

A REPORT OF THE MASS LECTURE, LABORATORY PROGRAM OF
INSTRUCTION: ORAL COMMUNICATION I, FALL SEMESTER
KANSAS STATE UNIVERSITY, 1964-65

by

JOE D. HUBERT

B. S., KANSAS STATE UNIVERSITY, 1958

A MASTER'S REPORT

submitted in partial fulfillment of the

requirements for the degree

MASTER OF ARTS

Department of Speech

KANSAS STATE UNIVERSITY
Manhattan, Kansas

1965

Approved by:


Major Professor

LU
2668
R4
1965
H 878
cop. 2

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to express my appreciation to Dr. Norma D. Buntton, Head of the Department of Speech, Dr. Terry A. Welden, my Major Professor, and Dr. Donald K. Darnell, assistant Professor of Speech, for their suggestions and helpful criticisms during the preparation of this report

CONTENTS

	INTRODUCTION	1
Section I	MASS LECTURE PROGRAM	4
Section II	LABORATORY PROGRAM	6
Section III	GRADING SYSTEM	7
Section IV	STUDENT EVALUATION OF THE COURSE	10
Section V	GRADING AND EVALUATION DATA	11
	SUMMARY	19
	APPENDIX	20

INTRODUCTION

Oral Communication I at Kansas State University is listed in the University catalogue as a two hour speech course required of all undergraduate students. Selection and outlining of speech material with emphasis on content, organization and oral presentation is the description in the University catalogue.

Prior to the fall semester of 1964-65, members of the Speech Department faculty and the graduate assistants taught the course in classes of twenty to twenty-five students. Each classroom instructor met with his students twice each week and was responsible for lecturing, testing, evaluating oral presentations, and grading. A course syllabus and periodic meetings of the instructors with the director of the program served to unify the course.

Because of increasing enrollment the Department of Speech planned an experimental program of instruction that would combine both a mass lecture and individual laboratory instruction. A plan to include thirty-two sections (twenty-five students per section) which would accommodate 800 students was adopted. The time schedules for the regular meetings of these sections was studied. It was found that these sections could be divided into groups of four sections per group (100 students), without changing the regular scheduled meetings of the sections. This division of the sections created eight mass lecture sections of 100 students per section. These sections would meet one hour per week to hear

the lecture.

The plan further provided that the thirty-two sections would remain in groups of twenty-five students for laboratory instruction one hour per week. Graduate assistants would be assigned as instructors for these laboratory sections. Classrooms to accommodate these sections would be needed.

Two staff members, assistant professors of speech, were to be responsible for the mass lecture program. Lecture rooms accommodating 100 students were reserved for the mass lecture program. Eight graduate assistants were designated as speech laboratory instructors. Four classrooms were available for meeting the smaller laboratory groups.

Prior to student enrollment, a departmental seminar was held to discuss the mass lecture-laboratory program of instruction. During the seminar, the content and weekly text assignments for the mass lecture were developed and dates for six tests in lecture were established. These tests consisted of four quizzes, a mid-term examination, and a final examination. Laboratory instructors were allotted five class periods to complete each of three rounds of required speeches. These five class periods were to be used as follows: the first day of each round would be used to assign speech topics, instruction related to the presentation of the speeches, and discussion of student evaluations of speeches. The remaining four class periods were to be used for the presentation of speeches with the maximum sized group presenting six speeches a period.

Dates were set for turning in three required speech analyses. A standardized grading system was established as a means to insure uniformity among the eight laboratory instructors and to simplify the process of grade reporting. The need for agreement between actual practice and the established date deadlines was stressed.

A second meeting of the instructors (lecture and laboratory) was planned after a few weeks of actual instruction to discuss and eliminate, if possible, operational problems.

The textbook selected for the experimental mass lecture-laboratory program of instruction is entitled Creative Speech. It's author is Keith R. St. Onge and it was published by the Wadsworth Publishing Company in 1964. The first 200 pages, entitled "Ideas in Theory" was used for weekly reading assignments to supplement the mass lectures. The 264 pages that follow the sections used in mass lecture are entitled "Ideas in Practice". The author presents a discussion of sixty suggested topics for speeches. This section of the text was used by the students and laboratory instructors as sources for speech topics.

After student enrollment was completed, graduate assistant laboratory instructors were assigned to their individual sections according to time blocks available in the assistant's own schedule. The small groups consisted of not more than twenty-five students per section. Each assistant had not more than six sections or fewer than two sections.

