To the Graduate Council:

I am submitting herewith a thesis written by James Brooks Holt, Jr., entitled "Speech Anxious Students' Perceptions of the Effective, Nonanxious Speaker: Preliminary Development of a Model." I recommend that it be accepted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Arts, with a major in Speech and Theatre.

Robert S. Ambler
Robert S. Ambler
Major Professor

We have read this thesis and recommend its acceptance:

Lorayne W. Lester

John W. Edgerly

Accepted for the Council:

L Evans Roach
Vice Chancellor
Graduate Studies and Research

Thesis
77
.H648
cop.2

SPEECH ANXIOUS STUDENTS' PERCEPTIONS OF THE EFFECTIVE, NONANXIOUS SPEAKER: PRELIMINARY DEVELOPMENT OF A MODEL

A Thesis

Presented for the

Master of Arts

Degree

The University of Tennessee, Knoxville

James Brooks Holt, Jr.

March 1977

1317658

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study was to investigate speech anxious students' perceptions of the effective, nonanxious speaker as a guideline to the development of an effective model for the reduction of speech anxiety. Thirty-five students who were identified as speech anxious by their responses on an introspective measure of speech anxiety were interviewed. In the interview the subjects were asked what characteristics they associated with the effective, non-anxious speaker and how important they considered each characteristic named. Additionally, a measure of locus of control was administered to determine what effect this variable had on the subjects' perceptions of the nonanxious speaker. The subjects' responses were content analyzed and evaluated in light of the available research on the effect of model characteristics on the outcome of modeling.

The characteristics associated by the subjects with effective, nonanxious speakers were related to the speaker, the speech, and the relationship between the audience and the speaker. It was concluded that these characteristics could be viewed as those exhibited by a conversational speaker. The conversational speaker was defined as a speaker who was relaxed and informal, who appeared calm and in control of the speaking situation, who used everyday

language, and who fostered a direct, one-to-one relationship with the audience. The physical characteristics of the effective, nonanxious speaker, as perceived by the subjects, revolved around the theme of a normal-appearing speaker. The subjects preferred speakers who were fairly attractive, who dressed well but neither too formally nor too casually, and who were of average size. They also expressed preferences for speakers who were white, male, and generally older than college age.

Because the characteristics associated by the subjects with the nonanxious speaker were interrelated, and because the variables of sex and locus of control seemed to have only minor effects on the subjects' perceptions of such a speaker, it was concluded that these characteristics could be incorporated into one model. By relying on the guidelines of a conversational manner of speaking and a speaker who does not appear unusual, it seems possible to develop a model that can be perceived generally by speech anxious students as an effective, nonanxious speaker.

An evaluation of the characteristics cited by the subjects as attributes of the nonanxious speaker revealed that, for the most part, these characteristics would be of value in the development of an effective model for the reduction of speech anxiety. Only the characteristics of a male speaker and a speaker older than college age were

deemed irrelevant to the development of a model, since these characteristics seemed to be artifacts of societal norms and not specifically related to speech anxiety.

The major implications of this study concern the factors which require consideration in the development of a public speaking model. In such a development, it is not enough to consider only the actual speaking behaviors of the model. The speaker's physical characteristics, the content and style of the speech itself, and the relationship established between the speaker and the audience are factors which must also be considered.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER		PAGE
I.	THE PROBLEM	1
II.	METHODOLOGY	13
III.	RESULTS	20
IV.	DISCUSSION	47
V.	SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS	73
LIST OF REFERENCES		78
APPENDICES		83
A.	PERSONAL REPORT OF PUBLIC SPEAKING APPREHENSION	84
B.	INTERNAL-EXTERNAL LOCUS OF CONTROL SCALE	86
VITA		90

CHAPTER I

THE PROBLEM

A particular area of concern for the speech educator is the problem of the inhibitions and fears of a student interfering with his/her acquisition of communication skills (McCroskey, 1970). An example of this interference is the anxiety of some students in the public speaking situation, anxiety which can hinder their acquisition of the skills necessary for effective public speaking. Such anxiety has been variously referred to as stage fright, speech fright, communication anxiety, communication apprehension, and speech apprehension. In this study, such anxiety will be referred to as speech anxiety.

