors			
Overall Quality (15) • Chose a strong topic about an appropriate, significant issue relevant to the audience • Met time limit of assignment • Speech was clearly either informative or persuasive • Connected well with the audience • Utilized creativity and originality in approach to topic • Speaker shows interest and enthusiasm for or commitment to the topic			

Composite Speech Grading Rubric

Name: _____   **Date:** _____

Topic: _____   **Speaking Time:** _____

                                                        Points: _____ **/100**

Strengths

1.

2.

3.

Areas for Improvement

1.

2.

3.

Composite Speech Grading Rubric

	- ✓ +	Comments	Points Earned
Written Materials (5) • Turned in complete sentence outline that used proper outline structure • If used, note card had only a keyword outline • Turned in all previous outlines, workshop evaluations, and workshop notes • Turned in a copy of all sources • Any other requested materials, including rubric			
Introduction (10) • Opener aroused interest and was relevant • Included relevant background information • Included audience "need to know" • Gave clear, identifiable thesis statement • Clear preview of main points			
Organization (20) • Had clear pattern of organization appropriate for a speech that makes an argument. • Thesis and main points were mutually inclusive. • Each main point was clearly stated and supported the argument being made. • Used internal transitions that included a clear summary and preview between all main points			
Support Materials (25) • Properly cited at least two recent, credible sources that was relevant and supported the argument (including the name of the person, periodical or book title; date of publication or interview; and reputation, position, or field of expertise). • Used a variety of supporting materials (at least 3), such as narration, definition, description, comparison, memorization strategies, evidence, and argument • Evidence met tests of relevancy, accuracy, expertise, recency, consistency • Arguments were valid and sound			
Conclusion (10) • Restated thesis • Reviewed main points • Included a memorable, strong closer			
Delivery (15) • Used concrete, specific language • Used note card only minimally; did not read speech from notes • Maintained a natural, conversational delivery style • Maintained eye contact and used appropriate gestures to emphasize important points • Refrained from distracting voice and body behaviors			
Overall Quality (15) • Chose a strong topic about an appropriate, significant issue relevant to the audience • Met time limit of assignment • Speech made a strong argument • Connected well with the audience • Utilized creativity and originality in approach to topic • Speaker shows interest and enthusiasm for or commitment to the topic			

Appendix B

Textbook Final Speech Grading Sheet

Instructor's Evaluation of Final or Composite Speech

Speaker aroused curiosity, prepared audience during opener.

_____

Speaker established an appropriate audience "need to know."

_____

Speaker clearly shared Thesis and preview of Main Points.

_____

Thesis and Main Points are mutually inclusive.

_____

Speaker selected a variety of appropriate support materials (narration, definition, description, comparison, evidence using fact or opinion, argument).

_____

Speaker cited outside sources for statistics, observations, opinions, quotations, ideas, organization.

_____

Speaker maintained audience interest.

_____

Speaker presented information that increases audience's understanding (appropriate level of difficulty, novelty).

_____

Speaker used strategies to help audience remember elements of message.

_____

Speaker presented obvious transitions between main points in body.

_____

Speaker summarized main points.

_____

Speaker chose a closing that was consistent with and reinforced Thesis and Audience Outcome.

_____

Speech moved toward the realization of Audience Outcome Goal (understanding, appreciation, entertainment, persuasion).

_____

The speech met the requirements of the assignment.

_____

Speaker maintained a natural, conversational delivery style.

_____

Speaker used voice and body to increase understanding and interest.

_____

Speaker refrained from distracting voice and body behaviors.

_____

Speaker maintained eye contact.

_____

Speaker projected confidence.

_____

Appendix C

Peer Workshop Evaluations

Peer Workshop Evaluation for Comparison Speeches

Speaker: _____ Evaluator: _____

Speaker: List 2 or 3 questions on the back of this sheet you would like your peer review to address while responding to your outline. These questions can focus on aspects you are uncertain about, parts that you would particularly like help or advice, a section you really wrestled with, or a feature that you are particularly proud of.

Evaluator: 1) Read through the outline, writing comments on any areas that you think need to be changed or that you think are especially good. Check to see whether the outline contains everything it is supposed to and whether it is structured properly. 2) Read the author's questions on the back of this sheet and write responses to them. 3) Write responses to each of the questions below. Be sure to explain your answers— the more you write, the more your comments will help the speaker. If you need more space, write on the back. When you are finished, discuss your suggestions and return this sheet and the outline to the speaker.

Which of the 3 categories of comparison does this speech fit into?

Is an alternating or divided pattern of organization used?

Are the thesis and main points mutually inclusive and stated as claims? Are the main points separate? How can they be better?

What sources have been cited? Do you think they are credible and relevant to the point being made? Why or why not? How can this be better?

Why should the audience care about this topic? How could the speaker make you care more?

What are your two favorite parts of this speech? Why? Can you think of a way to make them even better?

1.

2.

What are two ways you think this speech could be improved? How? Why?

1.

2.

Speaker: What was the most helpful advice you received today? Write down at least 3 things you plan to do to revise your speech before you present it in class. Be sure to bring this sheet and all comments and outlines on the day that you speak.
1.

2.

3.

Peer Workshop Evaluation for Argument Speeches

Speaker: _____   Evaluator: _____

Speaker: List 2 or 3 questions on the back of this sheet you would like your peer review to address while responding to your outline. These questions can focus on aspects you are uncertain about, parts that you would particularly like help or advice, a section you really wrestled with, or a feature that you are particularly proud of.

Evaluator: 1) Read through the outline, writing comments on any areas that you think need to be changed or that you think are especially good. Check to see whether the outline contains everything it is supposed to and whether it is structured properly. 2) Read the author's questions on the back of this sheet and write responses to them. 3) Write responses to each of the questions below. Be sure to explain your answers— the more you write, the more your comments will help the speaker. If you need more space, write on the back. When you are finished, discuss your suggestions and return this sheet and the outline to the speaker.

Are the thesis and main points mutually inclusive and stated as claims? Are the main points separate? Is each main point a good reason that supports the argument being made (thesis)? How can they be better?

What sources have been cited? Do you think they are credible and relevant to the point being made? Why or why not? How can this be better?

Why should the audience care about this topic? How could the speaker make you care more?

What are your two favorite parts of this speech? Why? Can you think of a way to make them even better?

1.

2.

What are two ways you think this speech could be improved? How? Why?

1.

2.

Speaker: What was the most helpful advice you received today? Write down at least 3 things you plan to do to revise your speech before you present it in class. Be sure to bring this sheet and all comments and outlines on the day that you speak.
1.

2.

3.

Peer Workshop Evaluation for Final or Composite Speeches

Speaker: _____   Evaluator: _____

Speaker: List 2 or 3 questions on the back of this sheet you would like your peer review to address while responding to your outline. These questions can focus on aspects you are uncertain about, parts that you would particularly like help or advice, a section you really wrestled with, or a feature that you are particularly proud of.

Evaluator: 1) Read through the outline, writing comments on any areas that you think need to be changed or that you think are especially good. Check to see whether the outline contains everything it is supposed to and whether it is structured properly. 2) Read the author's questions on the back of this sheet and write responses to them. 3) Write responses to each of the questions below. Be sure to explain your answers— the more you write, the more your comments will help the speaker. If you need more space, write on the back. When you are finished, discuss your suggestions and return this sheet and the outline to the speaker.

Is this an informative or persuasive speech? How do you know?

Are the thesis and main points mutually inclusive and stated as claims? Are the main points separate? Does each main point clearly support the thesis? How can they be better?

What sources have been cited? Do you think they are credible and relevant to the point being made? Why or why not? How can this be better?

Why should the audience care about this topic? How could the speaker make you care more?

What are your two favorite parts of this speech? Why? Can you think of a way to make them even better?

1.

2.

What are two ways you think this speech could be improved? How? Why?

1.

2.

Speaker: What was the most helpful advice you received today? Write down at least 3 things you plan to do to revise your speech before you present it in class. Be sure to bring this sheet and all comments and outlines on the day that you speak.

1.

2.

3.

Appendix D

Peer Evaluations

Peer Narration Evaluation

Speaker's Name:_____   Evaluator's Name:_____

Topic:_____

What was the claim/thesis?

How did the speaker connect the narration to the audience?

Who were the characters?

When and where did the narration take place?

What was the plot (2-3 sentence summary)?

Which type of narrative did the speaker use: story ( ), case study ( ), or history ( )?
Give one reason for your choice.

What delivery aspects (how the speaker looked and sounded) did the speaker use
effectively?

What were the two greatest strengths of this speech?
1.

2.

What are two areas that the speaker could have improved on? How?
1.

2.

Peer Comparison Evaluation

Speaker's Name:_____   Evaluator's Name:_____

Two things being compared:_____

Fill out the following keyword outline as you listen to the speech (The number of main points and subpoints will vary):

Opener
Introduction transition
       Topic Background
       Need to know
       Speaker background
Thesis

Main Point #1
       A.
       B.
       C.

Main Point #2
       A.
       B.
       C.

Main Point #3
       A.
       B.
       C.

Closer

What source was used? Why was or wasn't this a good source to use for this speech?

What category of comparison was used?

What do you think the audience outcome goal was?

What delivery aspects (how the speaker looked and sounded) did the speaker use effectively?

What were the two greatest strengths of this speech?
1.

2.

What are two areas that the speaker could have improved on? How?
1.

2.

Peer Argument Evaluation

Speaker's Name:_____ Evaluator's Name:_____

Topic:_____

Fill out the following outline as you listen to the speech:

Opener
Introduction transition
        Topic Background
        Need to know
        Speaker background
Thesis

Main Point #1
Support materials used:

Main Point #2
Support materials used:

Main Point #3
Support materials used:

Closer

What sources were used? Why were or weren't these good sources to support the argument?

What do you think the audience outcome goal was?

What delivery aspects (how the speaker looked and sounded) did the speaker use effectively?

After hearing the speech, are you willing to accept the speaker's argument? Why or why not?

What were the two greatest strengths of this speech?
1.

2.

What are two areas that the speaker could have improved on? How?
1.

2.

Peer Final or Composite Speech Evaluation

Speaker's Name: _____ Evaluator's Name: _____

Topic: _____

Fill out the following outline as you listen to the speech:

Opener
Introduction transition
   Topic Background
   Need to know
   Speaker background
Thesis

Main Point #1
Support materials used:

Main Point #2
Support materials used:

Main Point #3
Support materials used:

Closer

What sources were used? Why were or weren't these good sources to support the argument?

Was this speech informative or persuasive? How do you know?

What do you think the audience outcome goal was?

What delivery aspects (how the speaker looked and sounded) did the speaker use effectively?

What were the two greatest strengths of this speech?
1.

2.

What are two areas that the speaker could have improved on? How?
1.

2.

Appendix E

Instructor Survey

Instructor Survey

Demographic data (please check one response for each item)
1- I am _____ male _____ female.
2- I am studying _____ Speech Comm _____ Theater _____ Speech Pathology.
3- This was my _____1st _____2nd _____ year of teaching public speaking.
4- In the fall semester, I taught _____ SPCH 105 _____ SPCH 106.
5- In the spring semester, I taught _____ SPCH 105 _____ SPCH 106.
6- Did you compete in forensics as an undergrad (IE or debate)? _____ yes _____ no

Questions regarding research project

7- How helpful were the rubrics in helping your students understand your expectations for their speeches?

Not helpful at all   1   2   3   4   5   6   7   Very Helpful

8- How helpful were the in-class peer workshops for your students?

Not helpful at all   1   2   3   4   5   6   7   Very Helpful

9- How often did students utilize comments that you wrote on their sentence outlines to make changes that would improve their speeches?

Never   1   2   3   4   5   6   7   Always

10- Were the grading rubrics helpful for maintaining consistency in the grades you assigned to speeches?

Not helpful at all   1   2   3   4   5   6   7   Very Helpful

11- Were the grading rubrics helpful for communicating to students why they received a particular grade?

Not helpful at all   1   2   3   4   5   6   7   Very Helpful

12- How helpful were the grading rubrics and comments in helping students find ways to improve future speeches?

Not helpful at all   1   2   3   4   5   6   7   Very Helpful

13- Did the training procedures for using the rubrics adequately prepare you for using them in your classes?

Not adequate 1   2   3   4   5   6   7   Definitely adequate

14- Did the training procedures for conducting peer workshops adequately prepare you for conducting workshops in your classes?

Not adequate   1   2   3   4   5   6   7   Definitely adequate

15- Did the training procedures providing instructor feedback on outlines adequately prepare you for commenting on your student outlines?

Not adequate   1   2   3   4   5   6   7   Definitely adequate

If given the choice for speech classes that you teach in the future…

16- Would you use grading rubrics?   Yes   No

Why or why not?

17- Would you use peer workshops?   Yes   No

Why or why not?

18- Would you give comments on outlines before students give speeches? Yes   No

Why or why not?

Did the grading rubrics make it easier…

        19- To assign grades?   Yes   No

        20- To talk about grades?   Yes   No

        21- To justify grades?   Yes   No

        22- For students to accept grades?   Yes   No

        23- To pinpoint problems with student speeches?   Yes   No

Comments:

24- Do you think that your students gave better speeches when you used the rubrics, gave feedback on outlines, and had workshops?   Yes   No

Why or why not?

25- Do you think that your students learned more when you used the rubrics, gave feedback on outlines, and had workshops?   Yes   No

Why or why not?

26- Do you think that your students were more engaged with the material when you used the rubrics, gave feedback on outlines, and had workshops?   Yes   No

Why or why not?

27- Do you think that your students were more connected to you as the instructor when you used the rubrics, gave feedback on outlines, and had workshops?   Yes   No

Why or why not?

28- Do you think that your students were more confident with their speeches when you used the rubrics, gave feedback on outlines, and had workshops?   Yes   No

Why or why not?

29- Do you think that your students put more effort into their speeches when you used the rubrics, gave feedback on outlines, and had workshops?   Yes   No

Why or why not?

30- In your opinion, what was the best thing about participating in this experimental study?

31- In your opinion, what was the worst thing about participating in this experimental study?

32- If this experimental study were to be run again, what changes would you suggest?

33- If this experimental study were to be run again, what would you want kept the same?

34- What two pieces of advice would you give to someone who was using these methods in their classes for the first time?

35- An additional comments?

Appendix F

Instructors' Manual

Instructor's Manual
Introduction to Public Speaking
SPCH 105 and SPCH 106
Spring 2005

Table of Contents

Dear Public Speaking GTAs,

I am requesting your assistance with a research project that will test some experimental changes in the public speaking classes. Basically, this project will involve three main changes in the way that we teach public speaking:

1) **Specific Analytic Grading Rubrics:** These rubrics include a lot of detail outlining the grading criteria for each speech. The students will have a copy of the grading rubric when the speech is assigned, so the rubrics will serve as guidelines as students prepare their speeches and will give more specific justification about why the students received certain grades on their speeches. The rubrics will also include space for you give specific comments about the students' greatest strengths and areas for improvement, which should be seen as areas for students to focus on as they prepare their next presentation.

2) **Peer Workshops:** Before giving the major structured speeches (Comparison, Argument and Final for 106; Comparison and Composite for 105), time will be set aside for peer workshops so that students can offer feedback and suggestions to each other and revise their speeches based on others' comments before actually giving their speeches in class.

3) **Instructor Feedback Prior to Performance**: Two class days before students begin giving the major structured speeches, they will be required to turn in a typed sentence outline of their speech. You will write comments on the outline and return it to the students at least one class period before they speak. This will help ensure that the students understand and are meeting your expectations before actually giving the speech and, combined with the peer workshops, will encourage revision so that students engage in a speechwriting process instead of just throwing some rough ideas together the night before giving their speeches.

A couple of smaller changes will also be incorporated. Since giving written feedback on outlines will take additional time, one of the Outside Speech Reports has been eliminated from the syllabus, and those points have been reallocated to the peer workshops and sentence outlines that are turned in before the major speeches. Also, more specific peer evaluations that are more consistent with the peer workshops and grading rubrics have been developed.