When the students reported to their classrooms the first day

they were informed of the mass lecture-laboratory program of instruction. A general discussion and description of the course was presented and students were informed that one hour per week they would attend a lecture and one hour per week work in a small laboratory section. Half-way through the first class period, students were asked to accompany the laboratory instructor to the mass lecture hall to meet the mass lecture instructors and for the assigning of seating numbers. Seating charts were prepared for future roll taking at this time by the instructors.

SECTION I

MASS LECTURE PROGRAM

The mass lecture program consisted of lectures prepared and presented by Dr. Terry A. Welden and Dr. Donald K. Darnell, assistant professors of speech. These lectures were supplemented by weekly assignments in the text. Teaching schedules for the two mass lecturers were arranged so that either lecturer could meet any of the eight mass lecture sections each week. Most of the time the lecturers alternated with regard to presenting the lectures, four lectures each per week. However, this procedure allowed each lecturer to present all the lectures to all sections in an area of particular interest to him.

The lectures were essentially concerned with the scope and purpose of communication, with the factors involved in the process,

and with the role of language in human behavior. They explored the complex nature of the communication process. Furthermore, they attempted to demonstrate the relevance of other course work to Oral Communication I. They emphasized the basic principles that the purpose of communication is to affect behavior. It was on this principle that writing and speaking assignments in the recitation sections were developed.

Four quizzes, a mid-term test, and a final examination were given in the mass lecture period to determine fifty percent of each student's grade. The quizzes and the mid-term examination were objective tests based on the material presented in lecture and on the text supplement. The final examination was also an objective test designed by the author of the text and consisted of 120 multiple choice questions.

Graduate assistant laboratory instructors were required to attend lecture one hour per week. This requirement was designed to unify the program, provide the laboratory instructors with the basis for appropriate criticism and evaluation of student performances, and to aid the mass lecture instructor with roll taking and test proctoring. Graduate assistants were asked to submit test questions based on the material presented in lecture. These questions were incorporated in the mass lecture quizzes.

SECTION II

LABORATORY PROGRAM

Fifty percent of the individual student's grade was based on his performance in the laboratory section. Three speeches, five minutes each in length, and three analyses of speeches delivered in class were required of each student. The general topics for the speeches were selected by the laboratory instructor from the sixty suggested topics in the student's textbook. The objective was to use six topics for each of three rounds of speeches. Students could select any one of the six topics within a limit of four students per topic. This method allowed the instructor to schedule six speeches on six different topics per class period and thus complete a round of speeches within the allotted five class periods. The limitation of four students per topic established groups of students who could evaluate speeches within a group. The following example is offered to clarify this procedure: Assume that one of the six topics selected by the laboratory instructor was "civil defense". Students A, B, C, and D selected this topic and thus formed a group by their selection. While student A was giving his speech, students B, C, and D would be evaluating this speech on a form sheet furnished by the laboratory instructor. (See Appendix A). During the next class period student B would deliver his speech while students A, C, and D evaluated his speech and so on through the round of speeches. This method of student evaluation served to unify the system of writing assignments.

Students were advised to take notes on each speech in their group that could be useful in writing the speech analysis. The analysis then for any given student consisted of a written evaluation of three speeches given by other members in his group; an analysis of the laboratory instructor's evaluation of his speech (the laboratory instructor's evaluation also utilized the form reproduced in Appendix A); and a self evaluation of his own speech.

After the laboratory instructors graded these analyses, students were encouraged to exchange analyses so that they might see how their speeches were evaluated by fellow classmates. It was hoped that this inductive process of arriving at communication principles would reinforce the principles set forth by the instructors of the course.

SECTION III

GRADING SYSTEM

The laboratory instructor evaluated all speeches and gave tentative letter grades at the time of delivery. Students were informed that their grades on each speech would depend on two factors: the tentative letter grade at the time of delivery and by their rank as speakers within the class. Their rank, of course, could only be determined after the round was completed. The tentative letter grade and the numerical ranking grade were then combined for a final grade on the speech. (See Fig. 1.) The analyses were graded and ranked in the same manner. These two grades, a

final grade for the speech and a final grade for the analysis, were then recorded by the laboratory instructor in a central file and given to the students with the return of his written analysis. This grading procedure was repeated for each of the three required speeches and the three required analyses.