The incidence of speech anxiety appears to be sufficiently high to warrant concern over the problem. Paul (1966) maintains that there is a "relatively high incidence" of such anxiety among a large population of persons who are "essentially 'psychiatrically normal'" (p. 9). Phillips and Metzger (1968) report that a consistent 5% to 10% of the students in a Pennsylvania State University beginning speech course suffer from anxiety in a variety of communication situations, including the public speaking situation. This conclusion was based on interviews with the students, using

as criteria both the students' behavior and responses during the interview. McCroskey (1972), in a study of Michigan State University students, used an introspective measure, the Personal Report of Communication Apprehension—College (McCroskey, 1970), to measure the anxiety of students in a broad range of communication situations, of which public speaking was one. He characterized the level of such anxiety in 10% to 20% of his sample as extreme, and in 40% sufficient to require treatment. Such reports illustrate the need for investigations of speech anxiety and of possible methods of reducing it.

In his synthesis of research, Clevenger (1959) reports several definitions of speech anxiety. In general, these definitions characterize such anxiety as a disruptive emotional state experienced within the public speaking situation and accompanied by various behaviors. The behaviors associated with speech anxiety fall into two groups: those internally perceived by the speaker and those observed by the audience. The speaker-perceived behaviors include upset stomach, nausea, throbbing temples, headache, loud and rapid heartbeat, dryness of the mouth, and inability to see the audience (Phillips, 1968). Audience-observed behaviors include poor eye contact, nervous and restless movements, awkward posture, excessive perspiration, body tremor, and timid voice (Clevenger, 1959; Ickes, 1971; Phillips, 1968).

Clevenger (1959) notes that, no matter what the verbal definition, "the ultimate definition of stage fright—and the only one that makes sense experimentally—is the operational definition which describes the instrument used to measure it" (p. 135). Instruments which measure speech anxiety fall into three categories: introspective measures, observer rating scales, and physiological measures. Introspective measures, or self-report scales, are usually paper-and-pencil scales which ask the individual to indicate how much anxiety, discomfort, and nervousness he/she experiences in the public speaking situation. Observer rating scales are instruments which allow judges to rate the amount of anxiety, discomfort, and nervousness the individual exhibits while speaking. Physiological measures are devices which measure the physiological changes the individual undergoes while speaking. Clevenger (1959) infers from the high reliabilities of these three types of instruments, but the low correlations between them, that each instrument measures a variable that is somehow different from the other two. Such a conclusion suggests that any investigation of speech anxiety must take into account the instrument by which such anxiety is measured, since the instrument is, in effect, the definition of speech anxiety.

A further complication of any attempt to define speech anxiety is reported by Phillips (1968), who concludes from

various research that some individuals are anxious only in a public speaking situation, while others are anxious in a broad range of communication settings with public speaking being only one of the anxiety-provoking settings. This latter pattern of anxiety is termed reticence. Phillips (1968) defines the reticent individual as "a person for whom anxiety about participation in oral communication outweighs his projection of gain from the situation" (p. 40). The general characteristics of the reticent individual include a lack of social skills, general feelings of malaise and anxiety in most interpersonal situations, and an inability to communicate in a variety of situations (Phillips, 1968; Phillips & Metzger, 1973). However, since reticents evidence the same anxious public speaking behaviors as do those individuals who are situationally disturbed (McCroskey, 1970), a distinction between situation-specific speech anxiety and that resulting from reticence will not be made.

It is important to note that speech anxiety is not the normal amount of anxiety present in any stressful situation, including public speaking. Certain amounts of anxiety in such situations are to be expected (Ickes, 1971). Phillips (1968) reports that normal speakers often experience many of the physical symptoms of speech anxiety prior to giving a speech, but these symptoms tend to disappear during the actual delivery of the speech. Only when such anxiety

becomes so excessive as to impair the individual's ability to speak is it considered speech anxiety. Neither will this study consider the tensions and fears resulting from inexperience as speech anxiety. It is assumed that experience and training as a public speaker will relieve such tensions and fears (Phillips, 1968; Wilson & Arnold, 1968).

Several different modalities for reducing speech anxiety are in current use. The most widely used method is systematic desensitization (Wolpe, 1958; 1969). Widespread success in reducing speech anxiety has been reported for this method (McCroskey, 1972; McCroskey, Ralph & Barrick, 1970; Paul, 1966). Another method in current use is self-instruction therapy, also known as self-directed guidance (Mahoney, 1974). Research has shown this method effective in reducing speech anxiety when used either alone (Meichenbaum, Gilmore, & Fedoravicius, 1971) or in conjunction with systematic desensitization (Weissberg, 1975). While these methods have been effective in reducing speech anxiety, both have the disadvantage of requiring trained personnel to facilitate their application.

A third possible method for reducing speech anxiety is social modeling (Bandura, 1969; 1971). This method reduces excessive fears and inhibitions by "having persons observe models performing the fear-provoking behavior without experiencing adverse consequences" (Bandura, 1969, p. 175).