All of the grading rubrics, workshop sheets, and peer evaluations have already been developed and will be available as part of the syllabus that students must purchase or print at the beginning of the summer. An instructor's manual that includes all of these forms, instructions on how to use them, and directions for conducting effective peer workshops will be given to you later this semester. We will also include some training for these methods in Power Hour before each new component is implemented into the course.

Though this teaching method is relatively new and unresearched in public speaking classes, a great deal of research has been done and practical guidelines established for its successful implementation in writing courses, and consistent positive results have been seen in the quality of student writing. We have been conducting a pilot study during the fall semester to test this method before applying it to all of the public speaking courses for the broader experimental study, and we have seen many indicators that this teaching method will have significant positive impacts on the quality of student speeches.

The successful testing of these ideas depends on your willingness to use them and consistently follow the suggested guidelines. Without your cooperation, the results of the experiment will not be reliable, and we will be unable to determine whether these methods had a significant impact on the quality of student speeches. Thank you for your help with this project.

Sincerely,

Melissa Broeckelman

SPCH 106, TU

Week	Day	Class	Reading Assignment
1	--		
	1/13	Introduction and Orientation	Syllabus
2	1/18	Decision Making, Decision Factors	Ch. 1 & 2
	1/20	Global Decisions and Local Decisions	Ch. 3, App. D & E
3	1/25	Narration	Ch. 4
	1/27	QUIZ 1 (ch 1, 2, & 3, App. D & E), Work on narration speeches	
4	2/1	NARRATION SPEECHES	
	2/3	NARRATION SPEECHES	
5	2/8	Definition, Outside Speech Report #1 Due	Ch 5
	2/10	DEFINITION PRESENTATIONS, Description	Ch. 6
6	2/15	Comparison, Assign Comparison Speeches	Ch. 8
	2/17	DESCRIPTION PRESENTATIONS, QUIZ 2 (ch 4, 5, 6, & 8)	
7	2/22	Whole Speech Review, Intros and Conclusions, From Plan to Speech; workshop day for comparison speeches; comparison speech outlines due	Ch. 7
	2/24	Talk about source citations; Revisions/workshop comparison speeches	
8	3/1	COMPARISION SPEECHES	
	3/3	COMPARISON SPEECHES	
9	3/8	Memorization, Planning of Memorization Activity	Ch. 9
	3/10	MEMORIZATION PRESENTATIONS; Assign Argument and Final Speeches	
10	3/15	Evidence; Use of Library	Ch. 10, App.A
	3/17	QUIZ 3 (ch 7, 9, & 10, App. A)	
11	3/22	**NO CLASS- SPRING BREAK**	
	3/24	**NO CLASS- SPRING BREAK**	
12	3/29	Argument	Ch. 11
	3/31	Argument; assign argument analysis	Ch. 12
13	4/5	Argument; argument speech outline due; workshop day for argument speeches	
	4/7	Quiz 4 (ch 11 & 12); Argument speech revisions; Outside Speech Report #3 Due	
14	4/12	ARGUMENT SPEECHES	
	4/14	ARGUMENT SPEECHES	
15	4/19	ARGUMENT SPEECHES; final speech outlines due	
	4/21	Workshop day for final speeches	
16	4/26	FINAL SPEECHES	
	4/28	FINAL SPEECHES	
17	5/3	FINAL SPEECHES	
	5/5	Review for final exam	
18	5/9	**FINAL EXAM, 7:30-9:20 AM**	

SPCH 106, MWF

Week	Day	Class	Reading Assignment
1	-- 1/12	Introduction and Orientation	Syllabus
	1/14	Decision Making, Decision Factors	Ch. 1 & 2
2	1/17	**MLK DAY—NO CLASSES**	
	1/19	Global Decisions: Topic Selection	Ch. 3, App. D & E
	1/21	Global Decisions: Speech Goals, Thesis, Supporting Claims	
3	1/24	Local Decisions: Lower Level Supporting Claims, Support Materials, Legal/Ethical Issues, Delivery	
	1/26	Narration	Ch. 4
	1/28	QUIZ 1 (ch 1, 2, & 3, App. D & E)	
4	1/31	NARRATION SPEECHES	
	2/2	NARRATION SPEECHES	
	2/4	NARRATION SPEECHES	
5	2/7	Definition, Outside Speech Report #1 Due	Ch. 5
	2/9	DEFINITION PRESENTATIONS	
	2/11	Description	Ch. 6
6	2/14	DESCRIPTION PRESENTATOINS	
	2/16	QUIZ 2 (ch 4, 5, 6, & 8)	
	2/18	Comparison; Assign Comparison Speeches	Ch 8
7	2/21	Global Decisions for Comparison Speech, Whole Speech Review, Intros & Conclusions, From Plan to Speech	Ch. 7
	2/23	Source Citations; Comparison Speech Outlines Due	
	2/25	Workshop Day for Comparison Speeches	
8	2/28	COMPARISON SPEECHES	
	3/2	COMPARISON SPEECHES	
	¾	COMPARISON SPEECHES	
9	3/7	Memorization	Ch. 9
	3/9	MEMORIZATION PRESENTATIONS	
	3/11	Use of Library; Assign Argument and Final Speeches	Appendix A
10	3/14	Evidence	Ch. 10
	3/16	QUIZ 3 (ch 7, 9, & 10, App. A)	
	3/18	Argument	Ch. 11
11	3/21	**NO CLASS- SPRING BREAK**	
	3/23	**NO CLASS- SPRING BREAK**	
	3/25	**NO CLASS- SPRING BREAK**	
12	3/28	Argument	Ch. 12
	3/30	Argument; assign argument analysis	
	4/1	QUIZ 4 (ch 11 & 12); argument speech outlines due	
13	4/4	Workshop day for argument speeches; Outside Speech Report #3 Due	
	4/6	ARGUMENT SPEECHES	
	4/8	ARGUMENT SPEECHES	
	4/11	ARGUMENT SPEECHES	

14	4/13	ARGUMENT SPEECHES	
	4/15	ARGUMENT SPEECHES	
15	4/18	Final speech outlines due; workshop day for final speeches	
	4/20	Workshop/revision day for final speeches	
	4/22	FINAL SPEECHES	
16	4/25	FINAL SPEECHES	
	4/27	FINAL SPEECHES	
	4/29	FINAL SPEECHES	
17	5/2	FINAL SPEECHES	
	5/4	FINAL SPEECHES	
	5/6	Review for final exam	
18	5/9	**Final Examination; 7:30-9:20 am**	

SPCH 105, MW

Week	Day	Class	Reading Assignment
1	--		
	1/12	Introduction and Orientation	Syllabus
2	1/17	**MLK DAY—NO CLASSES**	
	1/19	Decision Making; Decision Factors	Ch.1 & 2
3	1/24	Global Decisions and Local Decisions	Ch. 3
	1/26	Narration (on quiz 2), assign narration speeches	Ch. 4
4	1/31	QUIZ 1 (1, 2, & 3)	
	2/2	NARRATION SPEECHES	
5	2/7	NARRATION SPEECHES	
	2/9	Definition	Ch. 5
6	2/14	GROUP DEFINITION PRESENTATIONS	
	2/16	Comparison; assign comparison speeches	Ch. 8
7	2/21	Whole Speech Review, Intros and Conclusions, From Plan to Speech	Ch. 7
	2/23	QUIZ 2 (ch 4, 5 & 8); comparison speech outline due	
8	2/28	Workshop Day for Comparison Speeches	
	3/2	COMPARISON SPEECHES	
9	3/7	COMPARISON SPEECHES	
	3/9	Memorization, planning of memorization activity	Ch. 9
10	3/14	MEMORIZATION ACTIVITY, assign composite speeches	
	3/16	Evidence/Use of Library	Ch. 10, App. A
11	3/21	**NO CLASS- SPRING BREAK**	
	3/23	**NO CLASS- SPRING BREAK**	
12	3/28	QUIZ 3 (ch 7, 9, & 10, App. A)	
	3/30	Argument	Ch. 11
13	4/4	Argument	Ch. 12
	4/6	IMPROMPTU ARGUMENT SPEECHES; Outside Speech Report #3 Due	
14	4/11	QUIZ 4 (ch 11 & 12); composite speech outlines due	
	4/13	Workshop Day for Composite Speeches	
15	4/18	COMPOSITE SPEECHES	
	4/20	COMPOSITE SPEECHES	
16	4/25	COMPOSITE SPEECHES	
	4/27	COMPOSITE SPEECHES	
17	5/2	COMPOSITE SPEECHES	
	5/4	Review for final exam	
18	5/9	**FINAL EXAM, 7:30-9:20 AM**	

SPCH 105, TU

Week	Day	Class	Reading Assignment
1	--		
	1/13	Introduction and Orientation	Syllabus
2	1/18	Decision Making; Decision Factors	Ch. 1&2
	1/20	Global Decisions and Local Decisions	Ch. 3
3	1/25	Narration (on quiz 2), assign narration speeches	Ch. 4
	1/27	QUIZ 1 (ch 1, 2, & 3)	
4	2/1	NARRATION SPEECHES	
	2/3	NARRATION SPEECHES	
5	2/8	Definition	Ch. 5
	2/10	GROUP DEFINITION PRESENTATIONS	
6	2/15	Comparison; Assign Comparison Speeches	Ch. 8
	2/17	Whole Speech Review, Intros and Conclusions, From Plan to Speech	Ch. 7
7	2/22	QUIZ 2 (ch 4, 5, 8); comparison speech outline due	
	2/24	Workshop day for comparison speeches	
8	3/1	COMPARISON SPEECHES	
	3/3	COMPARISON SPEECHES	
9	3/8	Memorization, planning of memorization activity	Ch. 9
	3/10	MEMORIZATION ACTIVITY; Assign Composite Speech	
10	3/15	Evidence, Use of Library	Ch. 10, App. A
	3/17	QUIZ 3 (ch 7, 9 & 10, App. A)	
11	3/22	**NO CLASS- SPRING BREAK**	
	3/24	**NO CLASS- SPRING BREAK**	
12	3/29	Argument	Ch. 11
	3/31	Argument	Ch. 12
13	4/5	TBA; Outside Speech Report #3 Due	
	4/7	IMPROMPTU ARGUMENT SPEECHES	
14	4/12	QUIZ 4 (ch 11 & 12); composite speech outlines due	
	4/14	Workshop day for composite speeches	
15	4/19	COMPOSITE SPEECHES	
	4/21	COMPOSITE SPEECHES	
16	4/26	COMPOSITE SPEECHES	
	4/28	COMPOSITE SPEECHES	
17	5/3	COMPOSITE SPEECHES	
	5/5	Review for final exam	
18	5/9	**FINAL EXAM, 7:30-9:20 AM**	

SPCH 106 Grading Scale

Possible Points		**Your Points**		
Speeches				
Narration	50	Narration	_____	points
Comparison	75	Comparison	_____	points
Memorization	25	Memorization	_____	points
Argument	75	Argument	_____	points
Final	100	Final	_____	points
Workshops and Outlines				
Comparison	15	Comparison	_____	points
Argument	15	Argument	_____	points
Final	20	Final	_____	points
Argument Analysis	25	Argument Analysis		points
Quizzes and Exams				
Quiz 1	20	Quiz 1	_____	points
Quiz 2	25	Quiz 2	_____	points
Quiz 3	30	Quiz 3	_____	points
Quiz 4	30	Quiz 4	_____	points
Final Exam	100	Final Exam	_____	points
Critiques				
Narration	10	Narration	_____	points
Comparison	10	Comparison	_____	points
Argument	10	Argument	_____	points
Final	10	Final	_____	points
Outside Speech Reports				
#1: Global Decisions	25	#1: Global Decisions	_____	points
#3: Entire Speech	25	#3: Entire Speech	_____	points
Quizzes, Homework, In-Class Work, Participation	75	Quizzes, Homework In-Class Work, Participation	_____	points
TOTAL	**770 Points**	**Your total:**	**_____**	**points**

Scale:
693-770=A
616-692= B
539-615=C
462-538=D
0-461=F

SPCH 105: GRADING SCALE

Possible Points		**Your Points**	
Speeches:			
Narration	50 points	Narration	__ points
Comparison	75 points	Comparison	__ points
Memorization	25 points	Memorization	__ points
Impromptu Argument	15 points	Impromptu Argument	__ points
Composite	100 points	Composite	__ points
Quizzes and Exam:			
Quiz 1	20 points	Quiz 1	__ points
Quiz 2	20 points	Quiz 2	__ points
Quiz 3	30 points	Quiz 3	__ points
Quiz 4	30 points	Quiz 4	__ points
Final exam	100 points	Final exam	__ points
Workshops and Outlines:			
Comparison	10 points	Comparison	___ points
Composite	15 points	Composite	___ points
Critiques:			
Comparison	10 points	Comparison	__ points
Peer Analysis of Composite	10 points	Peer Analysis of Composite	__ points
Composite	10 points	Composite	__ points
Outside Speech Reports:			
#3 Final Report	50 points	#3 Final Report	__ points
Quizzes, Homework, In-class work	40 points	Quizzes, Homework, In-class work	__ points
	610 points		___ points

SCALE: 610-549=A   426-366=D
                548-488=B   365-0=F
                487-427=C

SPCH 106, TU
Instructor Timeline

Week	Day	Class	Reading Assignment
1	--		
	1/13	Introduction and Orientation	Syllabus
2	1/18	Decision Making, Decision Factors	Ch. 1 & 2
	1/20	Global Decisions and Local Decisions	Ch. 3, App. D & E
3	1/25	**Narration--** Go over the narration speech assignment in class. Go over the grading rubric and explain that it can be used as a set of guidelines or a checklist as they prepare their speeches because it tells them exactly how they will be graded and what you will be looking for. Tell them what specific expectations you have for the speech. (ie: Do you want the thesis worded a certain way? Do you want a need to know statement in the intro? Do you have any structure requirements or suggestions that are unclear on the grading rubric?) It can be very helpful if you give them a sample narration speech so that they can see what a narration looks like. (Just make up a speech telling one of your stories.) Also point out that just meeting the requirements will not be enough to receive an A—gradations of quality will also be taken into consideration.	Ch. 4
	1/27	**QUIZ 1, Work on narration speeches.** You may also want to spend some time discussing your expectations and conventions for speech days. Do you have certain procedures that you want followed? Do you have rules for audience members and students coming in late?	
4	2/1	NARRATION SPEECHES	
	2/3	NARRATION SPEECHES	
5	2/8	**Definition, Outside Speech Report #1 Due--** Assign the definition presentation. If you are going to have students giving speeches or group speeches, be sure to give them a copy of the grading rubric along with the assignment.	Ch 5
	2/10	**DEFINITION PRESENTATIONS, Description-**- If you are having students do a formal description speech or group presentation, give them the assignment and have them bring the grading rubric on this day.	Ch. 6

6	2/15	**Comparison, Assign Comparison Speeches**—Have students bring a copy of the grading rubric and explain your expectations for this speech. Remind them that the grading rubric can serve as a great set of guidelines and a checklist as they prepare their speech. Remind them about gradations of quality. Go over the basic comparison structure with your students and show them a sample comparison speech outline. (you can give them a copy as a handout or post it online). Tell students what materials they will need to bring to class on each day. (For the workshop, they will need 2 copies of their sentence outline, 2 copies of the peer workshop evaluation, and a copy of their sources. On speech days, they will need to bring all of their previous drafts and workshop notes, an updated typed sentence outline, their grading rubric, copies of their sources, and a peer evaluation sheet that they can use to evaluate a classmate's speech. It can be helpful to give students a checklist of materials they will need to bring each day when you assign the speech.) Remind students that completion alone does not equal excellence, and that they must strive for excellence in order to receive an A.	Ch. 8
	2/17	DESCRIPTION PRESENTATIONS, QUIZ 2	
7	2/22	**Whole Speech Review, Intros and Conclusions, From Plan to Speech; workshop day for comparison speeches; comparison speech outlines due--** You will want to set aside 45 minutes for the workshop since this is the first peer workshop they will be doing. Follow the guidelines for workshop modeling and the initial peer workshop found in the manual under Instructor Instructions.	Ch. 7
	2/24	**Talk about source citations; Revisions/workshop comparison speeches--** See Instructor Instructions for information about how to conduct this workshop (V.1.A).	
8	3/1	COMPARISION SPEECHES	
	3/3	COMPARISON SPEECHES	
9	3/8	Memorization, Planning of Memorization Activity	Ch. 9
	3/10	**MEMORIZATION PRESENTATIONS; Assign Argument and Final Speeches--** Give students the speech assignments and go over your expectations for each speech. Remind them to use the grading rubrics as guidelines and give them the basic speech structure and sample outlines for each type of speech (easiest to make this available on K-State Online). It might be helpful to give the students a checklist of what is due on each day and what they need to bring to class. Remind students that completion alone does not equal excellence, and that they must strive for excellence in order to receive an A.	
10	3/15	Evidence; Use of Library	Ch. 10, App.A
	3/17	QUIZ 3	
11	3/22	**NO CLASS- SPRING BREAK**	
	3/24	**NO CLASS- SPRING BREAK**	
12	3/29	Argument	Ch. 11
	3/31	Argument; assign argument analysis	Ch. 12
13	4/5	**Argument; argument speech outline due**; **workshop day for argument speeches--** See information in manual about later workshops (V.1.D).	

