

AN EXPERIMENTAL STUDY OF TWO APPROACHES TO TEACHING SPEECH
IN TERMS OF REDUCING SPEECH ANXIETY

by

BERNARD FANDRICH

B.P.E., University of British Columbia, 1968

A THESIS SUBMITTED IN PARTIAL FULFILMENT OF
THE REQUIREMENT FOR THE DEGREE OF

MASTER OF ARTS

In the Department of
Speech and Drama,
Faculty of Education

We accept this thesis as conforming to the
required standard

THE UNIVERSITY OF BRITISH COLUMBIA

May, 1969

In presenting this thesis in partial fulfilment of the requirements for an advanced degree at the University of British Columbia, I agree that the Library shall make it freely available for reference and Study.

I further agree that permission for extensive copying of this thesis for scholarly purposes may be granted by the Head of my Department or by his representatives. It is understood that copying or publication of this thesis for financial gain shall not be allowed without my written permission.

Department of Speech & Drama, Faculty of Education

The University of British Columbia
Vancouver 8, Canada

Date May 27/69

ABSTRACT

The hypotheses on which this study is based state that a group receiving an encountering approach to speech training will register a greater reduction in speech anxiety than a group receiving the conventional approach to speech training; the conventional group will show a greater reduction in speech anxiety than a control group that received no speech training.

The encountering approach consisted of encountering exercises, role-playing, creative drama, and discussion techniques. The conventional approach consisted of formalized speechmaking in front of an audience.

Subjects were 47 grade 12 students enrolled in the English 12 course at Britannia High School in Vancouver. Three groups were randomly selected and each was assigned one of the experimental conditions. The experimenter met with the two treatment groups for fifteen one hour sessions and taught the encounter approach to one group and the conventional approach to the other.

An introspective measure was administered to each group in the first and last session. Two trained observers rated each subject in terms of the overt manifestations of speech anxiety in their final speeches.

An analysis of covariance was made involving the

results on the introspective measure (MAACL). The Kruskal-Wallace test was used in comparing the observational scores (TORCL).

Both hypotheses were rejected. The results of the introspective measure were not significant. However, in comparing the results of the observer scores, a significant difference was found between the encounter group and the other two groups. There was no significant difference between the conventional and control groups.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER		Page
1	INTRODUCTION	1
	General Problem	1
	Related Literature	1
	Specific Problem	8
	Purpose	8
	Hypotheses	9
	Definitions	9
	Tests and Measures	10
11	METHOD	14
	Subjects	14
	Speech Classes and Assignments	14
	Development of Groups	15
	Experimental-Group Management	16
	Schedule of Treatment and Testing	17
	Introspective Measure	17
	Encounter-Group Treatment	18
	Conventional-Group Treatment	24
	Introspective and Observational Measure	28
	Scoring Methods Used	30
111	FINDINGS	31
	Analysis of Introspective Scores	31
	Analysis of Observational Scores	34
1V	SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS	36
REFERENCES		44
APPENDIX		
A	Multiple Affect Adjective Check List	48
B	Trained Observer Report on Confidence Level	49
C	Introspective and Observational Scores	50

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE		PAGE
1	Pretest and Posttest Mean Anxiety Scores	32
2	Analysis of Covariance for the Encounter	33
3	<u>TORCL</u> Mean Anxiety Scores	35

CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION

General Problem

Today, as in the past, the speech teacher continues to be confronted by students who seek help in overcoming their problems of speech anxiety. Even Cicero had this problem. He confessed to Crassus: "I very often prove it in my own experience, that I turn pale at the outset of a speech, and quake in every limb and in all my soul." (7) It is generally true that when speakers appear before an audience they at some time experience behavior that is disintegrated, poorly adjusted to the situation, and an interference to effective communication (16, p.320). Various studies have been done which demonstrate that speech anxiety is a serious problem, particularly with beginning speech students.

Related Literature

In a survey of 789 students enrolled in a Communicative Skills course at the State University of Iowa, Greenleaf (21) found that 89 per cent of the students experienced either mild, moderate, or severe speech fright. Kasl and Mahl (27) found significant increases in disturbed

verbalization in the form of repetitions, omissions, stuttering and incomplete sentences among high anxiety individuals. At Redlands University, Dickens and Parker (12) reported significant alteration in the pulse rate and blood pressure rates of over 90 percent of students while addressing an audience.

The speech students themselves feel their lack of confidence and are not hesitant in voicing their need for guidance and assistance in overcoming their speech anxiety problems. In a survey conducted at the University of Minnesota, Le Blanc (28) asked 243 beginning speech students: "What do you expect to gain in this course? That is, do you have any special goals or problems? Any special reasons for taking this course?" In reply, 77 per cent of the students stated in effect: "To improve in self-confidence as a speaker." White (44, p.32) reported a survey of beginning speech students who were asked the question: "What do you consider to be your most important single speech need?" According to White, "the large majority" of the students indicated that they wanted "To gain poise and assurance when facing an audience."

The above studies reflect the student's desire of wanting to effectively cope with speech anxiety and suggest to the speech teacher the need to find methods to solve the problem. Although there is an impressive backlog of research defining speech fright, dealing with measuring devices, and

the psychological, sociological, and environmental factors assumed to be related to speech fright, very little experimental work has been done to test specific speech anxiety remedies that have been proposed by various writers such as Paulson (37), Low and Sheets (32), and Brygelson (5).

However, Robinson (38) surveyed 34 speech textbooks in order to determine whether there were consistent patterns suggested for the development of confidence. He found three general advice patterns, each of which he tested experimentally to gauge their relative effectiveness in terms of increasing speech confidence. The three patterns were:

- 1) an emphasis upon the inherent ideas of the speech,
- 2) a stress on the preparation of the speech, and 3) a closer attention to bodily control.

Robinson tested them by teaching each of the patterns of advice to a different section of beginning speech students at Ohio Wesleyan University. He reported no statistically significant differences in the confidence gained among the three groups although the data indicated a statistically significant lessening of speech anxiety in each group as a result of taking the course in public speaking.