Models can be live or symbolic (filmed or videotaped). The major disadvantage of modeling is the cost, since care and preparation are necessary in the development of the modeling sequence, and in the case of symbolic modeling access to videotape or film facilities is required. Modeling does have two advantages, however. The first advantage is the ease and convenience with which symbolic modeling can be applied (Bandura, 1971). In contrast to systematic desensitization and self-instruction therapy, symbolic modeling does not require trained personnel to accomplish its application once the filmed or videotaped modeling sequence has been developed. Modeling also has the added advantage of the potential to facilitate the learning of other public speaking skills besides anxiety coping. Research has shown modeling effective in teaching such communication skills as indirect verbal influence (Lange, 1971) and the communication of accurate empathic understanding (Dalton, Sunblad, & Hylbert, 1973). It may prove possible, in one properly designed modeling sequence, to combine anxiety reduction with the teaching of new public speaking skills. At this point, however, the emphasis should be placed on developing a modeling sequence for the reduction of speech anxiety.

Experimental investigations of the disinhibitory effects of modeling have concentrated, for the most part, on the reduction of animal-avoidance behavior. Geer and Turteltaub

(1967) and Bandura, Grusec, and Menlove (1967) found the observation of live models efficacious in reducing such behavior. Other research reports similar success for filmed or videotaped symbolic models (Bandura & Menlove, 1968; Hill, Liebert, & Mott, 1968; Spiegler, Liebert, McMains, & Fernandez, 1969). Bandura, Blanchard, and Ritter (1969) compared systematic desensitization, symbolic modeling, and live modeling with guided participation in the reduction of snake-avoidance behavior. Although all three procedures were effective, live modeling with guided participation was more effective than either desensitization or symbolic modeling. Bandura (1971) notes that despite the somewhat diminished efficacy of symbolic modeling this procedure does have the advantage of ease and convenience of application.

Relatively little research has investigated the use of modeling for the reduction of speech anxiety. Kleinsasser (1968) investigated the use of pretherapy training in the form of film-mediated vicarious learning in the systematic desensitization of speech anxiety. In this study, one group of subjects underwent systematic desensitization for speech anxiety, another group viewed films of others undergoing systematic desensitization for speech anxiety, and a third group viewed the modeled therapy sessions before themselves undergoing the same procedure. Results indicated that pre-therapy modeling did not enhance the effectiveness of

systematic desensitization, but modeling of systematic desensitization for the reduction of speech anxiety alone resulted in a significant reduction of such anxiety. While this study does not relate directly to the use of modeled nonanxious speaking behavior to reduce speech anxiety, it does serve to emphasize the power of modeling.

One study which did investigate the use of modeled nonanxious speaking behavior to reduce speech anxiety is reported by Morgan (1970). This study employed two self-report measures and an observer rating scale to measure speech anxiety. Three experimental groups were used. A self-modeling group viewed videotapes of their own speaking performances, with the instructions to watch "those things that you like about the presentation and would like to include in the next speech you give and those things that you don't like and would like to leave out of your next speech" (p. 14). An other-modeling group viewed videotapes of another speaker characterized as nonanxious, with instructions similar to those of the self-modeling group. The final group was a practice-only control group which, instead of viewing videotapes, sat and thought about their speeches. In all groups, an initial speech presentation was employed for testing purposes and to generate the initial self-modeling sequence. This presentation was followed by six exposures to the model, spread over three sessions, with the

subject delivering a speech after each exposure. In the control group, the subjects thought about their speeches instead of viewing a model. Results were mixed. All three groups showed a significant reduction in speech anxiety as measured by both introspective and observer rating measures, but although the two modeling groups showed a greater decrease than did the control group on all measures, the differences were not significant. Neither was there a significant difference between the two modeling groups.

Morgan's (1970) study illustrates a problem encountered in any research investigating the efficacy of modeling in reducing speech anxiety. That problem is the development of an appropriate model. Without some attention paid to the development of a model, it is impossible to determine whether the lack of a significant modeling effect is the result of the ineffectiveness of modeling to reduce speech anxiety, or the result of the model's inappropriateness.

It would seem especially important in developing a public speaking model to consider the characteristics perceived by speech anxious students to be associated with the effective, nonanxious speaker. Bandura (1971) suggests that the observer's perception of the model as fearful or nonfearful may affect the observer's response to that model. Research investigating the relative efficacy of fearful and nonfearful models has been somewhat contradictory. For

example, Meichenbaum (1971) found fearful models more effective, while Kornhaber and Schroeder (1975) found no difference in the effectiveness of fearful and nonfearful models. It appears that the effect of the model's fearfulness or nonfearfulness is interrelated with other variables, such as the specific fearful behavior under modification. A more complete discussion of this question is provided during the discussion of the findings of the present study, but whether a fearful or nonfearful model is desired, the perceptions of speech anxious students regarding the characteristics of nonanxious speakers are important to the development of that model.