	4/7	Quiz 4; Argument speech revisions; Outside Speech Report #3 Due	
14	4/12	ARGUMENT SPEECHES	
	4/14	ARGUMENT SPEECHES	
15	4/19	ARGUMENT SPEECHES; final speech outlines due	
	4/21	**Workshop day for final speeches--** See information in manual about later workshops (V.1.D).	
16	4/26	FINAL SPEECHES	
	4/28	FINAL SPEECHES	
17	5/3	FINAL SPEECHES	
	5/5	Review for final exam	
18	5/9	**FINAL EXAM, 7:30-9:20 AM**	

SPCH 106, MWF
Instructor Timeline

Week	Day	Class	Reading Assignment
1	-- 1/12	Introduction and Orientation	Syllabus
	1/14	Decision Making, Decision Factors	Ch. 1 & 2
2	1/17	**MLK DAY-- NO CLASSES**	
	1/19	Global Decisions: Topic Selection	Ch. 3
	1/21	Global Decisions: Speech Goals, Thesis, Supporting Claims	
3	1/24	Local Decisions: Lower Level Supporting Claims, Support Materials, Legal/Ethical Issues, Delivery	
	1/26	**Narration--** Go over the narration speech assignment in class. Go over the grading rubric and explain that it can be used as a set of guidelines or a checklist as they prepare their speeches because it tells them exactly how they will be graded and what you will be looking for. Tell them what specific expectations you have for the speech. (ie: Do you want the thesis worded a certain way? Do you want a need to know statement in the intro? Do you have any structure requirements or suggestions that are unclear on the grading rubric?) It can be very helpful if you give them a sample narration speech so that they can see what a narration looks like. (Just make up a speech telling one of your stories.) Also point out that just meeting the requirements will not be enough to receive an A—gradations of quality will also be taken into consideration.	Ch. 4
	1/28	**QUIZ 1.** You may also want to spend some time discussing your expectations and conventions for speech days. Do you have certain procedures that you want followed? Do you have rules for audience members and students coming in late?	
4	1/31	NARRATION SPEECHES	
	2/2	NARRATION SPEECHES	
	2/4	NARRATION SPEECHES	
5	2/7	**Definition, Outside Speech Report #1 Due--** Assign the definition presentation. If you are going to have students giving speeches or group speeches, be sure to have them bring a copy of the grading rubric along with the assignment.	Ch. 5
	2/9	DEFINITION PRESENTATIONS	
	2/11	**Description-**- If you are having students do a formal description speech or group presentation, give them the assignment and have them bring the grading rubric on this day.	Ch. 6
6	2/14	DESCRIPTION PRESENTATOINS	
	2/16	QUIZ 2	

	2/18	**Comparison, Assign Comparison Speeches**—Have students bring a copy of the grading rubric and explain your expectations for this speech. Remind them that the grading rubric can serve as a great set of guidelines and a checklist as they prepare their speech. Go over the basic comparison structure with your students and show them a sample comparison speech outline. (you can give them a copy as a handout or post it online). Tell students what materials they will need to bring to class on each day. (For the workshop, they will need 2 copies of their sentence outline, 2 copies of the peer workshop evaluation, and a copy of their sources. On speech days, they will need to bring all of their previous drafts and workshop notes, an updated typed sentence outline, their grading rubric, copies of their sources, and a peer evaluation sheet that they can use to evaluate a classmate's speech. It can be helpful to give students a checklist of materials they will need to bring each day when you assign the speech.) Remind students that completion alone does not equal excellence, and that they must strive for excellence in order to receive an A.	Ch 8
7	2/21	**Whole Speech Review, Intros and Conclusions, From Plan to Speech**	Ch. 7
	2/23	**Source Citations; Comparison Speech Outlines due--** You will want to set aside 45 minutes for the workshop since this is the first peer workshop they will be doing. Follow the guidelines for workshop modelling and the initial peer workshop found in the manual under Instructor Instructions.	
	2/25	Workshop Day/Revisions for Comparison Speeches (See V.1.C in manual)	
8	2/28	COMPARISON SPEECHES	
	3/2	COMPARISON SPEECHES	
	3/4	COMPARISON SPEECHES	
9	3/7	Memorization	Ch. 9
	3/9	MEMORIZATION PRESENTATIONS	
	3/11	**Use of Library**; Assign Argument and Final Speeches-- Give students the speech assignments and go over your expectations for each speech. Remind them to use the grading rubrics as guidelines and give them the basic speech structure and sample outlines for each type of speech (easiest to make this available on K-State Online). It might be helpful to give the students a checklist of what is due on each day and what they need to bring to class. Remind students that completion alone does not equal excellence, and that they must strive for excellence in order to receive an A.	Appendix A
10	3/14	Evidence	Ch. 10
	3/16	QUIZ 3	
	3/18	Argument	Ch. 11
11	3/21	**NO CLASS- SPRING BREAK**	
	3/23	**NO CLASS- SPRING BREAK**	
	3/25	**NO CLASS- SPRING BREAK**	
12	3/28	Argument	Ch. 12
	3/30	Argument; assign argument analysis	
	4/1	QUIZ 4; argument speech outlines due	

	4/4	**Outside Speech Report #3 Due, Workshop Day for Argument Speeches--** See information in manual about later workshops (V.1.D).	
13	**4/6**	ARGUMENT SPEECHES	
	4/8	ARGUMENT SPEECHES	
	4/11	ARGUMENT SPEECHES	
14	**4/13**	ARGUMENT SPEECHES	
	4/15	ARGUMENT SPEECHES	
	4/18	**Final speech outlines due; Workshop day for final speeches.** See information in manual about later workshops (V.1.D).	
15	**4/20**	Workshop/revision day for final speeches	
	4/22	FINAL SPEECHES	
	4/25	FINAL SPEECHES	
16	**4/27**	FINAL SPEECHES	
	4/29	FINAL SPEECHES	
	5/2	FINAL SPEECHES	
17	**5/4**	FINAL SPEECHES	
	5/6	Review for final exam	
18	**5/9**	**Final Examination; 7:30-9:20 am**	

SPCH 105, MW
Instructor Timeline

Week	Day	Class	Reading Assignment
1	--		
	1/12	Introduction and Orientation	Syllabus
2	1/17	**MLK DAY-- NO CLASSES**	
	1/19	Decision Making; Decision Factors	Ch.1 & 2
3	1/24	Global Decisions and Local Decisions	Ch. 3
	1/26	**Narration (on quiz 2), assign narration speeches--** Go over the narration speech assignment in class. Go over the grading rubric and explain that it can be used as a set of guidelines or a checklist as they prepare their speeches because it tells them exactly how they will be graded and what you will be looking for. Tell them what specific expectations you have for the speech. (ie: Do you want the thesis worded a certain way? Do you want a need to know statement in the intro? Do you have any structure requirements or suggestions that are unclear on the grading rubric?) It can be very helpful if you give them a sample narration speech so that they can see what a narration looks like. (Just make up a speech telling one of your stories.) Also point out that just meeting the requirements will not be enough to receive an A—gradations of quality will also be taken into consideration. You may also want to spend some time discussing your expectations and conventions for speech days. Do you have certain procedures that you want followed? Do you have rules for audience members and students coming in late?	Ch. 4
4	1/31	QUIZ 1	
	2/2	NARRATION SPEECHES	
5	2/7	NARRATION SPEECHES	
	2/9	**Definition--** Assign the definition presentation. If you are going to have students giving speeches or group speeches, have them bring a copy of the grading rubric that they can follow as you go over the assignment.	Ch. 5
6	2/14	GROUP DEFINITION PRESENTATIONS	

	2/16	**Comparison, Assign Comparison Speeches**—Have students bring a copy of the grading rubric and explain your expectations for this speech. Remind them that the grading rubric can serve as a great set of guidelines and a checklist as they prepare their speech. Go over the basic comparison structure with your students and show them a sample comparison speech outline. (you can give them a copy as a handout or post it online). Tell students what materials they will need to bring to class on each day. (For the workshop, they will need 2 copies of their sentence outline, 2 copies of the peer workshop evaluation, and a copy of their sources. On speech days, they will need to bring all of their previous drafts and workshop notes, an updated typed sentence outline, their grading rubric, copies of their sources, and a peer evaluation sheet that they can use to evaluate a classmate's speech. It can be helpful to give students a checklist of materials they will need to bring each day when you assign the speech.) Remind students that completion alone does not equal excellence, and that they must strive for excellence in order to receive an A.	Ch. 8
7	2/21	Whole Speech Review, Intros and Conclusions, From Plan to Speech	Ch. 7
	2/23	QUIZ 2; comparison speech outline due	
8	2/28	**workshop day for comparison speeches--** You will want to set aside the entire class period for the workshop since this is the first peer workshop they will be doing. Follow the guidelines for workshop modeling and the initial peer workshop found in the manual under Instructor Instructions.	
	3/2	COMPARISON SPEECHES	
9	3/7	COMPARISON SPEECHES	
	3/9	Memorization, planning of memorization activity	Ch. 9
10	3/14	**MEMORIZATION PRESENTATIONS; Assign Composite Speech--** Give students the speech assignment and go over your expectations. Remind them to use the grading rubric as a guideline and give them the basic speech structure and a sample complete speech outline (easiest to make this available on K-State Online). It might be helpful to give the students a checklist of what is due on each day and what they need to bring to class. Remind students that completion alone does not equal excellence, and that they must strive for excellence in order to receive an A.	
	3/16	Evidence/Use of Library	Ch. 10, App. A
11	3/21	**NO CLASS- SPRING BREAK**	
	3/23	**NO CLASS- SPRING BREAK**	
12	3/28	QUIZ 3	
	3/30	Argument	Ch. 11
13	4/4	Argument	Ch. 12
	4/6	IMPROMPTU ARGUMENT SPEECHES; Outside Speech Report #3 Due	
14	4/11	QUIZ 4; composite speech outlines due	
	4/13	**Workshop day for composite speeches--** See information in manual about later workshops (V.1.D).	
15	4/18	COMPOSITE SPEECHES	

	4/20	COMPOSITE SPEECHES	
16	**4/25**	COMPOSITE SPEECHES	
	4/27	COMPOSITE SPEECHES	
17	**5/2**	COMPOSITE SPEECHES	
	5/4	Review for final exam	
18	**5/9**	**FINAL EXAM, 7:30-9:20 AM**	

SPCH 105, TU
Instructor Timeline

Week	Day	Class	Reading Assignment
1	--		
	1/13	Introduction and Orientation	Syllabus
2	**1/18**	Decision Making; Decision Factors	Ch. 1&2
	1/20	Global Decisions and Local Decisions	Ch. 3
3	**1/25**	**Narration (on quiz 2), assign narration speeches--** Go over the narration speech assignment in class. Go over the grading rubric and explain that it can be used as a set of guidelines or a checklist as they prepare their speeches because it tells them exactly how they will be graded and what you will be looking for. Tell them what specific expectations you have for the speech. (ie: Do you want the thesis worded a certain way? Do you want a need to know statement in the intro? Do you have any structure requirements or suggestions that are unclear on the grading rubric?) It can be very helpful if you give them a sample narration speech so that they can see what a narration looks like. (Just make up a speech telling one of your stories.) Also point out that just meeting the requirements will not be enough to receive an A—gradations of quality will also be taken into consideration. You may also want to spend some time discussing your expectations and conventions for speech days. Do you have certain procedures that you want followed? Do you have rules for audience members and students coming in late?	Ch. 4
	1/27	QUIZ 1	
4	**2/1**	NARRATION SPEECHES	
	2/3	NARRATION SPEECHES	
5	**2/8**	**Definition--** Assign the definition presentation. If you are going to have students giving speeches or group speeches, be sure to give them a copy of the grading rubric along with the assignment.	Ch. 5
	2/10	GROUP DEFINITION PRESENTATIONS	

6	2/15	**Comparison, Assign Comparison Speeches**—Have students bring a copy of the grading rubric and explain your expectations for this speech. Remind them that the grading rubric can serve as a great set of guidelines and a checklist as they prepare their speech. Go over the basic comparison structure with your students and show them a sample comparison speech outline. (you can give them a copy as a handout or post it online). Tell students what materials they will need to bring to class on each day. (For the workshop, they will need 2 copies of their sentence outline, 2 copies of the peer workshop evaluation, and a copy of their sources. On speech days, they will need to bring all of their previous drafts and workshop notes, an updated typed sentence outline, their grading rubric, copies of their sources, and a peer evaluation sheet that they can use to evaluate a classmate's speech. It can be helpful to give students a checklist of materials they will need to bring each day when you assign the speech.) Remind students that completion alone does not equal excellence, and that they must strive for excellence in order to receive an A.	Ch. 8
	2/17	Whole Speech Review, Intros and Conclusions, From Plan to Speech	Ch. 7
7	2/22	QUIZ 2; comparison speech outline due	
	2/24	**workshop day for comparison speeches--** You will want to set aside the entire class period for the workshop since this is the first peer workshop they will be doing. Follow the guidelines for workshop modeling and the initial peer workshop found in the manual under Instructor Instructions.	
8	3/1	COMPARISON SPEECHES	
	3/3	COMPARISON SPEECHES	
9	3/8	Memorization, planning of memorization activity	Ch. 9
	3/10	**MEMORIZATION PRESENTATIONS; Assign Composite Speech--** Give students the speech assignment and go over your expectations. Remind them to use the grading rubric as a guideline and give them the basic speech structure and a sample complete speech outline (easiest to make this available on K-State Online). It might be helpful to give the students a checklist of what is due on each day and what they need to bring to class. Remind students that completion alone does not equal excellence, and that they must strive for excellence in order to receive an A.	
10	3/15	Evidence, Use of Library	Ch. 10, App. A
	3/17	QUIZ 3	
11	3/22	**NO CLASS- SPRING BREAK**	
	3/24	**NO CLASS- SPRING BREAK**	
12	3/29	Argument	Ch. 11
	3/31	Argument	Ch. 12
13	4/5	TBA; Outside Speech Report #3 Due	
	4/7	IMPROMPTU ARGUMENT SPEECHES	
14	4/12	QUIZ 4; composite speech outlines due	
	4/14	**Workshop day for composite speeches--** See information in manual about later workshops (V.1.D).	
15	4/19	COMPOSITE SPEECHES	

	4/21	COMPOSITE SPEECHES	
16	4/26	COMPOSITE SPEECHES	
	4/28	COMPOSITE SPEECHES	
17	5/3	COMPOSITE SPEECHES	
	5/5	Review for final exam	
18	5/9	**FINAL EXAM, 7:30-9:20 AM**	

1. Workshops

A. *Workshop Modeling and Commenting on Outlines*

You will want to go through this entire modeling process in class on the day that you have your first workshop (before the Comparison speech). The entire modeling process and workshop will probably take about 45 minutes the first time through. When you have workshops before the Argument (106) and Final (106) or Composite (105) speeches, you do not have to go through the entire modeling process again, but you should take about 5 minutes to have the students create a list of do's and don'ts on the board again to remind them of their prior workshop experiences and to set ground rules for the workshops. With the Argument and Final/Composite speeches, you should allocate about 30 minutes of class time for the workshops (5 to brainstorm a list of guidelines and put students into groups, 20 for the peer workshop, and 5 for them to think about the comments they received and write down a list of things they want to do to revise before the next class period.) If you have more time, it's ok to give the students more time in their workshop groups.

i. Before This Class:
Tell students to bring 2 copies of their complete sentence outline and 2 copies of the Peer Workshop Evaluation to class on this day. They should turn one copy of the outline in at the beginning of class and use the second outline and workshop evaluations in their peer workshop groups later in class. Remind students that the workshop is part of their grade, and they will not receive points if they are absent or do not bring their outlines and workshop evaluations to class. You may either use a sample outline for the workshop modeling or ask if one of the students would volunteer to bring copies of his/her outline to use. (They will have the advantage of receiving feedback from even more of their classmates.)