Several other researchers such as Gilkinson (19), Hendrickson (25), and Low and Sheets (32), carried out research on the effects of general speech training on speech anxiety. They found that significant reductions

in anxiety occurred. Undertaking general speech training is one of the methods mentioned in the literature for reducing speech anxiety. Le Blanc (28) mentioned three other methods in which experimentation had been carried out. These are as follows:

- (1) Studying the properties of speech anxiety -- the review of symptoms and physiological states associated with speech anxiety.
- (2) Reinforcing the speaker's self-image -- the deliberate emphasis of complimentary cues from the audience that depict the speaker as projecting poise and confidence.
- (3) Cultivating vocal and bodily control -- the mastery of the whole body through exercises in relaxation, breathing, vocal control, and bodily action.

The following two methods Le Blanc tested and the results of his experiment supported them:

- (1) Using hypnosis as a therapeutic method -- the use of hypnosis as a method for reducing speech anxiety.
- (2) Undergoing group counseling -- the use of small-group sessions involving interaction among several students and one or more counselors.

Le Blanc listed these theories which had not been tested experimentally:

- (1) Focusing on the significance of one's message -- the integration of emotional activity toward the definite goal of carrying significant ideas to an audience.
- (2) Developing habits of purposefulness -- the development of a task orientation; getting preoccupied with the task.
- (3) Working from (or memorizing) a speech outline -- bringing a speech outline to the platform, or working from an outline previously committed to memory.
- (4) Attending to the audience rather than to oneself -- concentrating on talking with, not at, or merely in front of the audience. This involves becoming audience-centered rather than speaker-centered.
- (5) Adapting through varied speaking experience and practice -- the exposure to different audiences; finding frequent opportunities to speak.
- (6) Undergoing slowly-increased doses of the "fear" stimuli -- the use of mild anxiety-provoking situations in a series of speeches, gradually

increasing the stimulation in each speaking experience.

- (7) Replacing fear by another emotion -- the willful substitution of serviceable "emotions" such as indignation, humor, pity, sympathy, and so on, for the feeling of personal fear.
- (8) Channeling nervous tension through bodily movement and action -- putting nervous tension to work: the deliberate use of gesture and movement in a fashion that will "consume" excess nervous energy; this involves finding natural, comfortable actions for the body, hands and feet.
- (9) Using psychodrama as a therapeutic agent -- the use of interpersonal "networks" in a group as instruments for building social speech confidence; for example, the speaker directs his speech to a specific, sympathetic audience member who engages in a friendly questioning and commentary.
- (10) Removing tensions through emotional catharsis -- instigating an "artificial" attack of speech anxiety that will have time to "burn itself out" well before the speech performance.
- (11) Keeping physically fit -- keeping the body physically fit which reduces susceptibility

to emotional disruption, which in turn allows for increased mental alertness and self-confidence.

- (12) Discovering the causes of fear through self-analysis -- the speech students' conscious re-evaluation of past experiences out of which speech fears originated.
- (13) Undergoing personal counseling -- talking over the problem with a teacher or some other competent person such as a psychotherapist or psychiatrist.
- (14) Developing an improved "social personality" -- carrying out a plan for personality improvement: making new friends, meeting a variety of people, consciously becoming a more outgoing individual.

This list can be classified into two major categories. One deals with the speaker in relation to an audience directly, and the other, indirectly. In (1) - (10) the speaker is offered specific methods for controlling his speech anxiety by focusing directly on the speech, emotional state of the speaker, or the audience. In (11) - (14), the problem is dealt with by concentrating on changing the "inner person." That is, techniques versus personality.

Specific Problem

This study posed the following question: What significance is there in an informal, unstructured approach (hereafter termed "encountering") to teaching speech as compared to a formal, structured approach (hereafter termed "conventional") in terms of reducing speech anxiety?

Purpose

The chief purpose of this study is to provide some empirical data supporting an encountering method to teaching speech as a remedy for speech anxiety. It was not known to what extent a combination of confrontation exercises, role playing, creative drama and discussion techniques would be effective in reducing speech anxiety in a select group of High School students. Would there be a statistically significant reduction in anxiety registered in this group when contrasted with a similar group of students in which there were no group activities, but in which subjects merely received practice in "formalized" public speaking?

The aim then, of this experiment is to measure and compare reduction in speech anxiety registered for three comparable groups of High School students subjected to:

Group 1 (Encountering approach to speech training -- involvement in group activities and discussion)

Group 11 (Conventional approach to speech training -- practice in speaking before an audience)

Group 111 (Control group -- no speech instruction given)

It is assumed in this study that reduction in speech anxiety is subject to measurement by introspective measures and observational measures.

Hypotheses

HYPOTHESIS 1: A group of High School students receiving an encountering approach to speech training will show a statistically greater reduction in speech anxiety than a comparable group of High School students receiving the conventional approach to speech training.

HYPOTHESIS 11: A group of High School students receiving a conventional approach to speech training will show a statistically greater reduction in speech anxiety than a comparable group of High School students receiving no speech training.

Definitions

Encountering Approach. This approach employed confrontation exercises, role playing, creative drama and

discussion techniques. Ideas, thoughts, experiences and feelings were expressed through activities and discussion. No restrictions were placed on topics so that feelings or issues could be dealt with.

Conventional Approach. Here all speech making was done formally. For example, students chose or were assigned speeches to be delivered in front of the class. Emphasis was placed by the instructor on positive reinforcement rather than critical analysis of each speaker and speech. The main purpose in this group was to provide frequent opportunities to speak within a relatively formal setting.

Speech Anxiety. In the present study this term is used interchangeably with "speech fright" and "speech confidence." It refers to an "emotional state" of the subjects as measured by the Multiple Affect Adjective Check List and is characterized by measurable overt manifestations via Trained Observers.

Tests and Measures

Selected data on the three measures used in this experiment are presented here. (Specific procedures used in their administration are presented in Chapter 11.)