Also of importance is the observer's perception of the skill and effectiveness of the model as a public speaker. Clevenger (1959) suggests that one of the possible consequences of speech anxiety is a poor speaking performance. Since the model is supposed to perform the "fear-provoking behavior without experiencing adverse consequences" (Bandura, 1969, p. 175), and one of the adverse consequences of speech anxiety may be a poor speaking performance, it is possible that a model which exhibits poor speaking skills could prove ineffective in reducing speech anxiety.

Morgan (1970) seems to have paid little attention to the development of an appropriate model, stating only that the models in the other-model condition exhibited "positive,

nonanxious behaviors" (p. 39). However, no evidence other than this assertion is reported to indicate the subjects' perceptions of the models. There was no reported attempt to obtain the subjects' perceptions of the models' level of fearfulness and speaking skill, leaving open the possibility that the failure to find a significant difference between modeling and control groups was the result of an inappropriate model.

It can be seen from the studies summarized above that modeling is a potentially effective method of reducing speech anxiety, but before this potential can be achieved it is necessary to develop an appropriate model. An important factor in this development is the perceptions of speech anxious students regarding the characteristics of an effective, nonanxious speaker. Specifically, three questions must be answered. First, what characteristics and behaviors do speech anxious individuals associate with the effective, nonanxious speaker? The various observer rating scales for measuring speech anxiety give ample evidence that the characteristics and behaviors of the anxious public speaker are known, but these scales do not answer the primary question of what the anxious student perceives in the nonanxious speaker. Second, is a single model possible? Are there groups of anxious students who perceive the nonanxious speaker differently from other groups, or are there certain

characteristics of the nonanxious speaker that are perceived by all types of speech anxious students? If differences exist, what variables serve to predict how an anxious student will perceive the nonanxious speaker? The final consideration is an evaluation of the usefulness of the anxious individual's perceptions of the nonanxious speaker in the development of a nonanxious model. For example, if most speech anxious students perceive the effective, nonanxious speaker as a 45-year-old male, does this mean that the most effective model for reducing the speech anxiety of college students is a 45-year-old male, or are there other considerations which mitigate against a model of this type?

The purpose of this study is to attempt to answer the three questions posed above. A representative sample of speech anxious students will be interviewed to determine their perceptions of the effective, nonanxious speaker. An analysis of the students' responses during this interview will attempt to determine the feasibility of a single public speaking model. Finally, the usefulness of the students' perceptions will be evaluated, using the criteria of the available research concerning the effect of model characteristics on the outcome of modeling.

CHAPTER II

METHODOLOGY

Subjects were drawn from the introductory public speaking course at the University of Tennessee, Knoxville. This sophomore-level course, required by approximately one third of the university's departments, is designed to develop an understanding of the basic principles of public speaking and a satisfactory level of speaking proficiency, combining lectures and textual readings with classroom speeches. An important adjunct to this course is the Speech Anxiety Program, operated jointly by the Department of Speech and Theatre and the Student Counseling Center. This voluntary program offers public speaking students and other interested students an opportunity to reduce their speech anxiety by systematic desensitization. To aid in identifying those students who might potentially benefit from speech anxiety reduction, an introspective measure such as McCroskey's (1970) Personal Report of Public Speaking Apprehension (PRPSA) is often administered to all sections of the public speaking course during the first two weeks of class.[1]

---

[1]The use of the PRPSA to identify the speech anxious student is based on two considerations. First, as a self-report scale, it is more convenient and less expensive to administer than other types of measures. Secondly, the instrument measures the individual's anxiety only in the public speaking situation. The scale is a 34-item, 5-point Likert-type scale with a potential score range of 34 to 170. (See Appendix A.)

Each student's score and information about the speech anxiety program are reported back to the individuals, and those who score one standard deviation or higher above the mean are urged to avail themselves of the opportunity to reduce their speech anxiety.[2] The program is completely voluntary, however, and is open to all students regardless of their PRPSA scores.