When you assign one of the major speeches, it might be a good idea to give the students a checklist of what materials they need to bring each day (or to post a checklist on K-State Online that they can print out). This will help avoid confusion and prevent them from using the excuse that they didn't know what they were supposed to bring.

ii. Materials:
5 copies of sample speech outline or student outline
Note cards or slips of paper with student workshop roles

iii. Student modeling (10 minutes):
Ask for (or assign) 5 student volunteers. Have the 5 volunteers circle their desks together facing one another in the middle of the room, and have the other students create a circle with their desks around the workshop group. Give each student volunteer a note card or slip of paper explaining his/her role (see pages that follow—roles include speechwriter, bored, praising, disruptive, helpful, etc.). The student playing the role as the speaker should share his/her outline with the group while others respond to it as their role playing

cards direct. Try to choose a student who is fairly confident, understands the material well, and has a little bit of experience doing workshops in other classes if at all possible.

Give the students a minute or two to look over their roles while you explain the purpose of the modeling exercise to the class. Your explanation should go something like this: "Have any of you ever done a peer workshop in a high school English class or Expository Writing class at K-State? What we're about to do is similar, but we're applying it to speeches. Sometimes workshops can be really helpful, but if we're not sure what we're doing, they can be a waste of time. Workshops are only helpful if students are giving useful suggestions, but all too often, we're afraid that we might hurt someone's feelings if we find something in their speech that we think should be better or we're not really sure how to explain what we think needs improved. But if we're the one trying to get help with our speech, we want to know what needs to be fixed and what we're doing well. The point of a workshop is to find ways to improve our speeches. There is no such thing as a perfect speech—even people who win national speaking championships have things that they would still like to improve or that other people think should be changed—so there should be things we can find to improve in any speech, no matter how good it is. Sometimes it's hard to explain what we like and don't like in a speech, but in our textbook and lectures, we have talked about what types of things we look for and have started to develop a vocabulary for talking about speeches. Often, we know if a workshop was helpful or not, but it can be hard to figure out why it did or didn't work, so we're going to watch a workshop and talk about what was and wasn't helpful. While you're watching, think about what you think is good and bad, and we'll brainstorm a list afterward."

Have the student volunteers role play for 3 or 4 minutes. They will probably get frustrated, and the workshop will not go well. That's ok. If it starts to get out of hand and they seem to be giving up after just a couple of minutes, go ahead and stop them. After role-playing for a few minutes, go into a brief class discussion.

Student Workshop Roles

the speechwriter

You are sharing your speech with the rest of the group and trying to get feedback and ideas for ways to improve it. Using your outline, give your speech to the group, then ask them what they think about it. Take notes and/or make changes to the outline when someone gives you a good suggestion or when you see something that you would like to change. Listen to their ideas, but make your own decision about whether their advice will help you improve your speech.

the bored group member

Do not show any interest in the speech or group. Slouch in your seat, look around the room, and glance at your watch frequently. Doodle on a sheet of paper, then try standing your pencil on one end and spin it in circles. Do not offer comments. If someone asks you a question, act a little surprised and say, "What?" or "I don't know."

the praising group member

Pretend you really like everything and think that this is one of the best speeches you've ever seen. Offer lots of praise, such as, "This is really good!" "I like it!" and "I think it's perfect the way it is!" Do not criticize any part of the speech or talk about specific parts of it. Speak only in very broad, general terms.

the disruptive group member

Try to get the group off-topic and be as disruptive as possible. Interrupt other group members in the middle of their sentences. Ask questions not related to the speech, such as, "So, what did everyone think of the football game?" "You won't believe what happened in my math class yesterday…." or "Hey, I really like your shirt. Where did you buy it?" If someone asks you about the speech, say, "That reminds me of something I did once," and proceed to tell or make up your own story. Talk a lot and try to keep the attention on you.

the helpful group member

Show interest in the speaker and the speech. Find specific things about the speech that you like or dislike and explain why. Make specific suggestions for changes that will improve the speech. Listen carefully when others are speaking and ask follow-up questions. For example, you might say, "The first and third points are a lot alike. Is there a way you can separate them more, or maybe combine them into one point and think of another one?" "Your need-to-know statement in the introduction really ties the speech to your audience, but the opener doesn't catch our attention very well. Can you think of another opener? Maybe a story about when this happened to you?" "The thesis is written as a question instead of a claim. If you reword it, it will work much better."

iv. Discussion (5 minutes):

Ask students what did and didn't work within the workshop group. What kinds of comments were helpful, and which were not? Why? Make a list on the board, creating a set of workshop guidelines. You might want to start with the volunteer speaker and the rest of the members of the model workshop group. Ask how they felt about the workshop and what was or wasn't helpful for them. Then ask the rest of the class what they saw that was and wasn't helpful. Create a list of do's and don'ts on the board. Students will probably come up with a lot more don'ts than do's based on what they saw. If they do, ask what they should do instead. (For example, if someone says, "Don't just tell them that their speech was good," ask them what type of comments they would be helpful instead.) Make sure that some version of the following guidelines are included in the list that is created:

- Make <u>specific</u> comments about <u>specific</u> parts of the speech.
- Focus on things the author can change to improve the speech.
- Be positive and encouraging, but give constructive comments rather than simply gushing praise.
- Respect the author's ownership—it's his/her speech, so he/she will decide which suggestions to use or not use.

v. Instructions for workshops (30 minutes—5 for grouping and instructions, 20 for workshop, and 5 for speakers to write revision plan):

1. Explain to students that their workshops will be a bit different because they will be reading outlines and writing comments instead of just speaking to each other. They spoke out loud in the model workshop so that everyone could see what comments were being made.
2. Divide students into groups of 3. (If you have less or more time, you may divide them into pairs or groups of 4.) You will probably want to assign groups in advance. It's often a good idea to place an above-average student, an average student, and a below-average student together.
3. Have students get into their groups and move their desks so that they're facing their other group members in a circle. Try to keep as much space between groups as possible. It usually works best to point to a location in the room for each group to be as you tell them who is in which group.
4. Remind students that they need to write as many of their comments as possible. The goal is give helpful suggestions, which the author should consider when revising the speech before giving it in class. Ask students to spend about 10 minutes on each outline. If they have extra time after writing out their comments on the evaluation sheet, they may quietly discuss their suggestions to help clarify their meaning.
5. While the students are working in groups, circulate through the room. Answer any questions and make sure that they're staying on task. Prompt students with questions if they seem uncertain what to write, and feel free to drift in and out of different group discussions.
6. When there are approximately 5 minutes remaining, ask students to return the workshop evaluations and outlines to the speakers. Have the students put their desks back in rows. Tell the students to take the last few minutes of class to look through the comments and write down at least 3 things they plan to revise before giving their

speeches in class. There is space for this at the bottom of the workshop sheet. (It might be a good idea to stand at the door and make them show you their workshop sheet with this list of revisions as they walk out the door at the end of class. Oftentimes, students have good intentions of remembering things that they want to revise, but it is far too easy to forget what they thought and talked about in their workshop groups if they don't write it down.)

7. Remind students that they will need to bring these workshop evaluation sheets and the outlines they brought today, along with their revised outline, grading rubric, peer evaluation sheet, and note card with only a keyword outline to class on the day that they speak. Tell them that you expect to see some revisions in their speeches.

B. Instructor Comments on Outlines

You will need to look over the sentence outlines that you were given and write comments on them. This is also a great opportunity to check to make sure you approve of their topic and that they understand the fundamental structure and ideas. Try to offer at least a couple of suggestions on each outline.

When commenting on outlines, I tend to focus only on things that they need to change. Most of these comments deal with structural issues and basic topic and concept issues.

Be sure to return them to students at least one class period before they speak so that they have an opportunity to use your comments for revision. When I return the outlines, I explain that I saw a lot of good things in the outlines, but commented only on the changes I would like to see. I tell them that I do not write much about the things they're doing well because it would be very difficult to get all of the outlines back to everyone on time, but that they should not take the lack of positive comments as a sign that their outlines are not good. I explain that I only gave them comments on a few of the most important things in their speeches, so they should not assume that their speech will be perfect if they only fix the things that I commented on.

C. Revision/workshop days after the first day of workshop on each speech

If you have class time set aside for revision the day after the initial workshop, it is a good idea to structure the time for the students. If you don't give them structure, it is likely that they will have a hard time staying focused on their speech and will talk to their friends instead. Here's a suggestion for one way to do this:

1. Have the students work individually for about 5-10 minutes. Tell them to look over the comments they received again and make any additional revisions. Ask them to create a list of a couple of questions they have or areas of their speech that they would really like feedback and suggestions on. During this time, pass back their outlines with your comments and tell them to look over your comments and make any revisions based on those comments. If they really feel like they have their outline finished the way that they want it for the speech, have them start writing out their keyword outline on their note card.

2. Let the students work in groups (the length of time will depend on how much time you have). It is probably a good idea to assign these groups again, though you

might want to assign them to work with different students than they did in the class period before.

3. During the last 10 or 15 minutes, have the students practice giving their speeches to each other out loud in their groups. If some students are making major revisions and still have a lot of work to do, have them work with each other and have students that are done revising work together to practice their speeches.

D. Later Workshops

After your class has had its first workshop session with the Comparison Speech, it is not necessary to go through the entire workshop modeling process again. However, you should review workshop guidelines with the students, structure the workshop time for the class, and hold the students accountable for their work.

i. Review workshop guidelines (5 min): Have students brainstorm a list of workshopping do's and don'ts on the board. Guide the discussion and make sure that the list includes the following ideas:

Do:
- Make specific comments about specific parts of the speech.
- Focus on things the author can change to improve the speech.
- Be positive and encouraging, but give constructive comments rather than simply gushing praise.
- Respect the author's ownership—it's his/her speech, so he/she will decide which suggestions to use or not use.

Don't:
- Give all positive or all negative feedback
- Distract the others in your group

ii. Peer workshops (25 min): Divide students into preassigned groups of three and have them work together. Make sure they sit so that their desks are facing each other and that there is as much space as possible between the groups. An easy way to do this is to direct students to a particular corner or area of the room as you tell them which groups they are in.

iii. Reflection and ending (5 min):
- Have students put their desks back in order.
- On the bottom of their workshop sheet, ask them to write down three things that they plan to do to revise their speeches before the next class period. Tell them that they will have to show you their list before they leave class.
- Stand at the door as the students leave and have them show you that they have three things listed that they plan to change. This holds them accountable for their time in class and makes it more likely that they'll remember the changes they were considering and actually revise their speeches.

E. Grading Workshops

You will notice that points have been allocated for each workshop in the grading scale. You may allocate these points and you find is most appropriate, but be sure to allocate some for students turning in their outline on the first day of the workshops and for participation in each workshop day. For example, there are 15 points allocated for the comparison speech workshop in SPCH 106, so I give students 5 points for turning in their sentence outline, 5 for participating in the first workshop day, and 5 for participating in the 2nd workshop day.

2. Grading Rubrics

When you assign the speech, make sure that students have copies of the grading rubric. Take a moment to draw their attention to the criteria on the rubric and encourage them to use these criteria as a checklist to help them ensure that their speech is meeting the expectations for the assignment. At this time, also discuss expectations of quality and point out that simply meeting the requirements is not enough to warrant an A. If you wish to redistribute some of the point in the Overall Quality into other categories or add other requirements to this category, you may do so. However, you may not reduce the points in other categories.

The grading rubrics work best if you can fill out as much information as possible on the side of the rubric with the grading criteria and comments while the students are speaking. Make a point to mark a +, ✓, or – beside each item on the rubric as students are speaking so that you will not have to go back and listen to the speeches again to make sure that each element was present in the speech. Also, write comments if something really sticks out in the speech, whether it's positive or negative. The more you can write during the speech, the less you will need to write later. If you are pressed for time, it can be helpful to write just a few words that will trigger your memory so that you can complete the comments later.

After students are finished speaking, go back and fill in point totals. On the other side of the rubric, list three strengths and weaknesses for the speech. These comments should focus on things the student should keep in mind to improve their performance on the next speech. Oftentimes, these comments will reflect information marked on the other side of the grading sheet, but listing them specifically will help the students focus their attention on the most important comments. Additionally, listing an equal number of strengths and areas for improvement helps the student get a balance of positive and negative feedback. Please list as many strengths and areas for improvement as there are spaces for comments.

3. Peer Evaluations

Ask students to use the peer evaluations provided in the packet instead of the ones included in the textbook. These revised peer evaluations ask students to listen more

carefully for the various components of the speech and require them to listen more critically because students are being asked to evaluate one another using the same criteria with which they will be evaluated and are required to give positive and negative feedback and constructive criticism to one another, which reinforces and replicates their workshop experience.

Students can earn up to ten points for each peer evaluation. Usually, I look over the evaluation to make sure that it is completed, but do not mark a grade on the evaluation. I enter points into my grade book (usually full credit is given if the evaluation is completed), and then give the evaluation to the student who was being evaluated at the same time that I return their speeches.

1. Comparison Speech Materials

- A. Peer Workshop Evaluation
- B. Grading Rubric
- C. Peer Evaluation
- D. Basic Speech Structure
- E. Sample Outline

Peer Workshop Evaluation for Comparison Speeches

Speaker: _____   Evaluator: _____

Speaker: List 2 or 3 questions on the back of this sheet you would like your peer review to address while responding to your outline. These questions can focus on aspects you are uncertain about, parts that you would particularly like help or advice, a section you really wrestled with, or a feature that you are particularly proud of.

Evaluator: 1) Read through the outline, writing comments on any areas that you think need to be changed or that you think are especially good. Check to see whether the outline contains everything it is supposed to and whether it is structured properly. 2) Read the author's questions on the back of this sheet and write responses to them. 3) Write responses to each of the questions below. Be sure to explain your answers— the more you write, the more your comments will help the speaker. If you need more space, write on the back. When you are finished, discuss your suggestions and return this sheet and the outline to the speaker.

Which of the 3 categories of comparison does this speech fit into?

Is an alternating or divided pattern of organization used?

Are the thesis and main points mutually inclusive and stated as claims? Are the main points separate? How can they be better?

What sources have been cited? Do you think they are credible and relevant to the point being made? Why or why not? How can this be better?

Why should the audience care about this topic? How could the speaker make you care more?

What are your two favorite parts of this speech? Why? Can you think of a way to make them even better?

1.

2.

What are two ways you think this speech could be improved? How? Why?

1.

2.

Speaker: What was the most helpful advice you received today? Write down at least 3 things you plan to do to revise your speech before you present it in class. Be sure to bring this sheet and all comments and outlines on the day that you speak.
1.

2.

3.

Comparison Speech Grading Rubric

Name: **Date:**

Topic: **Speaking Time:**

                                                        Points: /75

Strengths

1.

2.

3.

Areas for Improvement

1.

2.

3.