MAACL (Multiple Affect Adjective Check List). The MAACL was constructed to measure change in anxiety over a specific time span. It consists of 132 adjectives, 10 are anxiety "plus" terms and 11 anxiety "minus" terms. Scores

are obtained by adding the number of "plus" items checked to the number of "minus" items not checked. Subjects are asked to check those adjectives that describe the way they feel at a particular moment. Administration of the test takes less than five minutes in most cases.

Validity. Researchers have used the MAACL in a number of validity studies related to stage fright, examination anxiety, hypnotically induced anxiety, and in comparison with Taylor Manifest Anxiety Scale.

Subjects in a stage fright study done by Atkinson (45, p.9) were 30 actors and 10 actresses; half were classified as amateurs and half as professionals. The MAACL was completed on days prior to or immediately after the stress situation. Reports indicated significant increases in scores of both groups when tested just prior to their performance. There was no significant difference between groups.

Zuckerman (45, p.6) administered the MAACL to a class of 32 students on consecutive class meetings a week apart. Results showed a significant increase, relative to the base line, when the test was administered just prior to an examination. He replicated the study two more times. Fourth, fifth, sixth, seventh and eighth replications by other experimenters verified the sensitivity of the MAACL as a measuring instrument for anxiety.

Results of four experiments conducted by Levitt,

Persky, and Brady (45, p.8) were a highly significant indication of hypnotically induced anxiety. Hypnotized subjects under no stress, established a baseline. While still under hypnosis, they had anxiety induced which was measured by the MAACL and found to be significant below the .00001 level of confidence in all four groups.

The Taylor Manifest Anxiety Scale, a valid anxiety measuring instrument (45, p.19), was correlated with the MAACL. Results indicated a correlation of .29 and .32 between the two tests. However, if the mean scores for a number of days were correlated with the Taylor Manifest Anxiety Scale scores, the correlations became .52 and .44 for the two tests.

Reliability. Reliability correlations indicated internal reliability coefficients are high and very significant (.85) while retest reliability correlations (7 day interval) are low and only moderately significant (.31). However, because affect tests must be sensitive to changes in emotions, it is not essential that it be statistically reliable from day to day. Moods vary daily requiring an affect measure to be sensitive to the fluctuations. Group means should not change significantly unless the whole group is exposed to some common stress. Zuckerman et al. (45, p. 17) used the MAACL and found in a study of college students, that group means remained stable for three baseline days.

In light of the above research, the writer used this test as the chief measuring instrument for his study.

TORCL (Trained Observer Report on Confidence Level).

This was the only observational measure used in the present study. It is an adaptation from a scale developed and used by LeBlanc (28) (Observational Report on Confidence Level) for measuring some of the overt manifestations of speech anxiety. The only difference between the two scales lies in the observers. In Le Blanc's study the observers were speech students and in the present study they were two speech Instructors. This report form is a nine-point rating scale on which the observer indicates the degree of confidence (level of anxiety) by circling one of the nine points on the scale with polar extremes of "Low Confidence" and "High Confidence."

Similar overt manifestations of speech anxiety were the marking criteria. Some evidence which indicated that subjects were not hampered by speech anxiety in the final speech included playfulness, originality, good language, absence of repetitions, eye contact with the audience, and bodily control.

CHAPTER 11: METHOD

Subjects

A total of 47 subjects were involved in this experiment. The subjects ranged in age from sixteen to twenty years; the mean age was 18.6 years. They were grade 12 students enrolled in the English 12 course at Britannia High School in Vancouver. The school is located in a predominantly lower socio-economic area with a large diversity of ethnic groups. In the present experiment, 28 of the 47 subjects (60 per cent) were Chinese or Japanese. The two treatment groups met in special speech classes during a seven day school week. A school week consisted of "7 days" (excluding weekends) each of which had five periods -- three in the morning and two in the afternoon. Each treatment group met for a total of 15 one hour sessions.

Speech Classes and Assignments

Class enrollment was as follows: encounter group 16; conventional group 17; control group 14. One subject in the encounter group and two in the control group were absent on the day of the final testing and are not included in the results of this experiment. Each subject in the conventional group averaged a total of 9 speaking assignments which

indicates the majority of the time spent in this group was devoted to speechmaking. Some of the time was given to lecturing about the various kinds of speeches and the invention, arrangement, style, and delivery of each kind of speech. No formal speechmaking was done in the encountering group.

Except for the first two speeches in the conventional group, none of the assignments required research or prior preparation. The choice of topic for most assignments was left to the individual student. The types of speeches assigned and specific procedures followed in both treatment groups will be described more fully later in this chapter.

Development of Groups

Three groups of subjects were selected for this study. Two were treated while the third served as a control group and received no treatment. For the purposes of this experiment, the groups were selected according to the following criteria and randomly assigned to one of the three experimental conditions:

- (1) Groups consisted of subjects enrolled in the English 12 course.
- (2) Groups contained only those subjects whose class letter grades in English put them in the top segment of their class.

It was assumed in the present study that the individuals within the groups were randomly selected and that they were equal in terms of speech anxiety.

Experimental-Group Management

Seating and Physical Setting. The encounter group was arranged in such a way that all of the subjects could participate in an easy and informal manner. For example, a circular seating arrangement around a large rectangular table was used so that group members could see and hear each other conveniently. The writer, who directed both the encounter and conventional group sessions, was seated in such a fashion that he too was part of the group. A small seminar room was used.

The same room with similar physical arrangements was used for the conventional group in this experiment. The only difference was that the seating was arranged around three sides of the table, the fourth side served as the area from which speeches were delivered. The instructor was usually seated at the corner of the table, closest to the speaker and to his right. Each subject in both treatment groups was permitted to choose his own place each session.

Session Length and Time Intervals. The subjects involved in the experimental-group treatments met for two 1 hour sessions each 7 school days. On Day 1 of the 7 day

schedule, the researcher met with the encounter group from 11:00 to 12:00 and with the conventional group from 1:00 to 2:00 that afternoon. The next meeting was on Day 4 at which time the encounter group met from 10:00 to 11:00 and the conventional group from 11:00 to 12:00 the same morning.