The usual procedures employed in the speech anxiety program were used to select potential subjects for this study. During the Spring 1976 Quarter the PRPSA was administered to 429 students in 19 sections of the introductory public speaking course. The scores ranged from 55 to 169, with a mean of 108.28 and a standard deviation of 19.28. Those students who scored 128 or higher were considered eligible for this study. Sixty-eight students met this criterion. Additionally, one student who was not enrolled in the public speaking course and one student whose PRPSA score was below the standard volunteered for the speech anxiety program and were included in the study. The initial subject pool, therefore, consisted of 70 students, with PRPSA scores ranging from 116 to 169, a mean score of 136.42, and a standard deviation of 19.04. These individuals were

---

[2]The use of a score one standard deviation above the mean as the criteria for identifying the anxious speaker is admittedly arbitrary, but it does have the precedent of use in previous research (McCroskey, 1972).

approached, informed of the study, and invited to participate. Of the initial subject pool, 35 individuals (PRPSA score range = 128-166, mean score = 135.34, standard deviation = 24.70) either dropped the course before they could be contacted, declined to participate, or failed to keep their scheduled interview appointments. The remaining 35 students were the subjects for this study. This group consisted of 19 females and 16 males. Their PRPSA scores ranged from 116 to 169, with a mean score of 137.53 and a standard deviation of 10.27.

The primary method of data gathering for this study was the interview. The decision to use this method was based upon several considerations. More conventional methods, such as checklists, Likert-type scales or semantic differentials, are better suited for statistical analysis but require preconceived categories for that analysis. Since no previous research investigating the speech anxious individual's perceptions of the effective, nonanxious speaker could be found, any attempt to design such instruments would be only conjecture. At best, such an instrument could only measure the accuracy of its designer's conjectures of how the nonanxious speaker is perceived, with the dangers ever present that such conjecture is incomplete and that important perceived characteristics were not anticipated and thus not measured. It was decided, therefore, that the subjects

would simply be asked to state what characteristics they perceived in the effective, nonanxious speaker, using open-ended questions to prevent the exclusion of any pertinent characteristics. In this form, the questions could best be asked in a face-to-face interview. The face-to-face format was the most convenient method of data gathering, and also allowed attempts at clarification that would have been difficult with a written format.

The subjects were interviewed by the author or one of two paid undergraduate workers. Interviews were conducted individually, except in two instances when time limitations required that, with the subjects' permission, two subjects be interviewed together.

The initial question of the interview asked:

> As you look back at all the different speakers you have heard—in class, on TV, in movies and plays, in person, wherever—I'm sure that some have struck you as being particularly effective, non-anxious speakers. What characteristics do these speakers have that makes you think they are effective, nonanxious speakers?

The question was phrased in this manner so that the subjects were describing the characteristics of the speakers they had heard which they considered effective and nonanxious. This particular phrasing was used in order to obtain answers that were as concrete as possible. This study was also intended to find if any physical characteristics were associated with the effective, nonanxious speaker. Therefore, after the

subjects had responded to the initial question, they were asked what effect the physical characteristics of height, build, sex, age, race, dress and general appearance had on their assessment of a speaker's effectiveness and lack of anxiety. This question was followed by an attempt to obtain a rough estimate of the relative importance of each characteristic named, using a three-point rating scale designating three as very important, two as somewhat important and one as less important.

The final step in the interview was an attempt to determine to what extent the subjects believed they controlled the occurrence of reinforcing events. This phenomenon, originally conceived by Rotter (1966), is termed locus of control. It is based on the assumption that individuals may or not may perceive events as reinforcing, depending upon whether the individual perceives a causal relationship between his/her behavior and the reward. According to Rotter (1966):

> When a reinforcement is perceived by the subject as following some action of his own but not being entirely contingent upon his action, then in our culture, it is typically perceived as the result of luck, chance, or fate, as under the control of powerful others, or as unpredictable because of the great complexity of the forces surrounding him. When the event is interpreted this way by an individual, we have labeled this a belief in <u>external control</u>. If the person perceives that the event is contingent upon his own relatively permanent characteristics, we have termed this a belief in <u>internal control</u>. (p. 12)

Previous research has indicated that the individual's response to various therapeutic modalities is affected by his/her internality or externality. Hamilton (1976), for example, found that internal individuals were more likely to volunteer for systematic desensitization for speech anxiety, and also were more likely to reduce their speech anxiety by desensitization. Stone and Jackson (1975) report indirect evidence that modeling is more effective with internal subjects than with external subjects. One possible effect of the locus of control variable on an individual's response to modeling is on that individual's perception of the model. Rotter (1966) states that the internal individual seems "more alert to those aspects of the environment which provide useful information for his future behavior" (p. 25). Such "useful information" might include those behaviors and characteristics the individual perceives in the nonanxious speaker. If the internal individual is more alert to those behaviors and characteristics, then it is quite possible that the internal individual may perceive the nonanxious speaker differently from the external individual. To determine the degree of the subjects' internality or externality, Rotter's (1966) Internal-External Locus of Control Scale[3] was administered at the conclusion of the interview.