Test scores from lecture sections and the grades from the laboratory sections were converted to Standard Normal Scores, with a mean of fifty and a Standard Deviation of ten. The following grade distribution was used in the course: A, 12%; B, 15%; C, 40%; D, 18%; F, 15%. Simple raw score frequency distributions were available for grade estimates following each test and the Standard Normal Scores permitted a simplified integration of the grade elements for a final numerical score. These numerical scores were tabulated into a frequency table and the grade distribution applied. Students who had withdrawn from the course with a grade of F were retained in the F group for the purposes of accounting for 15% of the final grades.

As indicated previously, letter grades were given by laboratory instructors for reinforcement value immediately after the student delivered his speech. To minimize the subjective factor in the integration of letter grades and ranking of students, instructors employed the common procedure that is presented in Fig. 1 as follows: Start with the letter grade, find the number in that bracket that is nearest the actual rank in the class, then, record on the master card in the central file the corresponding number in column three.

<u>LETTER GRADE</u>	<u>RANK</u>	<u>NUMBER GRADE</u>
	1	1
	2	2
A	<u>3</u>	<u>3</u>
	4	4
	5	5
B	6	6
	7	7
	<u>8</u>	<u>8</u>
	9	9
	10	10
	11	11
	12	12
C	13	13
	14	14
	15	15
	<u>16</u>	<u>16</u>
	17	17
	18	18
D	19	19
	20	20
	<u>21</u>	<u>21</u>
	22	22
F	23	23
	24	24
	25	25

Fig. 1. Translation of letter grade and class rank to number grade.

Using Fig.1, assume that student X received a letter grade of A after delivering his speech. His rank in the class of twenty-five was five. The number which best represents his grade on the speech is three. Assume, as a second example, that student Y received a letter grade of C after delivering his speech. His rank in the class of twenty-five was sixteen. The number grade which best represents his grade on the speech is sixteen.

Instructors were required to record all grades in a central card file. This card file was always available to any one of the eight laboratory instructors and the mass lecture instructors for

student conferences. Laboratory instructors maintained office hours three hours each week for this purpose. In most cases, two instructors, a laboratory instructor and one of the mass lecture instructors, were always available to the students for conferences.

Section V includes a correlation matrix utilizing Pearson Product Moment Correlation Coefficients that was constructed from the data in the central card file. Each student (687 in number) had fourteen grades recorded on his master card. The correlation matrix provides the basis for analyses of the grading elements in the course where these elements were divided between mass lecture and recitation groups.

SECTION IV

STUDENT EVALUATION OF THE COURSE

The experimental nature of the course made useful the obtaining of formal feedback from the students. It was felt that an anonymous evaluation schedule administered with the final examination could provide appropriate feedback. A form was prepared and administered to the students and 656 useable forms were returned (See Appendix B).

Thirty-three evaluative scales across six concepts were employed to elicit responses that could be readily summarized and studied. It was believed that several open-ended questions, while not susceptible to objective analysis, could serve as legitimate outlets for student

feelings and these were included in the evaluation form.

The following section includes a summary of the student evaluations in the form of means and variances for the several scales classified by laboratory instructor and by the student's major field of study.

SECTION V

GRADING AND EVALUATION DATA

Table 1. contains a correlation matrix of fourteen variables consisting of four quiz grades, three speech grades, three analyses grades, a mid-term examination grade, a final number grade, and a final letter grade.

A total of 9,718 grades (fourteen grades for each student) were incorporated into the Pearson Product Moment Correlation Coefficient's for the 687 students included in this report. This resulted in 182 possible pairings (excluding the pairing of each variable with itself). The data were then divided into eight sub groups by laboratory instructor and the correlation analysis repeated. Table 1. contains the coefficients of this latter analysis only to the extent of recording the correlation coefficients between the other thirteen grading elements and the student's final grade.

Table 1. A matrix of Pearson Product Moment Correlation Coefficients across fourteen grade elements.