Research began the first week after the Christmas Holidays and terminated the last day of school prior to the Easter Holidays. The instructor met with each group a total of 15 hours over the 12 week period.

Session Attendance. Attendance was kept in both treatment groups and averaged 90 per cent. Included in this study were all subjects who attended the first class meeting although three of those were not able to be tested in the final session.

Schedule of Treatment and Testing

The treatment and testing sequence used in the present study was as follows:

(1) Introspective Measure -- First Speech. The researcher met independently with each of the three groups involved in this experiment and gave the following directions at the first meeting:

Each of you will come before the class and give a short demonstration speech. That is, you will choose something to demonstrate and

explain to the rest of the class. For example, you may want to demonstrate how to put on a jacket. Assume your audience knows nothing about a jacket and explain in precise detail every movement necessary for putting it on. Be very descriptive in your presentation.

Take a few minutes and think about a topic for your speech.

Before administration of the test, subjects were told no "right" or "wrong" answers existed and results would not be scored or counted against them. The instructions were read out and explained if necessary. The procedure outlined above was used to create anxiety in each subject who was then asked to complete the MAACL.

Encounter-Group Treatment

The first session consisted primarily of testing. However, the instructor also gave a general introduction to the procedures to be followed in the further sessions. That is, he mentioned the goals of personal involvement through participation in group activities and discussion, and free communication through the expression of feelings, ideas, thoughts and experiences as openly and as often as possible, as being the most important features of this approach.

The second session consisted of a confrontation exercise called "Drifting." The whole group was asked to drift aimlessly about the room without talking. No time limit was set for the activity. The experimenter also "drifted" about and was the last to return to his chair. Each participant was then asked to describe his feelings relating to the activity. The discussion that followed revolved around individual feelings of self-consciousness, conformity, and goal orientation.

In the third session members joined hands in a circle and closed their eyes. After a few moments the leader separated one pair of hands and led participants around the room. The members were asked to protect one another from bumping into objects on the floor and other obstacles scattered about. After the activity, a discussion followed in which feelings were related. Several members indicated they felt that they were being watched by other group participants although they knew each had his eyes closed. Others related feelings of confidence and trust in those leading them, while some felt very insecure.

Another variation of a confrontation activity was used in the fourth session. Each subject was asked to write two short paragraphs, one describing how he perceived himself and the other describing how he felt the group perceived him. When everyone had completed his description, they were collected

and read in random order by the experimenter. After each description was read, the group was asked to identify the writer and comment upon that member's perception of himself. In the discussion that followed each exposition, the group was generally supportive and verbally reinforced many positive personality characteristics of the participants. For example, one member felt her feelings of inferiority were very evident to others and as a result she did not have the courage to make friends. The group, however, told her they thought she was a very likeable, warm, and seemingly self-assured individual. In this manner they reinforced her self-image.

The encounter group in the fifth session was arbitrarily divided into three minor groups: the role-playing group, the picture-making group, and the discussion group. Each expressed the topic "Love" in its own way. That is, the role-playing group "acted out" what they felt love meant, the picture-making group drew pictures which depicted its concept of love, and the discussion group talked about love.

A "survival game" was played in the sixth session. The class was again divided into two groups and the following hypothetical situation was presented. Each group was on a boat which was sinking. Only two people on each boat would survive and would become the perpetuators of the human race.

Each group was to eliminate - throw into the water - all except two survivors. Each person was to verbally defend himself and try to be one of those who would remain. When the majority on board decided a member was to go "overboard", that participant was to leave the group. Thirty minutes was allowed for the exercise which was followed by discussion.

In the seventh session the encounter group was arbitrarily divided into two. Each group chose a "conductor" who was responsible for the action of his "choir." One group served as the audience and chose a topic which the other group used as a basis from which to create a story. When the "conductor" pointed to a specific person in his "choir", that individual began a story based upon the topic suggested by the audience, which he continued without interruption and without noticeable grammatical mistakes until another person was appointed by the conductor to further the story. When an individual made a mistake by not immediately furthering the imaginary tale, he was asked to leave the group. After the first "choir" had eliminated all its members, it changed roles with the audience who followed the same procedure outlined above.

In the eighth session each person was to have fifteen pennies in his possession. These he put on the table in front of him. Participants were then instructed to permanently give away to other members as much money as

they wished. The experimenter also took part in the activity, not giving away any of his pennies, but receiving some from other members. The group then discussed feelings related to sharing, greed and monetary values. After a short discussion the experimenter told the participants to walk around and take back as much money as they wished from each person. The instructor, however, did not take money from anyone although his supply quickly diminished. Discussion was then related to feelings of guilt, greed, and security.

The ninth session consisted of a creative drama exercise. A sequence of related sentences was written on a blackboard. From these, participants created and acted out a specific scene. For example:

(Subject) A. Can you turn it off

(Subject) B. I don't hear anything

A. But its so powerful

B. What

A. I can't do it

B. Okay

Two members at a time would present a situation by expressing the desired emotions through voice inflection, emphasis on key words, and appropriate bodily action. For example, the first subject's line "Can you turn it off" can be either a statement or a question. It can be said sarcastically, bitterly, lovingly, or pleadingly depending on the emotion

desired. The emphasis in the second line would be dependent upon the mood created in the first line, the situation, and so forth.

The tenth, eleventh, and twelfth sessions consisted of simple discussion activities on topics of "Discrimination" and "Involvement." Participants were given permission to question the experimenter along any lines they wished. This "interview" consisted of general questions related to speech courses at the University as well as more personal questions about the instructor's age, feelings of aloneness, and attitudes toward people and life.

The thirteenth and fourteenth sessions consisted of a modified form of the "survival game." Subjects were told to give a talk of self-defence before a "jury". The "jury" was comprised of members of the encounter group who impartially considered the "evidence" presented and determined the fate of each participant. Each person presented a hypothetical argument stating to whom or what he was indispensable. If sufficient evidence was presented supporting his case, he was acquitted. If not, he was condemned.

The fifteenth session was devoted to retesting. The sequence followed and the tests administered will be described later in this chapter.