Comparison Speech Grading Rubric

	- ✓ +	Comments	Points Earned
Written Materials (5) • Turned in complete sentence outline that used proper outline structure • If used, note card had only a keyword outline • Turned in all previous outlines, workshop evaluations, and workshop notes • Turned in a copy of all sources • Any other materials requested by your instructor			
Introduction (5) • Opener aroused interest and was relevant • Introduction transition included relevant background information and "need to know" • Gave clear, identifiable thesis statement • Clearly previewed main points			
Organization (15) • Used either alternating or divided pattern of organization • Used internal transitions that included a summary and preview between all main points • Thesis and main points were mutually inclusive • Main points were separate			
Support Materials (15) • Properly cited at least one recent, credible source that was relevant and supported the point being made • Each main point is described or explained precisely, using at least one type of support material that shows how the point clearly pertains to the thesis			
Conclusion (5) • Restated thesis • Reviewed main points • Included a memorable, strong closer			
Delivery (10) • Used concrete, specific language • Used note card only minimally; did not read speech from notes • Maintained a natural, conversational delivery style • Maintained eye contact and used appropriate gestures to emphasize important points • Refrained from distracting voice and body behaviors			
Quality of Comparison (10) • Utilized one of the three categories of comparison • Selected two items that had an appropriate relationship for comparison • Comparison showed insight and creativity			
Overall Quality (10) • Meets time limit of assignment • Connected well with the audience • Utilized creativity and originality in approach to topic			

Peer Comparison Evaluation

Speaker's Name:_____ Evaluator's Name:_____

Two things being compared:_____

Fill out the following keyword outline as you listen to the speech (The number of main points and subpoints will vary):

Opener
Introduction transition
       Topic Background
       Need to know
       Speaker background
Thesis

Main Point #1
       A.
       B.
       C.

Main Point #2
       A.
       B.
       C.

Main Point #3
       A.
       B.
       C.

Closer

What source was used? Why was or wasn't this a good source to use for this speech?

What category of comparison was used?

What do you think the audience outcome goal was?

What delivery aspects (how the speaker looked and sounded) did the speaker use effectively?

What were the two greatest strengths of this speech?
1.

2.

What are two areas that the speaker could have improved on? How?
1.

2.

Basic Comparison Speech Structure

Introduction:

Opener
Topic Background
Audience "Need to Know" Statement
Thesis: _____ is like _____ in (#) of ways:
Preview Main Points

Body:

I. Main Point 1
    A. Subpoint A
    B. Subpoint B

Internal Transition (Review Main Point 1, Preview Main Point 2)

II. Main Point 2
    A. Subpoint A
    B. Subpoint B

Internal Transition (Review Main Point 2, Preview Main Point 3)

III. Main Point 3
    A. Subpoint A
    B. Subpoint B

Conclusion:

Restate Thesis
Review Main Points
Closer

Sample Outline for a Comparison Speech

Introduction:

Opener: Should I live on campus or off campus next year? This is a question that many of you will begin to ask yourselves
Topic Background: Few people actually consider some of the most important factors when deciding whether to live on or off campus.
Audience "Need to Know" Statement: Since all of you are college students and will have to decide whether to live on or off campus next year, it is important for you to have information about two of the most common living arrangement options.
Speaker background: Since I have lived in both the residence halls and an apartment, I have experienced the drawbacks and benefits of both types of living arrangements.
Thesis and preview of main points: Living in the dorms and living in an apartment are similar in three ways: your food choices, the location, and the cost.

Body:

I. The first factor you should consider when deciding where to live is the food choices.
    A. Dorm: lots of options, food is prepared, don't have to go grocery shopping, must eat during certain hours
    B. Apartment: options are restricted to what you know how to cook; you can cook whatever you want to eat; have to go grocery shopping, cook, and do dishes; can eat meals whenever you want

* Internal Transition: Now that we've examined the food choices available, we must second, consider the importance of location for living in the dorms or in an apartment.

II. You should think about the location of where you'll live.
    A. Dorm: within a ten minute walk to all of your classes, might have to park far from your building but you won't have to find a parking spot every day to get to class, sidewalks are kept clear in bad weather, have to pay for a parking permit
    B. Apartment: if you're not close to campus, you will have to drive to class every day; sidewalks are often not cleared; you get to park right outside your apartment but have to spend a lot of time looking for a parking space on campus

*Internal Transition: As you can see, location should be an important factor when you decide where to live, but finally, we need to think about the factor that might matter most: the cost.

III. You need to know about the differences in cost for dorms and apartments.
    A. Dorms: fees are the same every month; don't have to worry about extra bills for utilities; according to the K-State Housing and Dining Services website, www.ksu.edu/housing, on September 27, 2004, the cost for a double occupancy regular room is currently $2,568 per semester, with costs ranging as high as $3,290 per semester for a single suite.
    B. Apartments: rent is the same every month, but utilities will vary; have to pay separate bills for utilities, phone, etc; costs will vary depending on location, landlord, whether you have roommates, amenities, etc.

Conclusion:

Restate Thesis: Today, we've seen that living in the dorm is similar to living in an apartment in three ways.
Review Main Points: First, we considered food choices; second, we looked at location; and finally, we learned about the costs.
Closer: Now that you've seen a comparison of some of the important factors, you will be better equipped to make an educated decision when answering the question, "Where are you going to live next year?"

2. Argument Speech Materials:

  A. Peer Workshop Evaluation
      B. Grading Rubric
      C. Peer Evaluation
    D. Basic Speech Structure
      E. Sample Outline

Peer Workshop Evaluation for Argument Speeches

Speaker: _____   Evaluator: _____

Speaker: List 2 or 3 questions on the back of this sheet you would like your peer review to address while responding to your outline. These questions can focus on aspects you are uncertain about, parts that you would particularly like help or advice, a section you really wrestled with, or a feature that you are particularly proud of.

Evaluator: 1) Read through the outline, writing comments on any areas that you think need to be changed or that you think are especially good. Check to see whether the outline contains everything it is supposed to and whether it is structured properly. 2) Read the author's questions on the back of this sheet and write responses to them. 3) Write responses to each of the questions below. Be sure to explain your answers—the more you write, the more your comments will help the speaker. If you need more space, write on the back. When you are finished, discuss your suggestions and return this sheet and the outline to the speaker.

Are the thesis and main points mutually inclusive and stated as claims? Are the main points separate? Is each main point a good reason that supports the argument being made (thesis)? How can they be better?

What sources have been cited? Do you think they are credible and relevant to the point being made? Why or why not? How can this be better?

Why should the audience care about this topic? How could the speaker make you care more?

What are your two favorite parts of this speech? Why? Can you think of a way to make them even better?

1.

2.

What are two ways you think this speech could be improved? How? Why?

1.

2.

Speaker: What was the most helpful advice you received today? Write down at least 3 things you plan to do to revise your speech before you present it in class. Be sure to bring this sheet and all comments and outlines on the day that you speak.
1.

2.

3.

Argument Speech Grading Rubric

	- ✓ +	Comments	Points Earned
Written Materials (5) • Turned in complete sentence outline that used proper outline structure • If used, note card had only a keyword outline • Turned in all previous outlines, workshop evaluations, and workshop notes • Turned in a copy of all sources • Any other requested materials, including rubric			
Introduction (10) • Opener aroused interest and was relevant • Included relevant background information • Included audience "need to know" • Gave clear, identifiable thesis statement • Clear preview of main points			
Organization (15) • Had clear pattern of organization appropriate for the argument being made • Used internal transitions that included a summary and preview between all main points • Each main point was stated clearly • Thesis and main points were mutually inclusive. Each main point clearly supported the argument being made.			
Support Materials (10) • Properly cited at least two recent, credible sources that were relevant and supported the argument (including the name of the person, periodical or book title; date of publication or interview; and reputation, position, or field of expertise). • Used a variety of supporting materials, such as narration, definition, description, comparison, memorization strategies, evidence, and argument			
Conclusion (5) • Restated thesis • Reviewed main points • Included a memorable, strong closer			
Delivery (10) • Used concrete, specific language • Used note card only minimally; did not read speech from notes • Maintained a natural, conversational delivery style • Maintained eye contact and used appropriate gestures to emphasize important points • Refrained from distracting voice and body behaviors	- ✓ +		
Quality of Argument (10) • Chose an appropriate, strong argument topic about a significant issue relevant to the audience • Data met the evidence tests (relevancy, accuracy, expertise, recency, consistency) • Arguments were valid and sound			
Overall Quality (10) • Met time limit of assignment • Connected well with the audience • Utilized creativity and originality in approach to topic			

Argument Speech Grading Rubric

Name: _____   **Date:** _____

Topic: _____   **Speaking Time:** _____

                                          Points: _____ /75___

Strengths

1.

2.

3.

Areas for Improvement

1.

2.

3.

Peer Argument Evaluation

Speaker's Name:_____ Evaluator's Name:_____

Topic:_____

Fill out the following outline as you listen to the speech:

Opener
Introduction transition
         Topic Background
         Need to know
         Speaker background
Thesis

Main Point #1
Support materials used:

Main Point #2
Support materials used:

Main Point #3
Support materials used:

Closer

What sources were used? Why were or weren't these good sources to support the argument?

What do you think the audience outcome goal was?

What delivery aspects (how the speaker looked and sounded) did the speaker use effectively?

After hearing the speech, are you willing to accept the speaker's argument? Why or why not?

What were the two greatest strengths of this speech?
1.

2.

What are two areas that the speaker could have improved on? How?
1.

2.

Basic Argument Speech Structure

Introduction:

Opener
Introduction Transition
- ❑ Topic Background
- ❑ Audience "Need to Know" Statement
- ❑ Speaker Background

Thesis _____should/should not_____ for three reasons:
Preview Main Points

Body:

I. Reason 1:
    A. Subpoint A
    B. Subpoint B

Internal Transition (Review Main Point 1, Preview Main Point 2)

II. Reason 2:
    A. Subpoint A
    B. Subpoint B

Internal Transition (Review Main Point 2, Preview Main Point 3)

III. Reason 3:
    A. Subpoint A
    B. Subpoint B

Conclusion:

Restate Thesis
Review Main Points
Closer

Sample Argument Speech
(sources are highlighted)

Introduction:

Opener (narrative): Haydee Garcia admits she was having a rocky time at Lane High School in Brooklyn. At 17, she had only earned enough credits to be considered a sophomore, and had been pregnant, suspended for fighting, and frequently absent. But in February 2002, she was called to the office for the last time and told that she was no longer welcome at Lane. Unfortunately, Haydee is not alone. According to the Winter/Spring 2003 *Fair Test Examiner*, an education journal, the Advocates for Children of New York City filed a lawsuit against Lane High School for illegally discharging more than 25% of its enrollment. However, this isn't just a problem in New York; it's a problem that is being uncovered across our nation.

Introduction Transition
- **Topic Background:** The 2001 No Child Left Behind Act was supposed to improve education by holding schools accountable and increasing funding for students who needed extra help, but it is actually hurting the quality of education and pressuring administrators across our nation to "push out" low achievers out to make test scores look falsely high instead of helping them learn more.
- **Audience "Need to Know" Statement:** Since all of you have just finished high school and many of you either have siblings or friends in school or will eventually have children of your own, you should be concerned about the quality of education in the US.
- **Speaker Background:** Since I have younger siblings in school, am a teacher, and tutor at the Douglas Community Center, I see the effects of our education system every day.

Thesis: No Child Left Behind should be reformed for three reasons:

Preview Main Points: 1) It hurts the students it was supposed to help, 2) It was based on false information, and 3) It hurts the quality of education instead of helping it.

Body:

I. Reason 1: No Child Left Behind hurts the students it was supposed to help.

    C.   What it was supposed to do: NCLB was supposed to help minorities, immigrants, and special education students who are often pushed into lower quality scores and not given the help they need.

    B. What it really does: Because schools that don't meet the high test score standards lose funding, these students are often "pushed" out of school (forced to drop out) or classified as special ed students so that their scores won't count. The schools can't afford the programs that NCLB requires because they only receive $77 for every $575 required for the new testing and programs, or 13% (June 16, 2003 National Public Radio *Morning Edition*).

Internal Transition: Now that it has become clear that NCLB is harmful to students, we can realize that it is harmful because it was based on lies.

II. Reason 2: NCLB was based on false information.

    C.   What they thought they were basing it on: In the 2000-2001 school year, the Houston, the test scores supposedly went up 20% and the dropout rate was cut to 1 ½ %, so Houston's superintendent, Rod Paige, became the Secretary of Education, and NCLB was modeled after Houston's plan.

    D.   What really happened: An audit of the school district a year later showed that they had faked the data. Bob Kimball, a former principal at Houston's Sharpstown High School, explained in an interview on PBS *Bill Moyers NOW* on October 17, 2003, that only about 50% of the students were actually graduating, and the students were just being reclassified in the computer system so that nobody would know they had dropped out (or, in many cases, been forced to drop out) or put into a special ed category so they wouldn't count.

Internal Transition: Now that we've seen that NCLB was based on false information, we need to finally, learn how NCLB hurts the quality of education instead of helping it.

162

III. Reason 3: NCLB hurts the quality of education instead of helping it.
    C. Standardized testing hurts education: NCLB is based on the idea that forcing schools to have higher standardized test scores will cause teachers to help students learn more. However, the test questions don't always match the curriculum (<mark>2003 *Brigham Young University Education and Law Journal*</mark>). Standardized testing forces teachers to drill the material instead of teaching problem-solving and creative thinking skills and forces them to spend time on testing and teaching testing strategies instead of teaching the real curriculum material.
    D. NCLB doesn't consider solutions that would really work: Instead of relying on standardized tests, we need to develop ways to teach toward all of the learning styles and find better ways to assess student learning that take these learning styles into consideration.

Conclusion:

Restate Thesis: Today, we've seen that No Child Left Behind should be reformed for three reasons:
Review Main Points: 1) It hurts the students it was supposed to help, 2) It was based on false information, and 3) It hurts the quality of education instead of helping it.
Closer: Without No Child Left Behind, Haydee Garcia would have been able to fulfill her dream of finishing her high school education, but instead, she and many others have been forced out of school. If we wanted the name to reflect the reality, we would have to rename this law Millions of Children Left Behind. But through reforming this law, maybe we can give these students the hope of earning their high school diplomas, just as each of us did.
.

3. Final and Composite Speech Materials:

A. Peer Workshop Evaluation
B. Final Speech Grading Rubric
C. Composite Speech Grading Rubric
D. Peer Evaluation
E. Basic Speech Structure
F. Sample Outline for Informative Final Speech
G. Sample Outline for Persuasive Final Speech
H. Sample Outline for Composite Speech

Peer Workshop Evaluation for Final Speeches

Speaker: _____   Evaluator: _____

Speaker: List 2 or 3 questions on the back of this sheet you would like your peer review to address while responding to your outline. These questions can focus on aspects you are uncertain about, parts that you would particularly like help or advice, a section you really wrestled with, or a feature that you are particularly proud of.

Evaluator: 1) Read through the outline, writing comments on any areas that you think need to be changed or that you think are especially good. Check to see whether the outline contains everything it is supposed to and whether it is structured properly. 2) Read the author's questions on the back of this sheet and write responses to them. 3) Write responses to each of the questions below. Be sure to explain your answers—the more you write, the more your comments will help the speaker. If you need more space, write on the back. When you are finished, discuss your suggestions and return this sheet and the outline to the speaker.

Is this an informative or persuasive speech? How do you know?

Are the thesis and main points mutually inclusive and stated as claims? Are the main points separate? Does each main point clearly support the thesis? How can they be better?

What sources have been cited? Do you think they are credible and relevant to the point being made? Why or why not? How can this be better?

Why should the audience care about this topic? How could the speaker make you care more?

What are your two favorite parts of this speech? Why? Can you think of a way to make them even better?

1.

2.

What are two ways you think this speech could be improved? How? Why?

1.

2.

Speaker: What was the most helpful advice you received today? Write down at least 3 things you plan to do to revise your speech before you present it in class. Be sure to bring this sheet and all comments and outlines on the day that you speak.

1.

2.

3.