---

[3]This scale uses a forced-choice format, with 23 question pairs and 6 filler questions. The potential scores range from 0 (most internal) to 23 (most external). (See Appendix B.)

Since this study was exploratory in nature and employed a methodology which does not lend itself to strict statistical analysis, such an analysis was not made. Instead, a subjective analysis of the subjects' responses was made. Subjects' responses during the interview were content analyzed to determine what characteristics the subjects associated with the effective, nonanxious speaker. As an aid in comprehension and analysis, related characteristics were grouped in categories. Responses were totaled to determine the frequency with which each characteristic was mentioned, and the importance ratings were averaged to determine the relative importance placed on each characteristic. To determine the feasibility of a single nonanxious model, subjects' responses were first examined to determine if any characteristics mentioned were mutually exclusive, and then the effect on the subjects' perceptions of the nonanxious speaker of such subject-characteristics as sex and locus of control was investigated. Finally, results were evaluated in light of the available research into the effect of model characteristics on the efficacy of modeling.

CHAPTER III

RESULTS

The subjects' responses to the first question of the interview, which asked what characteristics they associated with the effective, nonanxious speaker, comprise the group of characteristics labeled "Speaking Characteristics." Table 1 lists and explains these characteristics, while Table 2 lists the number of citations and mean importance ratings of each. As an aid in comprehension and analysis, those characteristics which seemed related were grouped in categories. This grouping resulted in four such categories: delivery, speaking style, confidence and control, and speaker-audience relationship. The delivery category is composed of those characteristics related to the overt, physical behaviors in the speaker's presentation, such as eye contact or no monotone. This category includes 11 characteristics cited a total of 67 times. Speaking style includes those characteristics related to the speech itself, such as a well-organized speech. Six characteristics cited 29 times are included in this category. The third category, confidence and control, includes those characteristics related to the speaker's demonstrated confidence in and control of the speaking situation. Such characteristics as nonreliance on notes and frankness are found in this category,

Table 1

Speaking Characteristics Associated with the Effective, Nonanxious Speaker

Characteristics	Explanation
Delivery	
No rigidity	The use of gestures, willingness to move away from the podium, and ability to change facial expressions
No fidgetiness	The absence of excessive shaky, jerky or unnecessary movements
Eye contact	The willingness to look at the audience
No monotone	The ability to vary the tone, pitch, volume, and rate of the voice
Interest and enthusiasm	Interest and enthusiasm for the topic as demonstrated by speaker's delivery
Smooth voice	The absence of trembling in the speaker's voice
Clear voice	Clarity of the speaker's voice, especially that it is not too loud or soft
Smiling	The speaker's practice of smiling
No articulated pauses	The avoidance of such utterances as "uh" and "you know"
Naturalness	The ability to appear normal and natural while speaking
Unclassified	"Don't like visuals" and "persuasive voice"
Speaking Style	
Conversational style	Informal, relaxed manner of speaking

Table 1 (continued)

Characteristics	Explanation
Use of humor	The use of appropriate jokes and other humorous devices
Effectiveness	The ability to adequately explain the ideas in the speech
Well-organized speech	The use of a clear pattern of organization
No rambling	The ability to avoid digressions from the topic
Clear language	The use of language that is neither overly vague nor overly complicated
Confidence and Control	
Calm appearance	The general appearance of calmness and confidence
Knowledge	The speaker's knowledge of the topic
Nonreliance on notes	The ability to deliver a speech without reading from a manuscript or excessive reference to notes
Control	The speaker's steadiness and ability to adapt the speech to meet the needs of the speaking situation
Ability to accept mistakes	The ability to accept mistakes, stumblings, and mispronunciations without becoming confused or upset
Frankness	The speaker's ability to explain and defend controversial ideas
Speaker-Audience Relationship	
Topic relevance	The topic's relevance to the audience, the audience's interest in the topic, and agreement with the ideas presented

Table 1 (continued)

Characteristics	Explanation
Directness	The ability to appear to talk individually with each member of the audience
Audience comfort	The ability of the speaker to put the audience at ease
Sincerity	The audience's perception of the speaker as sincere

Table 2

Frequencies and Mean Importance Ratings of Speaking Characteristics Associated with the Effective, Nonanxious Speaker