To the reader, the procedure described in this section may appear to be little more than a friendly discussion and

social group. However, the topics for discussion and the activities participated in were not those found in the ordinary social group. The encounter members talked freely about themselves, their reactions to each other, and their feelings toward the experimenter. Through involvement in both activities and discussion, subjects received insight into many of their feelings including speech anxiety.

The experimenter in this group had four functions: (1) participant-discussant, (2) resource person, (3) discussion leader, and (4) activity leader. In the first role, he became "one" of the group as much as circumstances permitted. In the second he acted as a resource person supplying information when requested or when he considered it to be beneficial to the individual or group. In the third role he structured group discussion. In the fourth he suggested and clarified various activities and techniques.

Conventional-Group Treatment

The methods followed in this group were relatively "structured" in comparison to the encounter group techniques. Each subject in this group gave at least 9 speeches on a variety of topics. Five minutes was the maximum time allowed for any one speech. The principal objective in this approach was to provide participants with speechmaking opportunities. The following types of speeches were described and assigned

during the treatment period:

- (1) Persuasive speeches
- (2) Informative speeches
- (3) Demonstration speeches
- (4) Impromptu speeches
- (5) Speeches presenting a problem
- (6) Speeches involving oral interpretation of literature
- (7) Story telling

No attempt was made to have the subjects adhere strictly to the characteristics of each type of speech. The invention and arrangement of ideas, memory of the outline, and delivery techniques, were briefly mentioned to the participants before a particular speech was required for presentation. For example, in the persuasive speech the outline was as follows:

- (1) Draw attention to the issue
- (2) Identify the issue
- (3) Refute the objections
- (4) Present alternatives
- (5) State specific action

In the first regular classroom speech the subjects brought an object which they "really loved" (an assignment from the previous session). The purpose in bringing and demonstrating something of emotional significance was twofold: (1) it would be easier to concentrate on the message of the speech, thereby

speech anxiety would presumably be lessened, and (2) each subject would understand more thoroughly the ideas inherent in his speech. The instructor suggested various techniques to enhance the communication process: eye contact, use of the hands and body, utilizing visual aids, and "letting go" of feelings.

The second and third sessions consisted of an oral interpretation assignment. Each subject was asked to write a short (5-6 lines) poem, story or description of an experience. The instructor illustrated and described one oral interpretation technique which the class was requested to follow. In this technique, the literature was taken to the scene, audience, or to self. If to the scene, the reader was to react as if what he was relating had actually just occurred on an imaginary stage behind the audience. If he presented it to the audience, he was to concentrate on good eye contact and talk with and not at the audience. If the reader decided a particular line or lines should be said to himself, he was to "talk to himself" but loudly enough that the audience could hear and understand. Generally, any one reading employed a combination of these three. The literature was not to be "read" but instead an idea or sentence was to be grouped together, memorized, and then presented in the manner just described. Emphasis was placed on "letting go" of feelings and bodily action.

In the fourth and fifth sessions persuasive speeches were given. The instructor reinforced positive cues that depicted the speaker as possessing poise, control, and confidence. The experimenter pointed out desired characteristics, such as: eye contact with individual members in the audience; use of the hands in such a manner that they did not interfere with the communication process but instead reinforced the words and ideas of the speech; the use of good language; voice control; logical arrangement and choice of ideas.

In the sixth session the instructor drew several squares on the floor representing various "phases" of the informative speech. Each subject began in the "walk-in" square, moved to the "predevelopment" square, then to the "development" square, and finally to the "leaving the idea" square. In this manner, simple speeches of information were presented. Topics for each speech in the first six sessions were chosen by the students.

The seventh and eighth sessions consisted of storytelling. Each subject was asked to present a very descriptive story about a real or imagined experience. Members were to attempt to create feeling through voice inflection, choice of appropriate words, and use of the body.

The instructor decided the topics for the next four impromptu speeches which were presented in the next six

sessions. Topics were as follows:

1. The time I was discriminated against
2. Involvement
3. Why I want to live
4. If I were God

General topics were purposely chosen to allow a variety of thoughts and experiences to be expressed. Each speech topic was written on the blackboard at the beginning of the class period, five minutes was allowed for either a mental or written grouping of ideas, and then participants presented a short speech.

In the last regular classroom speech each student was asked to choose a problem, describe its nature, and offer solutions to it. Arguments for both sides of the problem were presented although those not in agreement with the solution offered were to be refuted.

(2) Introspective and Observational Measures --

Posttest. Prior to the final speech and testing of each subject, two trained observers were introduced as two speech professors from the University of British Columbia. These observers were seated in the back of the same small seminar room used for all the sessions. Immediately after the introductions, the following directions were read to the class (the same procedure was followed in all three groups involved in this experiment):

1. In a few moments each of you will be given a piece of clay and will come before the group and give a speech for one minute.
2. Do not prepare the speech ahead of time.
3. Keep the speech in the present tense. That is, "I am holding the clay, I am moving it from my left hand to my right hand," and so on.
4. Be as original as possible; be creative.
5. If you cannot think of what to say or do with the clay, simply say: "I am holding the clay, I am holding the clay."
6. I will go first and show you what I mean.

The directions were repeated after the example "clay-speech" given by the instructor.

The MAACL was then immediately administered to each group just prior to the speech. The order of presentation in each group was determined by a random selection of names. Immediately after each speech was given, the two trained observers rated each subject according to a nine-point scale. Similar overt manifestations of speech anxiety were the marking criteria.

Following the final session, student scores registered on the MAACL and the TORCL were analyzed and compared to determine whether statistically significant differences existed among groups.

Scoring Methods Used

MAACL. The hand scoring stencil for anxiety was used for scoring the MAACL. The score was obtained by adding one point for every check appearing through a hole marked "plus" and adding one point for every item not checked in a hole marked "minus". The total score was the number of "plus" adjectives checked and the number of "minus" adjectives not checked.

TORCL. Each subject's score on this measure was obtained by calculating the average between the two scores circled by the trained observers.