Final Speech Grading Rubric

	- ✓ +	Comments	Points Earned
Written Materials (5) • Turned in complete sentence outline that used proper outline structure • If used, note card had only a keyword outline • Turned in all previous outlines, workshop evaluations, and workshop notes • Turned in a copy of all sources • Any other requested materials, including rubric			
Introduction (10) • Opener aroused interest and was relevant • Included relevant background information • Included audience "need to know" • Gave clear, identifiable thesis statement • Clear preview of main points			
Organization (20) • Had clear pattern of organization appropriate for a persuasive or informative speech. • Thesis and main points were mutually inclusive. • Each main point was clearly stated and supported the argument being made. • Used internal transitions that included a clear summary and preview between all main points			
Support Materials (25) • Properly cited at least two recent, credible sources that was relevant and supported the argument (including the name of the person, periodical or book title; date of publication or interview; and reputation, position, or field of expertise). • Used a variety of supporting materials, such as narration, definition, description, comparison, memorization strategies, evidence, and argument • Evidence met tests of relevancy, accuracy, expertise, recency, consistency • Arguments were valid and sound			
Conclusion (10) • Restated thesis • Reviewed main points • Included a memorable, strong closer			
Delivery (15) • Used concrete, specific language • Used note card only minimally; did not read speech from notes • Maintained a natural, conversational delivery style • Maintained eye contact and used appropriate gestures to emphasize important points • Refrained from distracting voice and body behaviors			
Overall Quality (15) • Chose a strong topic about an appropriate, significant issue relevant to the audience • Met time limit of assignment • Speech was clearly either informative or persuasive • Connected well with the audience • Utilized creativity and originality in approach to topic • Speaker shows interest and enthusiasm for or commitment to the topic			

Final Speech Grading Rubric

Name: _____   **Date:** _____

Topic: _____   **Speaking Time:** _____

                                                  Points: _____ /100

Strengths

1.

2.

3.

Areas for Improvement

1.

2.

3.

Composite Speech Grading Rubric

	- ✓ +	Comments	Points Earned
Written Materials (5) • Turned in complete sentence outline that used proper outline structure • If used, note card had only a keyword outline • Turned in all previous outlines, workshop evaluations, and workshop notes • Turned in a copy of all sources • Any other requested materials, including rubric			
Introduction (10) • Opener aroused interest and was relevant • Included relevant background information • Included audience "need to know" • Gave clear, identifiable thesis statement • Clear preview of main points			
Organization (20) • Had clear pattern of organization appropriate for a speech that makes an argument. • Thesis and main points were mutually inclusive. • Each main point was clearly stated and supported the argument being made. • Used internal transitions that included a clear summary and preview between all main points			
Support Materials (25) • Properly cited at least two recent, credible sources that was relevant and supported the argument (including the name of the person, periodical or book title; date of publication or interview; and reputation, position, or field of expertise). • Used a variety of supporting materials (at least 3), such as narration, definition, description, comparison, memorization strategies, evidence, and argument • Evidence met tests of relevancy, accuracy, expertise, recency, consistency • Arguments were valid and sound			
Conclusion (10) • Restated thesis • Reviewed main points • Included a memorable, strong closer			
Delivery (15) • Used concrete, specific language • Used note card only minimally; did not read speech from notes • Maintained a natural, conversational delivery style • Maintained eye contact and used appropriate gestures to emphasize important points • Refrained from distracting voice and body behaviors			
Overall Quality (15) • Chose a strong topic about an appropriate, significant issue relevant to the audience • Met time limit of assignment • Speech made a strong argument • Connected well with the audience • Utilized creativity and originality in approach to topic • Speaker shows interest and enthusiasm for or commitment to the topic			

Composite Speech Grading Rubric

Name: _____   **Date:** _____

Topic: _____   **Speaking Time:** _____

                                          Points: _____ **/100**

Strengths

1.

2.

3.

Areas for Improvement

1.

2.

3.

Peer Final or Composite Speech Evaluation

Speaker's Name:_____ Evaluator's Name:_____

Topic:_____

Fill out the following outline as you listen to the speech:

Opener
Introduction transition
        Topic Background
        Need to know
        Speaker background
Thesis

Main Point #1
Support materials used:

Main Point #2
Support materials used:

Main Point #3
Support materials used:

Closer

What sources were used? Why were or weren't these good sources to support the argument?

Was this speech informative or persuasive? How do you know?

What do you think the audience outcome goal was?

What delivery aspects (how the speaker looked and sounded) did the speaker use effectively?

What were the two greatest strengths of this speech?
1.

2.

What are two areas that the speaker could have improved on? How?
1.

2.

Basic Final or Composite Speech Structure

Introduction:

Opener
Introduction Transition
 ❑ Topic Background
 ❑ Audience "Need to Know" Statement
 ❑ Speaker Background
Thesis
Preview Main Points

Body:

I. Main Point 1:
 A. Subpoint A
 B. Subpoint B

Internal Transition (Review Main Point 1, Preview Main Point 2)

II. Main Point 2:
 A. Subpoint A
 B. Subpoint B

Internal Transition (Review Main Point 2, Preview Main Point 3)

III. Main Point 3:
 A. Subpoint A
 B. Subpoint B

Conclusion:

Restate Thesis
Review Main Points
Closer

Example of an Informative Final Speech
Melissa Broeckelman
"Event Data Recorders"

Opener	When Edwin Matos hit a car and instantly killed two teenage girls, he didn't know that his own car would become a witness for the prosecution. According to the **August 15, 2003 Seattle Times,** even though Matos claimed he was only driving 60 miles per hour, his 2002 Pontiac Trans Am contained an Event Data Recorder that showed that he was actually driving 114 miles per hour and helped convict him of manslaughter and vehicular homicide.
Topic background and definition	The Event Data Recorder, or EDR, known by many as the black box for cars, is a scaled-down version of the black box found in airplanes. But instead of recording conversation over long periods of time, this black box records only technical data of a car's operation in the few seconds before a collision.
Significance of topic	As Dave Snyder, Vice President of the American Insurance Association, told the **Scripps Howard News Service on July 28, 2003,** "With the data, auto insurers could settle claims faster, assess fault more often, and help prevent fraud. The data that (can) be gathered from this could revolutionize highway safety."
	But this isn't new technology. According to the **September 9, 2003 Washington Post**, unbeknownst to most Americans, the first EDRs were installed in cars in the 1970's, and these black boxes are now standard equipment in an estimated 25 to 40 million vehicles in the United States alone.
Audience Need to Know Thesis and preview of main points (note: thesis is implied as part of the Audience NTK statement—make sure that your thesis statement is clear in your speech)	Since an EDR might already be hiding in your car or van and now could be used as evidence against or for you, it's crucial that we become more aware of these devices. First, we'll examine the evidence to find out what EDRs are, second, hear the defense's testimony of their applications, and finally, cross-examine the witnesses about the concerns they are raising in courtrooms across our nation.
Main point 1 and preview of subpoints	Investigators have been using a lot of different tools for "car forensics". Crumpled hoods, broken bumpers, and skid marks offer clues that allow authorities to make good guesses of speed and reconstruct accidents. But the EDR can make this a more exact science; so let's examine the evidence to find out what EDRs are, how they work, and how they were developed.

Subpoint 1: what EDRs are	The black box in your car is actually a silver box that is about 4 inches square and is generally found near the front of the car as part of the air bag system. The devices made by each company differ slightly, but according to the **January 9, 2004 Ottawa Citizen,** the General Motors EDR, which is most common, collects information about five key factors: vehicle speed, engine speed, brake application, throttle position, and whether seat belts were fastened. T**he August 3, 2003 Sunday Times explains that** the device has a cyclical memory and is constantly being overwritten, but if a crash happens, the information in the 5 seconds before and 7 seconds after the accident is stored.
Subpoint 2: how they work	However, before the information can be used, it must be downloaded and interpreted by a computer. **The August 3, 2003 Boston Globe** explains that Vetronix, Inc. developed a system that can be purchased for $2,500 that "can download recorder data to a laptop in a matter of minutes by hooking a cable into the car's electronic system under the dashboard."
Subpoint 3: how they were developed	But EDRs were not originally developed for the purpose of collecting evidence. When manufacturers began installing airbags in vehicles, they needed a sensing and diagnostic device that could act as the brains of the airbag and tell it when to deploy. The **June 28, 2003 Rocky Mountain News** explains that carmakers developed the first version of the black box and began installing it in cars with airbags in 1974. In 1992, GM developed more sophisticated crash data recorders for racecars, and then began installing them in some regular cars. By 1999, GM was putting EDRs in all of its vehicle models, and Ford followed suit by installing similar recorders in most of its vehicles beginning in 2000.
Transition—reviews MP 1 and previews MP 2 **Preview of subpoints**	So it turns out that the EDR is yet another technology that is proving to be even more useful than its creators intended. But to find out just how valuable these black boxes can be, we need to next, hear the defense's testimony of how they can be applied in three areas: vehicle safety, accident reconstruction, and driver accountability.
Subpoint 1: vehicle safety	First, EDRs are valuable for monitoring and developing vehicle safety features. Jim Schell, a GM spokesperson, told the **Seattle Times,** "The idea was to learn more about how to improve crash performance. After serious crashes, GM would collect the information." The **July 16, 2003 Omaha World Herald**

	explains that this helped GM find out why some air bags were deploying inadvertently and led to a recall of more than 850,000 automobiles in 1998. The **November 6, 2003 Irish Times** explains that advanced versions of the black box that will soon be introduced in Europe will improve road safety even more by flashing the location and severity of a crash to emergency services.
Subpoint 2: accident reconstruction	Second, EDRs help reconstruct accidents. Poor weather conditions can obscure physical evidence, and eyewitness accounts are not always reliable. But with EDRs, investigators can get more exact detail about what happened in a crash.

Seth Roman, an assistant district attorney in Barnstable County told the **Boston Globe,** "It's fairly easy for a defense attorney to question the conclusions drawn by an accident reconstructionist based on skid marks and crash analysis. But data downloaded directly from the crashed vehicles is a different matter. I view it a lot like DNA…. It's scientific proof rather than speculation." |
Subpoint 3: driver accountability	Finally, EDRs could have the potential to hold drivers accountable. The **January 10, 2004 New Scientist** states that parents can now purchase an advanced model that will allow them monitor their teenage children's driving habits and track their children's location. The **Sunday Times** explains that a similar system will allow corporations to make sure that company cars are being driven carefully and only for business purposes. And yes, school vans are company cars. **According to the June 25, 2003 Irish Times**, one insurance company even offers a plan that allows drivers to install an advanced black box that lets them track driving habits, and then charges safe drivers lower premiums.
Transition to 2nd main point—review MP1 and preview MP2 Preview of subpoints (note: this transition doesn't directly restate the 1st main point, but refers to it the discussion before the preview of MP 2)	Most of us would probably have to admit that we don't always drive safely. Every now and then we might speed, run a red light, or take a turn a little faster than we should. But if we knew that our car could tattle on us, we would probably be a little more careful. The problem is that most people don't know, so let's finally, cross-examine three concerns that are being raised: inconsistency, privacy laws, and over-reliance on technology.
Subpoint 1: inconsistency	First, officials cannot yet get uniform, consistent information from EDRs. The **June 24, 2003 Los Angeles Times** explains that not all cars contain black boxes, and different manufacturers record different information. There are no national standards on

	what, if any, information should be collected. Even when vehicles already contain black boxes, that information is only valuable if it can be interpreted, but the technology needed to download the data is not yet available in all police departments.
Subpoint 2: privacy laws	Second, the use of information collected by EDRs could violate privacy laws. The question is, who owns the information in the black box—you or the investigators and insurance companies? In the **Scripps Howard News Service article,** Stephen Keating, the executive director of the Privacy Foundation, said, "Since the car is owned by the driver, the driver should have a choice whether the black box is operating and who gets access to it." According to the **October 20**, **2003 National Law Journal,** California settled this by passing a law that requires owner permission or a court order to collect black box data. But before the fast and furious groupies get any ideas—it is illegal to dismantle any safety feature in a car.
Subpoint 3: over-reliance on technology	Finally, EDRs could contribute to an over-reliance on technology. Bob Barr of the American Civil Liberties Union said in the **September 28, 2003 Atlanta Journal-Constitution,** "People have a tendency to place great faith in technology, and technology is not infallible." The **November 19, 2003 Montreal Gazette** reminds us, "The black box was not designed to be used as evidence." They are never checked after they are installed to make sure they are working properly. As EDRs are being used in more and more cases, we must remember that they are a valuable tool, but must be used along with other investigation techniques.
Conclusion Thesis and review of main points (note: the thesis is implied, but not stated directly in a single sentence. You will want to make sure that your thesis is very clear) Closer	Today, we examined the evidence to find out what Event Data Recorders are, heard the defense's testimony of their applications, and finally, cross-examined the witnesses about the concerns they are raising in courtrooms across our nation. As car black boxes are developed and used more widely, we might be able to prevent accidents and make our roads a safer place. In the **National Law Journal,** Safety Intelligence Systems' CEO Ricardo Martinez said, "We are really in the dark ages of data. If we practiced medicine the way we investigate car crashes, we'd all be sued for malpractice…. [But EDRs] are a fundamental revolution in our understanding."

Example of a Persuasive Final Speech Outline
(sources are highlighted)

Introduction:

Opener (narrative): Haydee Garcia admits she was having a rocky time at Lane High School in Brooklyn. At 17, she had only earned enough credits to be considered a sophomore, and had been pregnant, suspended for fighting, and frequently absent. But in February 2002, she was called to the office for the last time and told that she was no longer welcome at Lane. Unfortunately, Haydee is not alone. According to the Winter/Spring 2003 *Fair Test Examiner*, an education journal, the Advocates for Children of New York City filed a lawsuit against Lane High School for illegally discharging more than 25% of its enrollment. However, this isn't just a problem in New York; it's a problem that is being uncovered across our nation.
Introduction Transition
- **Topic Background:** The 2001 No Child Left Behind Act was supposed to improve education by holding schools accountable and increasing funding for students who needed extra help, but it is actually hurting the quality of education and pressuring administrators across our nation to "push out" low achievers out to make test scores look falsely high instead of helping them learn more.
- **Audience "Need to Know" Statement:** Since all of you have just finished high school and many of you either have siblings or friends in school or will eventually have children of your own, you should be concerned about the quality of education in the US.
- **Speaker Background:** Since I have younger siblings in school, am a teacher, and tutor at the Douglas Community Center, I see the effects of our education system every day.
Thesis: No Child Left Behind should be reformed for three reasons:
Preview Main Points: 1) It hurts the students it was supposed to help, 2) It was based on false information, and 3) It hurts the quality of education instead of helping it.

Body:

I. Reason 1: No Child Left Behind hurts the students it was supposed to help.
  C. What it was supposed to do: NCLB was supposed to help minorities, immigrants, and special education students who are often pushed into lower quality scores and not given the help they need.
  B. What it really does: Because schools that don't meet the high test score standards lose funding, these students are often "pushed" out of school (forced to drop out) or classified as special ed students so that their scores won't count. The schools can't afford the programs that NCLB requires because they only receive $77 for every $575 required for the new testing and programs, or 13% (June 16, 2003 National Public Radio *Morning Edition*).

Internal Transition: Now that it has become clear that NCLB is harmful to students, we can realize that it is harmful because it was based on lies.

II. Reason 2: NCLB was based on false information.

    C. What they thought they were basing it on: In the 2000-2001 school year, the Houston, the test scores supposedly went up 20% and the dropout rate was cut to 1 ½ %, so Houston's superintendent, Rod Paige, became the Secretary of Education, and NCLB was modeled after Houston's plan.

    D. What really happened: An audit of the school district a year later showed that they had faked the data. Bob Kimball, a former principal at Houston's Sharpstown High School, explained in an interview on PBS *Bill Moyers NOW* on October 17, 2003, that only about 50% of the students were actually graduating, and the students were just being reclassified in the computer system so that nobody would know they had dropped out (or, in many cases, been forced to drop out) or put into a special ed category so they wouldn't count.

Internal Transition: Now that we've seen that NCLB was based on false information, we need to finally, learn how NCLB hurts the quality of education instead of helping it.

III. Reason 3: NCLB hurts the quality of education instead of helping it.

    C. Standardized testing hurts education: NCLB is based on the idea that forcing schools to have higher standardized test scores will cause teachers to help students learn more. However, the test questions don't always match the curriculum (2003 *Brigham Young University Education and Law Journal*). Standardized testing forces teachers to drill the material instead of teaching problem-solving and creative thinking skills and forces them to spend time on testing and teaching testing strategies instead of teaching the real curriculum material.

    D. NCLB doesn't consider solutions that would really work: Instead of relying on standardized tests, we need to develop ways to teach toward all of the learning styles and find better ways to assess student learning that take these learning styles into consideration.