N=	Variable	Variable															
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14		
	Quiz I	1															
	Quiz II	2	.36														
	Quiz III	3	.36	.27													
	Quiz IV	4	.25	.23	.37												
	Speech I	5	.15	.10	.12	.01											
	Speech II	6	.15	.09	.14	.05	.32										
	Speech III	7	.15	.16	.17	.10	.33	.46									
	Analysis I	8	.16	.12	.11	.00	.25	.24	.24								
	Analysis II	9	.28	.17	.23	.10	.26	.28	.37	.36							
	Analysis III	10	.11	.07	.07	.08	.10	.22	.25	.17	.20						
	Mid-term	11	.42	.27	.32	.24	.12	.13	.14	.12	.27	.17					
	Final exam	12	.26	.13	.26	.32	.11	.12	.11	.07	.18	.11	.28				
	Number grade	13	.42	.30	.45	.45	.36	.37	.38	.34	.47	.28	.48	.82			
	Final grade	14	.43	.34	.43	.30	.48	.51	.52	.46	.61	.32	.51	.48	.82		
125	Instructor I		.44	.36	.53	.28	.40	.49	.52	.49	.64	.00	.58	.48	.85		
127	Instructor II		.45	.38	.39	.29	.44	.38	.47	.39	.57	.00	.51	.48	.80		
135	Instructor III		.33	.42	.38	.30	.42	.56	.33	.43	.59	.00	.51	.53	.86		
125	Instructor IV		.44	.36	.48	.22	.57	.40	.59	.44	.55	.00	.47	.58	.84		
42	Instructor V		.56	.31	.47	.50	.64	.43	.51	.58	.63	.00	.41	.57	.78		
49	Instructor VI		.36	.22	.45	.43	.52	.66	.76	.43	.80	.00	.62	.37	.96		
42	Instructor VII		.53	.05	.32	.20	.65	.67	.50	.51	.64	.00	.68	.55	.79		
42	Instructor VIII		.45	.28	.46	.43	.45	.46	.65	.42	.48	.00	.30	.63	.82		

Table 2. contains a summary of the course evaluation by the students in the form of means and variances. Six concepts were evaluated: Oral Communication I; Oral Communication I laboratory instructor; written analyses; speech exercises; Oral Communication I mass lecture instructors; and Oral Communication I textbook.

A total of 21,648 individual ratings (thirty-three for each student) were included in the means and variances for the 656 students who returned completed evaluation forms. While the evaluation form was designed to elicit anonymous ratings, the name of the student's laboratory instructor was obtained and Table 2. includes a breakdown of the ratings by instructor.

Table 3. contains a summary of the course evaluation identical to Table 2. except that it is classified by the student's major field of study. Table 3. is included because the course is an all University undergraduate requirement.

Table 2. The mean and variance for each of thirty-three scales arranged by instructor.

SN*	M**	V	Instructors								Total
			I	II	III	IV	V	VI	VII	VIII	
		N=	122	120	133	124	35	47	37	38	N= 656
1	M		3.46	3.60	3.91	3.81	3.63	3.72	3.75	3.81	3.71
	V		2.11	2.47	2.28	2.72	3.38	1.81	3.02	1.66	2.40
2	M		4.58	4.73	4.32	4.52	4.30	4.44	4.37	4.73	4.51
	V		2.52	2.55	1.90	2.72	2.38	2.29	3.63	2.57	2.47
3	M		3.77	3.91	4.24	4.08	4.13	4.12	4.37	4.23	4.05
	V		2.80	2.76	2.64	2.92	3.15	2.46	2.24	2.61	2.74

* Scale Number. See Appendix B for the corresponding scales.

** Mean and Variance.

Table 2. (cont.)