CHAPTER 111: FINDINGS

Introduction

Since the chief concern of this study was to determine the relative effectiveness of two methods of speech training on reduction in anxiety, the analysis of covariance met the needs of this experiment and was selected as the statistical method for analyzing results on the Introspective measure (MAACL). The Kruskal-Wallace test (41, p.406) was used in comparing the Observational scores (TORCL) of the posttest. To determine pair-wise differences between group means on the TORCL, post-hoc comparisons were made (24, p. 483).

Analysis of MAACL Scores

An analysis of covariance was made involving the scores (table 1) of the encounter, conventional, and control groups. As illustrated in table 2, the results of analysis show that there was no significant reduction in anxiety, ($F = .898$; df 2/40; $p > .05$). Because the overall F test was not significant, there was no need to test for significant differences between pairs of groups.

Table 1

Pretest and Posttest Mean Anxiety Scores

Group	Pretest	Posttest
Encounter Group	13.6000	11.4667
Conventional Group	11.0000	9.0000
Control Group	11.0000	11.0000

Table 2

Analysis of Covariance for the Encounter,

Conventional and Control Groups

Source	df	SS	MS	F
--------	----	----	----	---

Total	42	703.3516		
Between Groups (adj.)	2	30.2227	15.113	
Within Groups (adj.)	40	673.1289	16.8282	0.898

Analysis of Observational Scores

The nature of the TORCL data required distribution free statistics. For this the Kruskal-Wallace test was used. Since ties were involved in the ranking, the H result 9.266 was obtained by dividing through by a corrected value in order to determine the corrected value of H. Using the Chi square for K statistic, the result 9.266 is significant at .01 level of confidence.

Therefore pair-wise differences between means were examined using post-hoc comparisons (24, p.483). For a value to be significant at the .05 level, the required difference for 2 and 41 degrees of freedom is approximately 6.46 in absolute value. An obtained difference of 6.74 was found between the encounter and conventional groups, and a difference of 9.64 was obtained between the encounter and control groups. Both comparisons were significant. However, comparisons between the conventional and control groups were not significant (.57).

Table 3TORCL Mean Anxiety Scores

Group	Mean Score
Encounter Group	6.2
Conventional Group	4.9
Control Group	4.5

CHAPTER 1V: SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

Summary of Problem

Although many speech anxiety remedies and preventatives are reported in the literature, few have been experimentally tested. The present experiment sought to provide some empirical data supporting an encountering approach to speech training in contrast to a conventional approach to speech training as a method for reducing speech anxiety.

Summary of Method

This study involved an experimental evaluation of an encounter method as a technique for reducing the speech anxiety among a group of High School students. The subjects were 47 male and female students enrolled in the English 12 course at Britannia High School in Vancouver. They were randomly selected and assigned to one of the following:

Group 1 -- Encounter-Group Treatment -- involvement in group activities and discussion.

Group 11 -- Conventional-Group Treatment -- practice in formal speechmaking.

Group 111 -- Control-Group -- no treatment.

The two treatment groups met with the experimenter a total of 15 hours extending over a 12 week period. Testing was done using an introspective measure (MAACL) in the first and fifteenth sessions, and an observational measure in which two trained observers rated the subjects in all three groups while they gave their final speech.

The analysis of covariance was the statistical method used in the interpretation of results on the MAACL. The Kruskal-Wallace test for completely random design was used for comparing the observational scores.

Testing the Hypotheses

FIRST HYPOTHESIS: A GROUP OF HIGH SCHOOL STUDENTS RECEIVING AN ENCOUNTERING APPROACH TO SPEECH TRAINING WILL SHOW A STATISTICALLY GREATER REDUCTION IN SPEECH ANXIETY THAN A COMPARABLE GROUP OF HIGH SCHOOL STUDENTS RECEIVING THE CONVENTIONAL APPROACH TO SPEECH TRAINING.

In testing the first hypothesis the following findings were established:

- (1) This hypothesis would be rejected on the basis of posttest difference scores obtained from the Multiple Affect Adjective Check List.
- (2) This hypothesis would be accepted on the basis of posttest scores obtained from the Trained Observer Report on Confidence Level.

SECOND HYPOTHESIS: A GROUP OF HIGH SCHOOL STUDENTS RECEIVING A CONVENTIONAL APPROACH TO SPEECH TRAINING WILL SHOW A STATISTICALLY GREATER REDUCTION IN SPEECH ANXIETY THAN A COMPARABLE GROUP OF HIGH SCHOOL STUDENTS RECEIVING NO SPEECH TRAINING.

In testing the second hypothesis the following findings were established:

- (1) This hypothesis would be rejected on the basis of posttest difference scores obtained from the Multiple Affect Adjective Check List.
- (2) This hypothesis would be rejected on the basis of posttest scores obtained from the Trained Observer Report on Confidence Level.

Interpretations and Conclusions

Reasons for hypotheses rejection by the MAACL.

One may only speculate why both hypotheses were rejected. Although researchers have verified the MAACL as a measuring instrument for general anxiety (even stage fright), the conditions of the present study necessitated an extremely sensitive measure in order to record each subject's reduction in anxiety which occurred as a result of speech training. The possibility exists that the MAACL was not sensitive to speech anxiety

alone, but other factors may have influenced the results as well. As already indicated earlier in this paper (p.11), the anxiety resulting from examinations is sufficient to influence the results of the MAACL at a statistically significant level. The subjects in the encounter and conventional groups had just completed a History examination in the class period previous to the final speech training session. The effect of the examination was still apparent when the groups entered the speech class for their final testing. Therefore, results on the introspective measure were influenced by the anxiety which resulted from the History examination as well as anxiety which resulted from the speaking situation. This factor may help explain why results of this experiment were not significant on the MAACL.

More significant MAACL results. Results may have been more relevant had subjects been closely matched in terms of high speech anxiety. The matching would have resulted in homogenous groups and the anxiety reduction would probably have been more meaningful after analysis was completed.