Conclusion:

Restate Thesis: Today, we've seen that No Child Left Behind should be reformed for three reasons:

Review Main Points: 1) It hurts the students it was supposed to help, 2) It was based on false information, and 3) It hurts the quality of education instead of helping it.

Closer: Without No Child Left Behind, Haydee Garcia would have been able to fulfill her dream of finishing her high school education, but instead, she and many others have been forced out of school. If we wanted the name to reflect the reality, we would have to rename this law Millions of Children Left Behind. But through reforming this law, maybe we can give these students the hope of earning their high school diplomas, just as each of us did.

.

Sample Outline for Composite Speech
Jessica Wolff

Introduction

Opener
The Reality TV Show: *The Apprentice* – Millions of people watched NBC's finale of the hit show the Apprentice to see who would win the ultimate job with Donald Trump. Contestants were faced all types of challenges to see who had the necessary skills.

Statement that Surprises: in 1980 1 out 36 students participated in an internship, today 4 out 5 students have participated in an internship. (Interview with Kristy Morgan, CES)

Introduction Transition

Topic Background
An internship is defined as "paid or unpaid work experience typically completed over a summer or semester in a field related to the student's area of study" (CES website)

Need to know
Personal: an internship could help you get a job.
Societal: In tough economic times, employers are looking for qualified people.

Speaker Background
Working at CES and critiquing student resumes, the one thing I have noticed is that students do not have enough work related skills.

Thesis
All students should get an internship during their college career.

Preview
1) Build new skills, 2) comparison shop 3) and obtain job offers.

Body

Build New Skills

A.   CES Resume guide notes that employer's are looking for three types of skills, functional, personal, and technical. (Define Terms). Technical skills are specific to the type of job you do. Internships help you to learn these skills.

B.   Narration – Ashley King, Senior in Apparel Marketing and Design, gained an internship with Norma Kamali in New York City, she learned skills about the fashion world that she could not gain in the classroom.

Internal Transition: Not only will internships help you build new skills, it also gives you an opportunity to comparison shop.

<u>Comparison Shop</u>

A. Definition of Comparison shop – allows students to try a job out before committing a lifetime to a specific field.

B. Comparison – Comparison shop in the job sense is similar to shopping for a car you would not buy a career before test-driving it – so when choosing a career it is also important to test drive your field of interest.

Internal Transition: Comparison shopping helps you determine whether or not you like a particular job, but internships can also provide you key job opportunities.

<u>Obtain Job Offers</u>

A. Employers report that they hire 50% of their intern and co-op students as full-time employees following graduation. (CES website, evidence)

B. Narration, a senior majoring in Agriculture Economics, was offered a job with Farm Credit Bureau after interning with the company for two summers.

Conclusion

<u>Review of Main Points and Thesis</u>

Overall internships are very valuable to your future, they can help you build new skills, allow you to comparison shop, and even get you a job offer in the future. These three reasons prove that all students should participate in an internship.

<u>Closer</u>

With over 80% of students participating in an internship nationwide, make sure you are not in the minority to avoid hearing the infamous words of Donald Trump: You're Fired.

4. Materials for Other Speeches

A. Narration
  i. Grading Rubric
  ii. Peer Evaluation
B. Definition
C. Description
D. Memorization
  i . Grading Rubric
  ii. Sample Outline
E. Impromptu Argument

Narration Speech Grading Rubric

Name: _____   **Date:** _____

Topic: _____   **Speaking Time:** _____

Points: _____ **/50** _____

Strengths

1.

2.

Areas for Improvement

1.

2.

Narration Speech Grading Rubric

	- ✓ +	Comments	Points Earned
Written Materials (5) • Turned in speech planning sheet • If note card was used, it did NOT have the entire speech written out word for word • Turned in other written materials requested by the instructor			
Introduction (5) • Opener aroused interest and was relevant to the topic • Included relevant background information and audience "need to know" • Gave clear, identifiable thesis or claim			
Components of Narration (10) • Narration had a clear plot. • Characters and their relationships were identified. • Information about the setting was included so that the audience knew when and where the story took place.			
Elements of Narration (5) • The characters of the story were developed underwent some type of change. • Progress of events through time was logical and easy to follow.			
Conclusion (5) • Summed up the story and its relevance to the audience • Restated thesis or claim • Included a memorable, strong closer			
Delivery (5) • Used concrete, specific language • Used note card only minimally; did not read speech from notes • Maintained a natural, conversational delivery style • Maintained eye contact and used appropriate gestures to emphasize important points • Refrained from distracting voice and body behaviors			
Quality of Narration (5) • Narration was an appropriate choice for supporting the claim/thesis.			
Overall Quality (10) • Meets time limit of assignment • Connected well with the audience • Utilized creativity and originality in approach to topic			

Peer Narration Evaluation

Speaker's Name:_____ Evaluator's Name:_____

Topic:_____

What was the claim/thesis?

How did the speaker connect the narration to the audience?

Who were the characters?

When and where did the narration take place?

What was the plot (2-3 sentence summary)?

Which type of narrative did the speaker use: story ( ), case study ( ), or history ( )?
Give one reason for your choice.

What delivery aspects (how the speaker looked and sounded) did the speaker use effectively?

What were the two greatest strengths of this speech?
1.

2.

What are two areas that the speaker could have improved on? How?
1.

2.

Definition Presentation Grading Rubric

Written Materials • Turned in complete outline • Each member of the group turned in note card with ONLY keywords	
Introduction • Opener aroused interest and was relevant to the topic • Included clear "need to know" statement • Gave clear, identifiable thesis or claim that clearly stated what was being defined • Included preview of main points	
Main Point #1 • Correctly stated whether definition was descriptive or prescriptive • Used both classification and differentiation in definition • Used at least one other definition strategy (verbal example, sensory example, secondary definition) • If sources were used, they were cited	
Main Point #2 • Correctly stated whether definition was descriptive or prescriptive • Used both classification and differentiation in definition • Used at least one other definition strategy (verbal example, sensory example, secondary definition) • If sources were used, they were cited	
Main Point #3 • Correctly stated whether definition was descriptive or prescriptive • Used both classification and differentiation in definition • Used at least one other definition strategy (verbal example, sensory example, secondary definition) • If sources were used, they were cited	
Conclusion • Restated thesis or claim • Reviewed/summarized main points • Included a memorable, strong closer	
Delivery • Used concrete, specific language • Used notecard only minimally; did not read speech from notes • Maintained a natural, conversational delivery style • Maintained eye contact and used appropriate gestures to emphasize important • Refrained from distracting voice and body behaviors	• Speaker 1 • Speaker 2 • Speaker 3 • Speaker 4
Overall Quality • Meets time limit of assignment • Connected well with the audience • Utilized creativity and originality in approach to topic • All group members contributed to the presentation of the speech • Each main point was about a separate definition for each word • Followed overall speech plan of introduction, development, and conclusion	

Definition Presentation Grading Rubric

Names: _____   **Date:** _____

_____   **Speaking Time:** _____

Word: _____   **Grade:** _____

Strengths

1.

2.

3.

Areas for Improvement

1.

2.

3.

Description Presentation Grading Rubric

	- ✓ +	Comments	Points Earned
Written Materials • Turned in speech planning sheet and sentence and keyword outlines • Outlines used proper numbers, symbols, etc.			
Introduction • Opener aroused interest and was relevant to the topic • Included relevant background information and audience "need to know" • Gave clear, identifiable thesis or claim			
Description • Included properties related to several senses			
Organization • Used one of the four patterns of organization (spatial categories; parts, whole, and relationship; sensory; time order) • Used appropriate structure in the introduction, body, and conclusion			
Conclusion • Restated thesis or claim • Included a memorable, strong closer			
Delivery • Used concrete, specific language • Used notecard only minimally; did not read speech from notes • Maintained a natural, conversational delivery style • Maintained eye contact and used appropriate gestures to emphasize important points • Refrained from distracting voice and body behaviors			
Overall Quality • Meets time limit of assignment • Connected well with the audience • Utilized creativity and originality in approach to topic • Left audience with a clear mental picture			

Description Presentation Grading Rubric

Name: _____   **Date:** _____

Topic: _____   **Speaking Time:** _____

                                                Grade: _____

Strengths

1.

2.

3.

Areas for Improvement

1.

2.

3.

Memorization Presentation Grading Rubric

	Comments	Points Earned
Outline (4) • Turned in complete outline for group • Each member of the group turned in note card with ONLY keywords		
Introduction (4) • Opener aroused interest and was relevant to the topic • Explained where the content would fit into a complete speech • Included relevant background information • Included clear audience "need to know" • Gave clear, identifiable thesis or claim • Previewed subpoints		
Body (5) • Utilized at least three memorization strategies to teach the information to the audience • Each main point was well developed and supported • If any sources were used, they were cited properly		
Conclusion (3) • Restated thesis or claim • Summed up main points • Included a memorable, strong closer		
Delivery (4) • Used concrete, specific language • Used notecard only minimally; did not read speech from notes • Maintained a natural, conversational delivery style • Maintained eye contact and used appropriate gestures to emphasize important points • Refrained from distracting voice and body behaviors	• Speaker 1 • Speaker 2 • Speaker 3 • Speaker 4	
Overall Quality (5) • Meets time limit of assignment • All group members participated in the presentation • Utilized creativity and originality in approach to topic		

Memorization Presentation Grading Rubric

Names: _____   **Date:** _____

_____   **Speaking Time:** _____

Topic: _____   **Points:** ____ **/25** ____

Strengths

1.

2.

3.

Areas for Improvement

1.

2.

3.

Sample Outline of a Memorization Speech
Jessica Wolff

Introduction

I.   Opener
   a.   *Narration*
            i.   Susie is applying for a summer internship – needs to send appropriate documentation – resume, references, and cover letter. Susie has a resume, but what is a cover letter?

II.   Introduction Transition
   a.   *Definition of topic:* A cover letter: is a letter that accompanies your resume and lets the employer know why you are interested.
   b.   *Relevance (Need to Know):* According to CES, in 1980 1 out of 36 students had an internship, today 4 out 5 students have participated in an internship – chances are you might need to apply for an internship, too.
   c.   *Background of Speaker:* Since I work at CES, I am good person to inform you about this.

III.   Thesis
   a.   Today, I will go through the steps of writing a cover letter.

IV.   Preview
   a.   We will examine the three paragraphs: all you need to do is provide a rationale, link, and closing.

Body

I.   Rationale
   a.   What, When, Where, Why
            i.   **What** are you applying for?
           ii.   **When** did you see the internship opening?
          iii.   **Where** did you see the internship opening?
           iv.   **Why** are you applying? – This is the suck- up line
   b.   Internal Transition
            i.   Now that you can write a rationale – just remember what, when, where, why, and it is time for the next paragraph. What is the next step? (Ask audience to tell me – correct answer gets a piece of candy.)

II.   Link
   a.   Think – then Link
            i.   **Think** about the job description
           ii.   **Then link** your skills
   b.   Internal Transition
            i.   Okay, so you can think and link – but what's next? (piece of candy for correct answer).

III.   Closing
   a.   Connect, Call, Consideration
            i.   **Connect** the employer to you
           ii.   Say you will **call** them
          iii.   Thank them for their time and **consideration**

Conclusion

I.   Restate thesis and preview
   a.   Now you should know how to write a cover letter – here is the finished product containing the three important paragraphs – rationale, link, and closing. (show overhead).

II.   Tie back to Opener
   a.   With these helpful tips, rationale, link, and closing – you and Susie should have no problem writing an excellent cover letter.

Memorization Strategies used

I.   Repetition
II.   Extrinsic Rewards
III.   Made content meaningful
IV.   Some humor
V.   Associations

Impromptu Argument Speech Grading Rubric

Name:	Date:
Topic:	Speaking Time:
	Points: /15

Strengths

1.

2.

Areas for Improvement

1.

2.

	- ✓ +	Comments	Points Earned
Written Materials (1) • Speech planning sheet was completed • If used, note card was turned in			
Introduction (2) • Opener aroused interest and was relevant • Included relevant background information • Included audience "need to know" • Gave clear, identifiable thesis statement • Gave clear preview of main points			
Organization (3) • Had two sub-arguments • Sub-arguments clearly supported the main argument (thesis) • Used internal transition between the sub-arguments • Each sub-argument was stated clearly			
Support Materials (2) • Each sub-argument was supported by at least one piece of support • Each sub-argument was developed and supported			
Conclusion (2) • Restated thesis • Reviewed main points • Included a memorable, strong closer			
Delivery (2) • Used concrete, specific language • Used note card only minimally; did not read speech from notes • Maintained a natural, conversational delivery style • Maintained eye contact and used appropriate • Refrained from distracting voice and body behaviors			
Overall Quality (3) • Met time limit of assignment • Connected well with the audience • Utilized creativity and originality in approach to topic			

Samples of Filled Out Forms

Instructor Comments on Outlines
Grading Rubrics

Basic Final Speech Structure

Introduction:

~ Need to fill in more info on the outline
~ Need sources and some good evidence to support this argument→ I've seen a lot of evidence against your argument, so you really need to make sure you have a lot of good evidence to support it.

Opener- story
Introduction Transition
- ❑ Topic Background- don't know
- ❑ Audience "Need to Know" Statement- statistics?
- ❑ Speaker Background- I don't know

Thesis- I think that capital punishment is the way to go
Preview Main Points- I will tell you why capital punishment is good in three ways and those are Relief, Life w/out parole is ot good enough, and a good example for others to come.

Body:

I. Main Point 1: Relief
   A. Family and loved ones will be happy that the killer can't get lose again or ever
   B. People don't have to fear that those men will after them next.

Internal Transition (Review Main Point 1, Preview Main Point 2) ★

II. Main Point 2: Life w/out parole is not good enough *~ Good enough for what?* ★
   A. When you send a person to jail w/out parole the family's victim will not be satisfied that the person is in jail for life and that he took the life of a family member of theirs but that can't take his/hers
   B. They are basically living for free, there are some prisons that have TVs with cable and almost everything, and they are living for free for the person or people he/she killed

~ Need transitions

Internal Transition (Review Main Point 2, Preview Main Point 3) ★

III. Main Point 3: Example to others to come
   A. It will show them to respect the law
   B. It will show them what not to do

Conclusion:

Today I have said to you that capital punishment is a good solution in solving criminal acts against one another doesn't pay off.   And to review what I have said… Relief helps families victim, two Life w/out parole isn't good enough for the criminals and three it's a good way to show others that committing a crime doesn't pay.

~ Some other issues to consider w/ this topic: cost, whether it really deters criminals, who usually gets the death penalty
~ If you have time to read a book, find a copy of Sister Helen Prejean's Dead Man Walking (or rent the movie)

Final Speech Outline (Argument)

Intro:
Opener: ESPN News Ron Artest suspended for the remainder of the season along with other players suspensions for various numbers of games.
Intro transition: This will be the main topic I will discuss and refer to through out my speech.
Topic background: In every sport fans are a big part of the action especially when they get angry.
Audience "Need to Know" statement: Every professional athlete, no matter how much money he/she earns, is still a person with emotions.
Speaker background:
Thesis: Professional athletes should have a lesser punishment for fighting with fans who physically assault or who try to bring harm to them which includes throwing beer or any other beverage at them. This is for three reasons, they are only human, when it's self defense, and under pressure.
Main point I: When ever a player has to defend their self to anyone the penalty should not be as bad as if they just attacked someone.
Subpoint A: From my experiences for playing team sports I know that fans can be the meanest people you ever see and try to degrade and even harm you.
Subpoint B: When a punch is thrown in your direction there is no other choice than to defend yourself the best way you know how.
Internal transition: You have heard my first point concerning self defense and when it is used, now I shall speak on my next point of that they are only human beings.
Main point II: The fact that professional athletes are on T.V. and make a multitude of money does not change that they are only human, just like the rest of us.
Subpoint A: Everyone has a limit of how much abuse they can take from anyone or period, if your buttons are pushed you shall push back
Subpoint B: as humans we have natural instincts that occur differently in different situations and protecting yourself is one of them.
Internal transition: The fact that athletes are only human is the main point I discussed and now will inform you of my third and final main point that they are under pressure.
Main point III: When playing any professional sport you are always under some kind of pressure, whether it's the pressure to uphold an image that you've already established, or trying to establish an image.
Subpoint A: Once you're a professional athlete the love of the game becomes clouded by expectations from; team owners, teammates, coaches, or fans.
Subpoint B: You're livelihood now rest on the shoulders of other individuals perception of how you perform, and though this sounds like any other corporate occupation, your performance is on display for anyone to judge and critique

*Need a conclusion w/ thesis, MPs and closer
* Need at least 2 sources
* Be sure to give us some specific detail and that you have enough info to meet the time limit

194

Basic Argument Speech Outline

*Nice topic! How does this influence how
Politicians vote on important issues?*

Sources?