SN	M V	Instructors									Total N=656
		I	II	III	IV	V	VI	VII	VIII		
		N= 122	120	133	124	35	47	37	38		
4	M	3.27	3.41	3.86	2.93	3.16	3.68	3.27	3.71	3.40	
	V	2.23	2.46	2.99	3.15	3.00	2.52	3.70	2.53	2.83	
5	M	3.36	3.18	3.59	3.39	3.33	3.23	3.48	3.28	3.37	
	V	2.53	2.15	1.89	2.89	2.80	1.70	2.86	1.99	2.33	
6	M	3.26	3.31	3.25	3.65	4.02	2.91	3.59	3.60	3.40	
	V	1.71	1.69	1.81	1.96	2.19	1.68	1.96	2.08	1.88	
7	M	3.72	3.78	3.95	4.01	4.33	4.04	4.13	3.57	3.90	
	V	3.07	2.84	2.81	3.11	2.51	3.12	4.34	3.27	3.04	
8	M	5.26	4.90	5.25	5.59	5.22	4.59	4.40	5.28	5.16	
	V	1.98	2.16	2.57	1.50	2.00	2.28	3.58	1.72	2.22	
9	M	4.98	4.92	5.04	5.70	4.86	4.65	4.51	4.94	5.06	
	V	1.85	2.18	2.13	1.45	2.40	1.75	3.25	2.32	2.11	
10	M	3.05	3.37	3.30	2.19	3.13	3.42	3.32	3.47	3.07	
	V	2.73	2.85	3.12	1.81	2.58	2.94	2.89	3.01	2.86	
11	M	5.54	5.44	5.24	6.02	5.33	5.04	5.16	5.18	5.46	
	V	1.58	1.91	2.09	1.22	2.11	1.51	2.69	2.26	1.87	
12	M	2.86	3.23	2.93	2.17	3.27	3.23	4.02	3.39	2.96	
	V	2.18	2.46	2.51	1.78	2.72	1.96	3.58	2.89	2.55	
13	M	2.37	3.05	2.89	2.34	2.72	3.08	3.37	2.47	2.73	
	V	1.41	1.82	2.48	1.73	1.86	1.64	2.24	1.98	1.97	
14	M	3.40	3.75	3.15	4.08	3.19	3.25	3.56	4.39	3.58	
	V	2.42	2.37	2.07	3.19	3.87	2.32	3.03	1.86	2.68	
15	M	4.04	3.76	4.53	3.91	4.30	3.40	4.45	4.07	4.06	
	V	3.54	3.13	2.81	3.93	4.10	3.37	3.81	3.69	3.50	
16	M	3.90	4.14	3.44	4.10	3.41	4.46	3.40	3.73	3.86	
	V	2.99	2.25	2.64	3.19	3.22	3.12	3.41	3.71	2.99	
17	M	3.27	3.63	2.91	3.45	3.08	3.25	3.13	3.39	3.28	
	V	2.94	2.62	2.39	3.03	2.47	2.45	3.23	3.97	2.83	

Table 2. (cont.)

SN	M V	N=	Instructors								Total N=656
			I	II	III	IV	V	VI	VII	VIII	
			122	120	133	124	35	47	37	38	
18	M V	3.50 3.39	3.65 3.20	4.18 3.74	3.55 3.85	4.11 3.75	3.44 2.55	4.10 3.76	3.78 3.08	3.75 3.52	
19	M V	4.25 2.95	3.50 2.53	3.83 2.23	3.75 2.54	3.94 3.08	3.72 2.24	3.45 3.19	4.05 2.86	3.82 2.65	
20	M V	2.37 1.79	2.63 2.15	2.39 1.60	2.11 1.70	2.86 3.03	2.36 1.67	2.89 3.37	2.23 1.75	2.42 1.97	
21	M V	5.31 2.02	5.39 1.93	5.48 1.52	5.90 1.50	4.94 2.79	5.70 .95	5.24 2.46	5.47 2.41	5.48 1.86	
22	M V	4.72 3.14	4.50 3.24	4.62 2.99	4.67 3.35	4.08 3.45	4.85 3.25	4.27 2.98	4.18 3.66	4.57 3.22	
23	M V	2.25 1.99	2.30 2.45	2.17 2.00	1.84 1.62	2.38 2.47	2.00 1.65	2.27 3.14	2.44 2.82	2.17 2.13	
24	M V	4.20 3.22	4.09 3.69	3.57 3.70	3.79 3.68	4.16 3.80	3.72 3.20	4.45 3.08	4.55 2.19	3.97 3.51	
25	M V	4.13 3.13	4.03 3.41	3.56 3.26	3.49 3.59	4.13 3.72	3.76 2.92	4.18 3.04	4.13 3.46	3.85 3.37	
26	M V	4.62 3.45	4.49 3.54	4.52 3.55	4.47 4.23	3.86 3.32	4.48 3.90	3.70 3.82	4.60 3.65	4.44 3.71	
27	M V	5.31 2.15	5.05 2.74	4.95 2.92	5.20 3.03	5.27 2.89	5.04 2.51	5.48 2.49	5.02 2.40	5.14 2.68	
28	M V	3.73 3.10	3.57 2.68	4.19 3.09	3.94 3.15	3.30 2.56	4.21 3.21	3.72 3.14	3.57 3.43	3.83 3.07	
29	M V	2.95 2.33	2.97 2.68	3.42 2.76	3.07 2.56	2.63 2.40	3.00 1.52	2.54 2.47	2.55 2.74	3.01 2.54	
30	M V	4.88 2.59	5.30 2.21	4.93 2.68	4.98 2.91	4.83 2.77	4.91 2.38	5.02 2.69	5.10 2.09	5.00 2.57	

Table 2. (concl.)