Possible cause of significant TORCL results. More difficult to ascertain is why the encounter group indicated a statistically significant reduction on the observational measure compared to the other two groups. It is possible that had pretest observation scores been obtained on this measure, results would have indicated an initial difference.

Thus the present posttest observations would have been meaningless in that these discrepancies initially existed.

Questionability of the observers. It is assumed the three groups were matched. The results therefore hinge on the reliability of the judges, both of whom were experienced in noting overt manifestations of speech anxiety. In addition to the general criteria of playfulness, good language, originality, and good bodily action, the observers mentioned in conversation with the experimenter, that they utilized an "intuitive feeling" in indicating each subject's score. Non-verbal cues they "picked up" were taken into consideration when assigning scores. Specific criteria which describe the non-verbal are not possible to list, nor are they necessary to describe because the visual cues of anxiety were the principal marking criteria. The "intuition" was mentioned only to indicate that this factor, whether consciously or unconsciously, was involved in the decision-making process particularly since both observers were experienced in noting speech anxiety.

It is noteworthy that the observers noticed a significant difference between the encounter group and the other two groups in this study. As already mentioned, the observers noticed more originality, greater freedom of expression, more control of the hands, eyes, and body, and fewer repetitions in the encounter group. These criteria

were observed in each subject as being indications of a lack of anxiety. However, the possibility exists that subjects initially possessed these traits which were characteristics of their personalities and not learned speech skills. If this was the case, then the observers were rating personalities in addition to or rather than speech anxiety. It also holds true, that if a lack of speech anxiety results in originality, bodily control, and so forth, then the opposite manifestations would be the result of high anxiety or a reflection of a banal personality, or a combination of both. It would have been interesting to note whether a correlation existed between an "introversion-extroversion" scale on a personality test and the observer rating scale used in the present study. Had such a correlation existed, then one may assume that observers also rated this personality characteristic. It is quite probable that there is a connection between the "social personality" and speech anxiety and one may be an indication of the other on the observational measure. In any case, the two observers in the present study were looking for indications of freedom from the stifling influence of speech anxiety, and were not concerned with the general anxiety level inherent in each personality. Through training and experience they had become aware of speech anxiety and its symptoms.

Reasons for significant reductions of overt speech

anxiety. An explanation for the significant reduction in the overt manifestations of anxiety in the encounter group may be due to the nature of the treatment itself. Most activities necessitated an involvement requiring the minimum of self-consciousness. They were good exercises in fostering spontaneity, originality, and involvement. Participants realized feelings of anxiety only hampered their own effectiveness unless these feelings were controlled. They learned to accept them as being natural and tried not to let them be a hindrance in achieving their objectives. They also learned these feelings were shared by nearly all speakers. Subjects discussed the universality of speech anxiety and related their own experiences in order to reduce the problem to more realistic proportions.

In the conventional group, the instructor made reference to bodily action, expression, speech anxiety, and so forth, and suggested ways to enhance the communication process. These were techniques designed for conscious application in the speaking situation. It is possible that the length of the speech training sessions was not sufficient for these suggestions to become natural speech-making habits. Thus, when observed in the final speech, they seemed to indicate a high anxiety level although their cognitively perceived anxiety was similar to that of the encounter group. Therefore no significant difference existed

on the MAACL although it did exist on the TORCL.

Implications for further research. The researcher would like to make several suggestions for other experimenters who undertake similar kinds of studies:

- (1) The administration of an observational pretest as well as the posttest.
- (2) A selection of subjects closely matched in terms of high speech anxiety.
- (3) A combination of both the encounter and conventional approaches as a possible third group.
- (4) Administration of a personality test in addition to speech anxiety measures.

REFERENCES

- (1) Auer, Jeffery J. An Introduction to Research in Speech. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1959.
- (2) Barnes, Harry G. Speech Handbook. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1965.
- (3) Bois, Samuel J. Explorations in Awareness. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1957.
- (4) Brown, Charles T., and Charles Van Riper. Speech and Man. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1966.
- (5) Bryngelson, Bryng. Applying hygienic principles to speech problems. Quarterly Journal of Speech, 1943, 29, 351-354.
- (6) Capp, Blenn R. How to Communicate Orally. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1966.
- (7) Cicero. De Oratore. 1, XXVI, transl. by E.W. Sutton. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1942.
- (8) Clevenger, Theodore, Jr. An analysis of variance of the relationship of experienced stage fright to selected psychometric inventories. Ph.D. dissertation, Florida State University, 1958. Abstracted in Speech Monographs, 1959, 26, 89.
- (9) Clevenger, Theodore, Jr. A synthesis of experimental research in stage fright. Quarterly Journal of Speech, 1959, 45, 134-145.
- (10) Clevenger, Theodore, Jr. The effect of a physical change in the speech situation upon experienced stage fright. Journal of Communication, 1959, 10, 131-135.
- (11) Clevenger, Theodore, Jr., and Gregg Phifer. What do beginning college speech texts say about stage fright? Speech Teacher, 1959, 8, 1-7.
- (12) Dickens, Milton, Francis Gibson, and Caleb Prall. An experimental study of the overt manifestation of stage fright. Speech Monographs, 1950, 17, 37-47.
- (13) Dickens, Milton, and William R. Parker. An experimental study of certain physiological, introspective and rating scale techniques for the measurement of stage fright. Speech Monographs, 1951, 18, 251-259.