Characteristic	Frequency	Mean Importance Rating
Delivery		
No rigidity	11	2.55
No fidgetiness	10	2.30
Eye contact	8	2.75
No monotone	8	2.37
Interest and enthusiasm	7	2.71
Smooth voice	6	2.67
Clear voice	5	2.40
Smiling	4	2.25
No articulated pauses	3	2.67
Naturalness	3	2.00
Unclassified	2	2.00
TOTAL	67	2.48
Speaking Style		
Conversational style	10	2.80
Use of humor	7	2.29
Effectiveness	4	2.25
Well-organized speech	3	2.67
No rambling	3	2.33
Clear language	2	2.50
TOTAL	29	2.52
Confidence and Control		
Calm appearance	5	3.00
Knowledge	5	2.80
Nonreliance on notes	5	2.80
Control	5	2.60
Ability to accept mistakes	4	2.50
Frankness	3	3.00
TOTAL	27	2.78
Speaker-Audience Relationship		
Topic relevance	9	2.89
Directness	5	2.60
Audience comfort	5	2.40
Sincerity	3	3.00
TOTAL	22	2.73
TOTAL	145	2.58

which includes a total of six characteristics cited 27 times. Speaker-audience relationship, the final category, is composed of those characteristics related to the audience's perception of the speaker's credibility and the speech's relevance to them, including such characteristics as sincerity and topic relevance. Four characteristics cited 22 times are included in this category.

In each of the four categories, several characteristics stand out because of either their relatively high frequencies or the relatively high importance placed upon them. Importance was measured by a three-point rating system, with three designating very important, two designating somewhat important, and one designating less important. The higher the importance rating, the greater the importance placed upon the characteristic. In the category of delivery, the most frequently cited characteristic was no rigidity. This characteristic was cited by 11 subjects, with a mean importance rating of 2.55. Most of the subjects who cited this characteristic mentioned it as a specific, technical requirement of the effective speaker, such as "moves around, gets away from podium," or simply "uses gestures." Several subjects, however, mentioned the characteristic in relation to a relaxed, confident speaker, such as "more confident, uses gestures, not rigid," or "at ease, relaxed posture, not rigid." The characteristic of no fidgetiness was cited 10

times with a mean importance rating of 2.30. The citations of this category were almost evenly divided between references to specific fidgety behaviors, such as "hands don't shake" or "don't sway back and forth," and more general references, such as "no outward jerkiness or shakiness." Two other frequently mentioned delivery characteristics were eye contact and no monotone, both with eight citations. The presence of eye contact was rated the most important of the two, with a mean importance rating of 2.75, while the lack of a monotone voice was given a mean importance rating of 2.37.

Of the characteristics in the category of speaking style, the most frequently cited and most important characteristic was conversational style, with 10 citations and a mean importance rating of 2.80. All of the citations for this characteristic related to the informality and relaxed pace of the speaker's presentation, although one subject seemed to also equate a conversational style with not reading the speech from a manuscript. The second most frequently cited speaking style characteristic was the use of humor, cited seven times. However, with a mean importance rating of 2.29, this characteristic was not considered as important as conversational style. It is interesting to note the different purposes attributed to humor. Two subjects thought that humor should be used to "put the audience at ease," while three other subjects stated that humor would "relieve

the monotony" of the speech. While the two purposes are probably related, it seems that putting the audience at ease refers more to putting the audience in the right frame of mind to receive the speech, while relieving the monotony refers more to giving the audience a break, refreshing them so that they can pay better attention to the speech.

Three of the confidence and control characteristics are notable not so much for the frequency with which each was mentioned, since they had only five citations each, but for the relatively great importance placed upon them. The characteristic of calm appearance had a mean importance rating of 3.00. This characteristic was a very general one, relating to the speaker's overall appearance of calmness and self-assurance. The characteristic of knowledge, with a mean importance rating of 2.80, was concerned with the speaker's demonstration that he/she "knew what they were talking about." The characteristic of nonreliance on notes also had a mean importance rating of 2.80. This characteristic reflected the subjects' perception of the effective, nonanxious speaker as one who has the confidence to deliver a speech without reading from a manuscript or excessively referring to notes.

In the category of speaker-audience relationship, the most frequently cited characteristic, with nine citations, was topic relevance. This characteristic was also considered

to be very important, with a mean importance rating of 2.89. Topic relevance includes such considerations as the audience's interest in the topic, relevance of the topic to the audience, and the audience's agreement with the ideas presented. It is interesting to note the approach of various subjects to this characteristic. Some subjects seemed to feel that topic relevance was a characteristic of the speaker or the speech, such as a speaker who "relates the subject to the audience" or "makes the speech interesting," or a speech with an "interesting subject." Other subjects, however, seemed to imply that the characteristic was one which applied, at least partially, to the audience. These subjects in citing this characteristic referred to it as something they did. One subject, for example, stated that in judging a speaker's effectiveness and lack of anxiety the most important factor was "if I agree with what he says or am interested in the topic."