SN	M V	N=	Instructors								Total N=656
			I	II	III	IV	V	VI	VII	VIII	
			122	120	133	124	35	47	37	38	
31	M		4.73	5.20	4.84	5.06	5.00	4.57	5.29	4.71	4.93
	V		2.95	2.56	2.81	3.35	3.08	3.03	2.43	3.18	2.94
32	M		5.09	5.30	5.21	5.47	5.22	5.31	5.67	5.21	5.28
	V		2.87	3.13	2.19	3.02	2.97	2.56	2.28	2.87	2.75
33	M		3.09	2.72	3.24	3.07	3.27	2.95	3.08	2.89	3.04
	V		3.19	2.58	3.52	3.24	4.32	2.73	3.79	2.63	3.18

Table 3. The mean and variance for each of thirty-three evaluative scales arranged by major field of study.

SN*	M** V	N=	Major								
			1†	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
1	M	38	3.86	3.47	3.74	3.71	4.18	3.56	3.65	3.46	4.84
	V	36	2.11	2.19	2.48	2.59	3.16	2.17	1.75	2.62	1.97
2	M	228	4.36	4.55	4.43	4.52	5.00	4.69	4.65	4.74	3.53
	V	161	2.18	2.36	2.47	2.60	4.20	2.13	1.96	3.24	2.26
3	M	11	4.39	4.02	4.03	4.03	4.18	4.06	3.91	3.87	4.76
	V	83	2.02	2.77	2.92	2.89	2.56	2.59	1.90	3.37	2.52
4	M	47	3.68	3.33	3.34	3.37	3.90	3.25	3.74	3.00	4.61
	V	39	3.14	2.51	2.84	2.53	3.89	2.84	2.93	2.73	4.42

* Scale Number. See Appendix B for the corresponding scales.

** Mean and Variance.

† Key to major field symbol: 1= Agriculture; 2= Architecture; 3= Arts and Science; 4= Education; 5= Commerce; 6= Engineering; 7= Home Economics; 8= Veterinary Medicine; 9= Major not listed.

Table 3. (cont.)

SN	M V	Major									
		N=	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
5	M		3.71	3.00	3.46	3.41	3.18	3.07	3.46	3.10	4.00
	V		1.83	2.00	2.38	2.53	2.36	1.99	1.99	2.83	2.83
6	M		3.36	3.69	3.46	3.17	3.81	3.55	3.23	3.53	3.15
	V		1.64	1.93	2.11	1.86	1.56	1.73	1.57	1.46	1.64
7	M		4.50	4.05	3.83	3.80	4.45	3.90	3.70	3.76	5.07
	V		3.22	2.51	3.08	2.98	3.67	2.62	2.69	3.86	3.74
8	M		5.00	5.33	5.25	5.02	5.00	5.08	5.17	5.12	6.00
	V		3.08	1.65	2.21	2.28	1.40	2.56	1.66	2.37	.83
9	M		4.94	5.19	5.05	5.00	5.00	5.01	5.00	5.38	5.61
	V		2.80	1.87	2.17	2.15	2.40	2.40	1.65	1.55	1.08
10	M		2.76	3.41	3.03	3.06	3.63	3.18	3.08	3.28	2.00
	V		2.18	2.87	2.90	2.61	3.45	3.39	2.55	3.57	1.50
11	M		5.26	5.58	5.43	5.44	5.45	5.36	5.51	5.74	6.07
	V		2.46	1.50	2.00	1.78	2.07	2.01	1.82	1.45	.74
12	M		2.89	2.63	2.97	3.01	3.09	3.04	3.06	2.98	2.30
	V		2.09	1.78	2.54	2.73	2.29	2.43	2.40	3.62	2.89
13	M		2.89	2.86	2.79	2.60	2.63	2.79	2.74	2.53	2.46
	V		1.39	1.55	2.20	1.67	2.65	1.89	2.23	2.93	1.43
14	M		3.02	3.88	3.54	3.72	3.72	3.33	3.78	3.92	3.38
	V		2.18	2.90	2.76	2.65	3.21	2.27	2.77	3.12	2.42
15	M		4.65	3.58	4.01	4.06	3.90	3.85	4.17	4.43	4.30
	V		3.09	3.27	3.45	3.89	3.29	2.93	3.57	3.04	6.23
16	M		3.42	4.19	3.91	3.85	4.00	3.96	3.72	3.82	3.53
	V		2.41	2.96	2.99	3.08	2.80	3.03	2.81	2.73	5.60
17	M		2.89	3.55	3.20	3.47	3.54	3.08	3.40	3.51	2.84
	V		2.04	2.76	2.84	3.40	2.47	2.56	2.35	2.78	2.47
18	M		4.13	3.44	3.83	3.55	4.72	3.50	4.12	3.74	4.38
	V		3.25	3.45	3.81	3.34	1.61	3.59	3.41	2.40	5.08

Table 3. (concl.)