- (14) Driver, Helen I. Counseling and Learning Through Small-Group Discussion. Madison: Monona Publishing Company, 1962.
- (15) Edwards, Allen L. Experimental Design in Psychological Research. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1964.
- (16) Eisenson, Jon. The Psychology of Communication. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1963.
- (17) Geer, J.H. Effect of fear arousal upon task performance and verbal behavior. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1966, 71, 119-123.
- (18) Gilkinson, Howard. Social fears as reported by students in college speech classes. Speech Monographs, 1942, 9, 141-160.
- (19) Gilkinson, Howard. Indexes of change in attitudes and behavior among students enrolled in general speech courses. Speech Monographs, 1941, 8, 23-33.
- (20) Gilkinson, Howard, and Franklin H. Knower. Individual differences among students of speech as revealed by psychological tests. Quarterly Journal of Speech, 1940, 26, 243-255.
- (21) Greenleaf, Floyd I. An exploratory study of speech fear. Quarterly Journal of Speech, 1952, 38, 326-330.
- (22) Gruner, Charles R. A further note on stage fright. Speech Teacher, 1964, 13, 223-224.
- (23) Hamilton, John L. The psychodrama and its implications in speech adjustment. Quarterly Journal of Speech, 1943, 29, 61-67.
- (24) Hays, William L. Statistics for Psychologists. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1963.
- (25) Henrikson, Ernest L. Some effects on stage fright of a course in speech. Quarterly Journal of Speech, 1943, 29, 490-491.
- (26) Irwin, Joan V., and Marjorie Rosenberger. Modern Speech. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1966.

- (27) Kasl, S.V., and Mahl, G.F. The relationship of disturbances and hesitations in spontaneous speech to anxiety. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1965, 1, 425-433.
- (28) Le Blanc, J.C., Jr. An Investigation of the use of hypnosis as a method for Improving Speech Confidence. Doctoral dissertation, University of Minnesota Ann Arbor, Mich.: University Microfilms, 1964. No. 65-7789.
- (29) Levitt, Eugene E. The Psychology of Anxiety. New York: The Bobbs-Merrill Company, Inc., 1967.
- (30) Lomas, Charles W. The psychology of stage fright. Quarterly Journal of Speech, 1937, 23, 35-44.
- (31) Lomas, Charles W. Stage fright. Quarterly Journal of Speech, 1944, 30, 479-485.
- (32) Low, Gordon M., and Boyd V. Sheets. The relation of psychometric factors to stage fright. Speech Monographs, 1951, 18, 266-271.
- (33) Malamud, Daniel I., and Soloman Machover. Toward Self-understanding: Group Techniques in Self-confrontation. Springfield: C.C. Thomas, 1965.
- (34) Monroe, Alan., and Douglas Ehninger. Principles and Types of Speech (6th ed.). Chicago: Scott, Foresman and Company, 1967.
- (35) Murray, Elwood. The Speech Personality. (revised ed.). New York: J.B. Lippincott Co., 1944.
- (36) Oliver, Robert T., and Rupert L. Cortright. Effective Speech. (4th ed.). New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1961.
- (37) Paulson, Stanley Fay. Changes in confidence during a period of speech training: transfer of training and comparison of improved and non-improved groups on the Bell Adjustment Inventory. Speech Monographs, 1951, 18, 260-265.
- (38) Robinson, Edward R. An experimental investigation of certain commonly suggested teaching methods for the development of confidence in beginning students of public speaking. Ph.D. dissertation, Indiana University, 1956, Abstracted in Speech Monographs, 1956, 23, 97-98.

- (39) Robinson, Edward R. What can the speech teacher do about students' stage fright? Speech Teacher, 1959, 8, 8-14.
- (40) Rose, Forrest H. Training in speech and changes in personality. Quarterly Journal of Speech, 1940, 26, 193-196.
- (41) Ross, Raymond S. Speech Communication. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1965.
- (42) Steel, Robert G.D., and James H. Torrie, Principles and Procedures of Statistics. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1960.
- (43) Wheatley, B.C. The effects of four styles of leadership upon anxiety in small groups. Doctoral dissertation, University of Denver Ann Arbor, Mich.: University Microfilms, 1966, No. 67-3592.
- (44) White, Eugene E. Practical Speech Fundamentals. New York: The MacMillan Company, 1960.
- (45) Zuckerman, Marvin, and Bernard Lupin. Manual for the Multiple Affect Adjective Check List. San Diego: Educational and Industrial Testing Service, 1965.

APPENDIX A

MULTIPLE AFFECT ADJECTIVE CHECK LIST

Copies of the MAACL can be obtained by writing to:

Educational and Industrial Testing Service,
Post Office Box 7239,
Can Diego, California. 92107.

APPENDIX B

TRAINED OBSERVER REPORT ON CONFIDENCE LEVEL

Speaker's name: _____

(low confidence) 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 (high confidence)

Speaker's name: _____

(low confidence) 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 (high confidence)

APPENDIX C

Introspective Scores

Pretest and Posttest Difference Scores

<u>Encounter Group</u>		<u>Conventional Group</u>		<u>Control Group</u>	
<u>pre</u>	<u>post</u>	<u>pre</u>	<u>post</u>	<u>pre</u>	<u>post</u>
20	8	10	10	0	3
18	16	11	2	17	19
10	11	13	9	17	13
12	14	3	6	12	15
10	10	6	10	12	13
11	11	6	9	17	12
11	14	10	9	1	1
10	6	18	12	13	15
16	11	10	10	8	4
13	14	14	2	8	9
20	15	11	13	18	17
14	15	13	9	9	11
17	3	8	7		
5	17	10	7		
17	7	16	14		
		7	5		
		21	19		

Observational Scores Ranked

<u>Encounter Group</u>	<u>Conventional Group</u>	<u>Control Group</u>
3.5 (6)	3.0 (2.5)	1.5 (1)
4.5 (14)	3.0 (2.5)	3.5 (6)
5.0 (20)	3.5 (6)	3.5 (6)
5.5 (25.5)	3.5 (6)	3.5 (6)
5.5 (25.5)	4.0 (10.5)	4.0 (10.5)
5.5 (25.5)	4.5 (14)	4.5 (14)
6.0 (30)	4.5 (14)	4.5 (14)
6.5 (34)	4.5 (14)	5.0 (20)
6.5 (34)	5.0 (20)	5.5 (25.5)
7.0 (38.5)	5.0 (20)	5.5 (25.5)
7.0 (38.5)	5.0 (20)	6.0 (30)
7.5 (42)	5.5 (25.5)	7.0 (38.5)
7.5 (42)	6.0 (30)	
7.5 (42)	6.5 (34)	
8.0 (44)	6.5 (34)	
	6.5 (34)	
	7.0 (38.5)	