Intro:

Opener: "California in billion dollar depth, millions of dollars taken from schools". This
was a large concern in the Oakland tribune during 2002-2003. *Can you cite a source
and explain the situation more?*

Topic Background: Donations are often made to causes that hold political concern by
potential candidates and others.

Audience "Need to Know" Statement: Rich potential candidates use their abundance of
money to by them, what I call brownie points, which is basically trying to get in good.

Thesis: Wealthy potential political candidates should not be allowed to use their wealth
to make hefty donations to causes that are related with political issues or hold political
concerns for three reasons: the potential political candidate is buying popularity, using
the wealth is an unfair advantage, and causes that are related to political issues hold a lot
of weight with voters.

Body:

I. The potential political candidate is buying his/her popularity.
    A. As donations to a popular charity increase by an individual, their attractiveness
        shall also increase.
    B. By buying popularity strays away from other real concerns.

Internal Transition: I have given information about the potential political candidate
buying popularity and now I shall discuss how using his/her wealth is an unfair
advantage.

II. By using his/her wealth to make very large contributions is an unfair advantage. *Can
you give us specific examples of when this has happened and the bad effects?*
    A. The other candidate may not be able to compete with the amount of money that
        he/she has.
    B. To even the status they should have to raise the money for their donations to
        charities of political concern.

Internal Transition: Now that I gave the view of using their own wealth is unfair
advantage, next I will talk about causes that are related to political issues and that they
hold a lot of weight with voters.

III. Many of the causes that are political issues or hold political concern weigh a lot with
voters, which can leave out other important topics.
    A. Voters look at what the candidates' charities are especially when it holds concern
        to the communities needs.
    B. There are many concerns of political influence but if one is stressed by a
        candidate it may over shadow others.

Conclusion:

Restate Thesis: Wealthy potential political candidates should not be allowed to use their
wealth to make hefty donations to causes that are related with political issues or hold

political concerns for three reasons: the potential political candidate is buying popularity, using the wealth is an unfair advantage, and causes that are related to political issues hold a lot of weight with voters.

Closer: I have given you the information supporting my thesis so certainly you must agree with it.

Work on a better closer. Can you tie it back to the opener?

Sources??   **Argument Speech Outline**

Introduction:

Opener: There was a recent accident with a freshman girl in Colorado that had drank close to forty drinks in one night, she was left in a fraternity house, and the next day a life out was taking his mom through to tour the house when the body was discovered. *Do you have a source?*

Topic Background: In the past like the 1950-60's there has been lots of issues with alcohol related deaths in the Greek system, and that time period was probably the worst.

Audience "Need to Know" Statement: Drinking is a problem everywhere, not just in the Greek System

Thesis: The public should not be so judgmental on Greek life *for three reasons:*
 Your thesis should refer specifically to alcohol since that's what your speech centers on.

Preview Main Points: Main points are the history of the Greek community, people precipitation of the Greek community, when something negative happens Greeks hold themselves to hire standards.

Body:

I. History of the Greek Community *Make sure your MPs are stated as claims (in complete sentences)*

   A. Used to have problems with hazing, discrimination

   B. Drinking was out of control *You might want to switch MP#1 and MP#2 so that you can explain the stereotypes and then why they started.*

     Internal Transition: Now since we know about history we can discuss the perception of the Greek community.

II. Peoples perception of the Greek community

   A. Binge drinking, and hazing

   B. Some kind of cultish things

     Internal Transition: We have understanding on people perception, now we can see the higher standards that the Greek community holds themselves to.

III. When something negative happens Greeks hold themselves to ~~hire~~ *higher* standards

   A. Chapters are shut down

   B. Heard through media much more publicity

Conclusion:

Restate Thesis: The public should not be so judgmental on Greek life.

Review Main Points: Main points are the history of the Greek community, people precipitation of the Greek community, when something negative happens Greeks hold themselves to hire standards

Closer: People everywhere *- refer to opener*

Argument Speech

Introduction:

Opener: The relationship between violence on the screen and violence in real life is extremely complicated. But while the relationship may not be that of direct cause and effect, we must bear it in mind. Violent programmers may depress some people, shock others, de-sensitize some and encourage imitation by a few." (BBC Handbook- Guidelines for TV Producers Regarding Violence and Censorship) *Great source!*
Introduction Transition
- ❑ **Topic Background**: Viewing violence poses a harmful risk to children. Critics of the research challenge this conclusion and dispute claims that exposure to violence leads to real-life aggression.
- ❑ **Audience "Need to Know" Statement:** The media is all around us and for this reason I feel it is inevitable that it will have some sort of effect on us. Television is the most popular and accessible form of media; everybody has at least one television set in their home. It is also said to be the most vivid portrayer of the world. Screen violence is a term given to violence seen in television programmers, videos and cinema; basically any violence viewed on a screen. *Can you connect this directly to your audience and tell them why they should care?*
- ❑ **Speaker Background:** Since I have five younger siblings in school. I see the effects that violent television programming has on my brothers and sister.

Thesis: Screen violence is connected to real-life violence for these reasons: *Right now, this is more of an informative speech format than an argument. Can you reword the thesis to turn it into an argument? (What should be done?)*
Preview Main Points: 1) a countless amount of time is spent viewing violent activity on television, 2) screen violence is reaching directly to today's youth through video game consoles, 3) real-life violence which is influenced by TV/media programming is hurting the population of our society.

Body:

I. Reason 1: A countless amount of time is spent viewing violent activity on television. *Can you find a source that tells us how much TV people watch?*
- A. Explain how violence is "faked" and what might happen if people tried the same stunts. Ask how the conflict could have been resolved without violence.
- B. Establish screen time limits that include TV, computer, and video game screens and stick to them. Set a timer to signal when to turn off the set. Delay TV viewing until homework and chores are done.

Internal Transition: Now that it has become clear that most television shows are harmful to children at such early ages.

II. Reason 2: Screen violence is reaching directly to today's youth through video game consoles.

A. I feel that violence in computer games is becoming a lot more of a problem than it once was. Due to the increase in technology, computer games are now more life films, with very realistic looking characters and settings. An example of such a game is Grand Theft Auto 3 for the Playstation 2. It is a controversial game in which you 'become' the man who is able to run people over, shoot people, and become involved in police chases. *Nice specific example.*

B. Parents are the most important role models for their children. In our society, television is the second most important source of information. Watch shows together and review what video games the kids are playing. Let them know your feelings about violence on TV and seek their help in making a change in your family's TV and video game use.

Transition:

III. Reason 3: Real-life violence which is influenced by TV/media programming is hurting the population of our society.

A. 22-34% of young male felons imprisoned for committing violent crimes (homicide, rape, assault) report having consciously imitated crime techniques watched on TV. (Journal of American Medical Association- Studies in Violence and Television) *date?*

B. All Canadian and US studies of the effect of prolonged childhood exposure to television show a positive relationship between earlier exposure to TV violence and later physical aggressiveness. (Public communication and behavior- Academic Press) *date?*

Conclusion:

Restate Thesis: Today, we've seen "How screen violence is connected to real-life violence" in three reasons:

Review Main Points: 1) countless amounts of violent activity are viewed through television, 2) screen violence is reaching directly to today's youth through video game consoles, 3) real-life violence which is influenced by TV/media programming is hurting the population and our society.

Closer: I agree that children and the mentally ill are vulnerable and should always be protected by film classifications and watersheds, so that they do not view unsuitable material. *Work on a stronger closer.*

Grading Rubric for Argument Speech

	- ✓ +	Comments	Points Earned
Written Materials (5) • Turned in complete sentence outline that used proper outline structure + • If used, note card had only a keyword outline + • Turned in all previous outlines, workshop evaluations, and workshop notes + • Turned in a copy of all sources - • Any other requested materials, including rubric +	+	*Need a copy of your sources*	*4*
Introduction (10) • Opener aroused interest and was relevant + • Included relevant background information + • Included audience "need to know" + • Gave clear, identifiable thesis statement + • Clear preview of main points +	+	*Nice use of source in opener* *Good*	*10*
Organization (15) • Had clear pattern of organization appropriate for the argument being made + • Used internal transitions that included a summary and preview between all main points +/- • Each main point was stated clearly✓ • Thesis and main points were mutually inclusive. + Each main point clearly supported the argument being made.+	✓+	*Need transition b/w points 1 & 2 -- had it between 2nd and 3rd point*	*14*
Support Materials (10) • Properly cited at least two recent, credible sources that were relevant and supported the argument (including the name of the person, periodical or book title; date of publication or interview; and reputation, position, or field of expertise).+ • Used a variety of supporting materials, such as narration, definition, description, comparison, memorization strategies, evidence, and argument+	+	*- What is the date of The Patriot Ledger?* *- You have some great sources and information to support your argument.* *- Excellent!*	*10*
Conclusion (5) • Restated thesis + • Reviewed main points + • Included a memorable, strong closer -	✓+	*Great- need a closer*	*4*
Delivery (10) • Used concrete, specific language • Used note card only minimally; did not read speech from notes • Maintained a natural, conversational delivery style • Maintained eye contact and used appropriate gestures to emphasize important • Refrained from distracting voice and body behaviors	✓	*Avoid playing w/ the hood strings on your sweater.* *Work on increasing eye contact— avoid reading from note card so much.*	*9*
Quality of Argument (10) • Chose an appropriate, strong argument topic about a significant issue relevant to the audience • Data met the evidence tests (relevancy, accuracy, expertise, recency, consistency) • Arguments were valid and sound	+	*Very relevant topic—great!*	*10*
Overall Quality (10) • Met time limit of assignment • Connected well with the audience • Utilized creativity and originality in approach to topic	+	*Great!*	*10*

Grading Rubric for Argument Speech

Name: _____   **Date:** _____

Topic: _____   **Speaking Time:**   *6:40*

                                                                                  Points: *71/75*

Strengths

1. *Excellent choice of very relevant topic*

2. *Excellent use of evidence and support materials to back up your argument.*

3. *Nice use of source to establish significance in opener.*

Areas for Improvement

1. *Make sure you have a transition between all main points.*

2. *Need to have a closer at the end of your conclusion. Try to tie it back to the opener.*

3. *Delivery—work to increase eye contact and avoid distractions (like playing with the strings on your hood.*

Grading Rubric for Argument Speech

	- ✓ +	Comments	Points Earned
Written Materials (5) • Turned in complete sentence outline that used proper outline structure + • If used, note card had only a keyword outline - • Turned in all previous outlines, workshop evaluations, and workshop notes - • Turned in a copy of all sources - • Any other requested materials, including rubric +	✓		2
Introduction (10) • Opener aroused interest and was relevant + • Included relevant background information + • Included audience "need to know" + • Gave clear, identifiable thesis statement + • Clear preview of main points+	+	Nice question in intro—but if someone's tired of living w/ a roommate, would they really want to join a Greek house?	10
Organization (15) • Had clear pattern of organization appropriate for the argument being made ok • Used internal transitions that included a summary and preview between all main points - • Each main point was stated clearly + • Thesis and main points were mutually inclusive.+ Each main point clearly supported the argument being made.+	✓	- Make sure MP is stated as a claim—in a complete sentence, not a phrase -Need transitions between MPs	12
Support Materials (10) • Properly cited at least two recent, credible sources that were relevant and supported the argument (including the name of the person, periodical or book title; date of publication or interview; and reputation, position, or field of expertise). - • Used a variety of supporting materials, such as narration, definition, description, comparison, memorization strategies, evidence, and argument✓	✓	- Can you give exact #s & sources for the costs? - Need sources & more support for each point	4
Conclusion (5) • Restated thesis + • Reviewed main points + • Included a memorable, strong closer +	+	Good	5
Delivery (10) • Used concrete, specific language • Used note card only minimally; did not read speech from notes • Maintained a natural, conversational delivery style • Maintained eye contact and used appropriate gestures to emphasize important • Refrained from distracting voice and body behaviors	✓	Good- don't read from notes, though. Use note card, not outline	8
Quality of Argument (10) • Chose an appropriate, strong argument topic about a significant issue relevant to the audience - • Data met the evidence tests (relevancy, accuracy, expertise, recency, consistency) ✓ • Arguments were valid and sound ✓	✓	Make sure your thesis is stated as an argument- you have it set up a lot like an informative.	8
Overall Quality (10) • Met time limit of assignment - • Connected well with the audience ✓ • Utilized creativity and originality in approach to topic	✓	Too short	6

Grading Rubric for Argument Speech

Name: _____   **Date:** _____

Topic: _____   **Speaking Time:**   **3:48**

                                                 Points: 55   /75

Strengths

1. *Good conversational vocal delivery*

2. *Nice choice of reasons to support your main argument*

3. *Clear delineation of main points*

Areas for Improvement

1. *Need sources and more support materials to back up each claim*.

2. *Too short—make sure you have enough information to meet the minimum time requirement*

3. *Don't read from your outline*

Grading Rubric for Argument Speech

	- ✓ +	Comments	Points Earned
Written Materials (5) • Turned in complete sentence outline that used proper outline structure + • If used, note card had only a keyword outline + • Turned in all previous outlines, workshop evaluations, and workshop notes + • Turned in a copy of all sources - • Any other requested materials, including rubric +	+	*Need an actual copy of your sources, not just the web site*	*4*
Introduction (10) • Opener aroused interest and was relevant ✓ • Included relevant background information + • Included audience "need to know" + • Gave clear, identifiable thesis statement + • Clear preview of main points +	+	*Good*	*10*
Organization (15) • Had clear pattern of organization appropriate for the argument being made + • Used internal transitions that included a summary and preview between all main points -/+ • Each main point was stated clearly✓ • Thesis and main points were mutually inclusive+ Each main point clearly supported the argument being made.+	✓+	*Be sure to review the previous point before previewing the next point*	*14*
Support Materials (10) • Properly cited at least two recent, credible sources that were relevant and supported the argument (including the name of the person, periodical or book title; date of publication or interview; and reputation, position, or field of expertise). • Used a variety of supporting materials, such as narration, definition, description, comparison, memorization strategies, evidence, and argument	✓+	*- Be sure to include the date and credibility of your sources* *- Nice job explaining points and giving examples—need some more hard evidence to back this up*	*9*
Conclusion (5) • Restated thesis + • Reviewed main points + • Included a memorable, strong closer -	✓+	*Need a closer*	*4*
Delivery (10) • Used concrete, specific language • Used note card only minimally; did not read speech from notes • Maintained a natural, conversational delivery style • Maintained eye contact and used appropriate gestures to emphasize important • Refrained from distracting voice and body behaviors	✓+	*- Work on increasing volume* *- Try to project greater confidence—volume will help a lot (& energy)* *-Great eye contact!*	*9*
Quality of Argument (10) • Chose an appropriate, strong argument topic about a significant issue relevant to the audience • Data met the evidence tests (relevancy, accuracy, expertise, recency, consistency) • Arguments were valid and sound	+	*Good*	*10*
Overall Quality (10) • Met time limit of assignment • Connected well with the audience • Utilized creativity and originality in approach to topic	+	*good*	*10*

Grading Rubric for Argument Speech

Name: _____

Date: _____

Topic: _____

Speaking Time: *6:06*

Points: *70/75*

Strengths

1. *Great topic choice—very relevant*

2. *Nice job explaining your points and giving examples*

3. *Excellent eye contact.*

Areas for Improvement

1. *Make sure your transitions include a review of the previous point*

2. *Be sure to include the date and credentials when citing sources.*

3. *Need a closer at the end of your conclusion. Try to tie it back to the opener*