SN	M V	N=	Major								
			1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
19	M V		3.63 2.72	3.94 2.51	4.05 2.60	3.80 2.78	3.00 1.00	3.40 2.80	4.08 2.03	3.61 2.87	3.38 2.42
20	M V		2.47 1.87	2.41 2.07	2.44 2.00	2.29 1.74	2.36 .85	2.50 2.30	2.44 1.77	2.30 1.85	3.23 4.85
21	M V		5.42 1.92	5.38 1.67	5.33 1.65	5.63 1.65	5.72 1.21	5.15 2.57	5.48 1.82	5.61 1.76	4.76 4.35
22	M V		4.55 2.79	4.33 4.11	4.73 3.10	4.77 2.97	3.81 1.96	4.02 3.38	4.78 2.51	4.61 3.97	3.15 3.64
23	M V		2.36 2.02	2.38 2.41	2.15 2.02	1.90 1.52	2.27 2.61	2.28 2.76	2.17 1.97	2.43 2.77	3.00 5.00
24	M V		3.65 3.63	4.11 3.64	3.94 3.36	3.88 3.69	4.00 4.00	4.45 3.61	3.82 3.83	4.15 2.55	3.07 2.91
25	M V		3.65 2.77	4.30 2.67	3.74 3.38	3.78 3.63	3.45 2.87	4.37 3.38	3.72 3.81	4.12 2.48	2.76 2.69
26	M V		4.71 2.69	3.61 4.07	4.50 3.53	4.57 4.04	4.81 2.36	4.02 3.34	4.40 4.15	4.53 4.25	5.69 1.89
27	M V		4.68 2.33	5.41 2.19	5.19 2.72	4.98 2.83	5.27 1.81	5.32 2.61	5.17 2.57	5.53 2.51	4.30 3.56
28	M V		4.18 2.64	3.97 2.25	3.82 3.07	3.95 3.54	3.63 2.65	3.40 2.70	4.00 2.73	3.46 3.04	4.76 3.35
29	M V		3.10 1.93	3.27 2.66	2.94 2.46	3.14 2.96	2.72 3.41	2.86 2.28	2.93 1.93	2.82 2.46	3.76 4.02
30	M V		5.23 1.91	5.05 2.79	4.94 2.83	4.86 2.58	5.45 1.07	5.20 2.31	4.95 2.38	5.07 2.91	5.46 1.93
31	M V		4.86 2.49	5.05 2.79	4.88 3.00	4.88 3.17	5.27 2.01	4.85 3.12	5.02 2.54	5.23 2.86	5.53 2.76
32	M V		5.44 1.55	5.13 2.86	5.25 2.92	5.21 2.79	6.09 1.49	5.30 2.82	5.14 3.04	5.51 2.78	5.84 2.47
33	M V		3.05 2.48	2.83 2.82	3.03 3.24	3.21 3.61	2.72 2.21	3.03 3.32	2.93 2.62	2.76 2.97	3.07 3.57

SUMMARY

This report, in part, was prepared to describe and explain the course structure and procedures of instruction in Oral Communication I, fall semester, 1964-65, at Kansas State University. This record should be useful in the decision process accompanying any long range plan for the utilization of mass lecture-recitation sections in the basic speech course. In addition, this report provides basic data from the mass lecture and recitation sections dealing with grade assignments and course evaluations in appropriate form. These data, also, should be useful in the decision process accompanying any long range plan for the utilization of mass lecture-recitation sections in the basic speech course.

APPENDIX

Appendix B (cont.)

ORAL COMMUNICATION I LAB INSTRUCTOR

boring ___ : ___ : ___ : 8 : ___ : ___ : ___ stimulating
 ineffective ___ : ___ : ___ : 9 : ___ : ___ : ___ effective
 clear ___ : ___ : ___ : 10 : ___ : ___ : ___ unclear
 incompetent ___ : ___ : ___ : 11 : ___ : ___ : ___ competent
 interested in me ___ : ___ : ___ : 12 : ___ : ___ : ___ just doing a job
 available ___ : ___ : ___ : 13 : ___ : ___ : ___ unavailable

WRITTEN ANALYSES

difficult ___ : ___ : ___ : 14 : ___ : ___ : ___ easy
 useful ___ : ___ : ___ : 15 : ___ : ___ : ___ useless
 worthless ___ : ___ : ___ : 16 : ___ : ___ : ___ valuable
 I don't like them ___ : ___ : ___ : 17 : ___ : ___ : ___ I like them
 relevant to the course ___ : ___ : ___ : 18 : ___ : ___ : ___ busy work

SPEECH EXERCISES

difficult ___ : ___ : ___ : 19 : ___ : ___ : ___ easy
 useful ___ : ___ : ___ : 20 : ___ : ___ : ___ useless
 worthless ___ : ___ : ___ : 21 : ___ : ___ : ___ valuable
 I don't like them ___ : ___ : ___ : 22 : ___ : ___ : ___ I like them
 relevant to the course ___ : ___ : ___ : 23 : ___ : ___ : ___ busy work

MASS LECTURE INSTRUCTORS

boring ___ : ___ : ___ : 24 : ___ : ___ : ___ stimulating
 ineffective ___ : ___ : ___ : 25 : ___ : ___ : ___ effective
 clear ___ : ___ : ___ : 26 : ___ : ___ : ___ unclear
 incompetent ___ : ___ : ___ : 27 : ___ : ___ : ___ competent
 interested in me ___ : ___ : ___ : 28 : ___ : ___ : ___ just doing a job
 available ___ : ___ : ___ : 29 : ___ : ___ : ___ unavailable

Appendix B (concl.)

ORAL COMMUNICATION I TEXTBOOK

easy ___ : ___ : ___ : 30 : ___ : ___ : ___ difficult
 valuable ___ : ___ : ___ : 31 : ___ : ___ : ___ worthless
 I like it ___ : ___ : ___ : 32 : ___ : ___ : ___ I don't like it
 unclear ___ : ___ : ___ : 33 : ___ : ___ : ___ clear

How did the course agree with what you expected before the course began?

Are there changes in the structure of this course that you think would improve it?

Is there any segment of this course that you particularly liked?

Disliked?

A REPORT OF THE MASS LECTURE, LABORATORY PROGRAM OF
INSTRUCTION: ORAL COMMUNICATION I, FALL SEMESTER
KANSAS STATE UNIVERSITY, 1964-65

by

JOE D. HUBERT

B. S., KANSAS STATE UNIVERSITY, 1958

AN ABSTRACT OF A MASTER'S REPORT

submitted in partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the degree

MASTER OF ARTS

Department of Speech

KANSAS STATE UNIVERSITY
Manhattan, Kansas

1965

ABSTRACT

Purpose: This report, in part, was prepared to describe and explain the course structure and procedures of instruction in Oral Communication I, fall semester, 1964-65, at Kansas State University. This record should be useful in the decision process accompanying any long range plan for the utilization of mass lecture-recitation sections in the basic speech course. In addition, this report provides basic data from the mass lecture and recitation sections dealing with grade assignments and course evaluations in appropriate form. These data, also, should be useful in the decision process accompanying any long range plan for the utilization of mass lecture-recitation sections in the basic speech course.

Procedure: The mass lecture segment of the course was described in terms of teaching, text assignment and integration, and testing procedures. The recitation segment of the course was described in terms of performance standards, speech topics, written analyses and student-speaker evaluations. Individual grades across quizzes, speeches, analyses, and examinations were available for 705 students and individual course evaluation ratings across thirty-three evaluative scales were available for 656 students. These data were listed in an appropriate order for machine analysis.

Results: Data in regard to grades were compiled into a fourteen

variable correlation matrix (Pearson product moment correlation coefficients). The variables were: four quizzes, three speeches, three written analyses, one mid-term examination, one final examination, one final number grade, and one final letter grade.

Data in regard to the course evaluation were processed in the form of means and variances for thirty-three seven point evaluative scales. The scales were assigned to six concepts: Oral Communication I (seven scales), laboratory instructor (six scales), written analyses (five scales), speech exercises (five scales), mass lecture instructors (six scales), and text book (four scales).

Means and variances were computed across thirty-three scales for all 656 students and also for the following sub-classes: for each of eight recitation instructors, and for each of nine major fields of study.