Looking at the individual, specific characteristics named in the subjects' responses to the first interview question is one way of approaching the problem of speech anxious students' perceptions of the effective, nonanxious speaker. Another approach is to look at the general perspective with which such students view the nonanxious speaker. In examining the responses to the first interview question, a member of the author's graduate committee

noticed that a basic difference seemed to exist in the perspective with which the subjects viewed the effective, nonanxious speaker. Some subjects were oriented more toward the speaker's technical competence. They seemed to judge a speaker's effectiveness and lack of anxiety using the criteria of the presence or absence of specific characteristics, particularly those related to delivery. This group was labeled the "precise" group. Other subjects seemed more oriented toward the effect of the speaker and the speech on the audience. These individuals seemed to base their judgments of a speaker's effectiveness and lack of anxiety on more general criteria, such as whether they feel comfortable with the speaker, whether the speaker is relaxed and informal, or whether the speaker could "get the message across." This group was labeled the general group.

To give a rough indication of the validity of this hypothesized difference, a three-judge rating system was employed. Judges consisted of the author and two members of his graduate committee. The hypothesized difference between the two perspectives was explained, and the judges then categorized each subject as precise or general according to his/her responses to the first interview question. By chance alone, the probability of any one subject being categorized as precise by any one judge was 1/2, so that the probability of any one subject being categorized as precise

by all three judges was 1/8. The same probabilities apply to a subject being placed in the general group by all three judges. To determine the probability that all three judges will agree on any one subject, the probability that all three judges will place the subject in the precise group and the probability that all three judges will place the subject in the general group are added, giving a 25% probability that all three judges would agree on any one subject. Out of 35 subjects, it would be expected that the judges would agree on approximately nine. All three judges, however, actually agreed on 20 subjects, indicating that an apparent difference did exist between the precise and general groups. It should be noted, however, that this procedure was only a rough test of the validity of the precise-general distinction, and this fact must be considered in any interpretation of these results.

The precise group consisted of 11 subjects (5 male, 6 female). The responses of this group to the first interview question tended to be fairly specific and generally dealt with the speaking characteristics in the delivery and confidence and control categories. The general group included 24 subjects (11 male, 13 female). This group's responses to the first interview question tended to be more general, and dealt more with those characteristics related to speaking style and speaker-audience relationship. It is important to note

that the precise-general distinction is not as clear-cut as the above discussion may indicate. In fact, it seems to be mainly a matter of emphasis. The precise group emphasized the specific technical competencies of delivery and the somewhat more general characteristics of confidence and control in their judgment of a speaker's effectiveness and lack of anxiety. If the speaker evidenced the correct delivery behaviors and appeared to be confident and in control of the speaking situation, then that speaker was judged to be effective and nonanxious. The emphasis in the general group was different. While the individuals in this group seemed to be aware of the speaker's technical competencies and to look for those competencies, they also placed emphasis on the more intangible characteristics of speaking style and speaker-audience relationship. It is not enough for the speaker to perform the acceptable delivery behaviors and appear confident and in control. The effective, nonanxious speaker must also be able to relate well to the audience and "get the message across." It is conceivable that a technically competent, confident-appearing speaker would not be perceived by this group as an effective, nonanxious speaker if he/she did not meet these latter requirements of speaking style and speaker-audience relationship.

The second question of the interview asked what effect the various physical characteristics of a speaker had on the

subjects' judgments of that speaker's effectiveness and lack of anxiety. The subjects' responses to this question comprised the group of characteristics labeled "Physical Characteristics." Table 3 lists and explains these characteristics, and Table 4 lists the frequency with which each was mentioned and the mean importance rating given to each. The subjects' responses were grouped under the categories used in the question: height, build, sex, age, race, dress, and general appearance. In reporting the results, the categories of height and build were combined because they were usually related in the subjects' responses.

As in the speaking characteristics, several of the physical characteristics are notable for the relatively high frequency with which they were mentioned. The most frequently cited characteristic in the category of general appearance, with 11 citations and a mean importance rating of 1.73, concerned the attractiveness of the speaker. The subjects who cited this characteristic seemed to prefer speakers, both male and female, who are attractive or at least not unattractive. Most of the citations to this characteristic were stated as preferences—that is, the subjects given a choice would rather listen to an attractive speaker—but several subjects said that attractive speakers were usually better, more confident speakers. The characteristic of personal preferences was cited nine times with a mean importance

Table 3

Physical Characteristics Associated with the Effective, Nonanxious Speaker

Characteristics	Explanation
General Appearance	
Attractive	The audience's perception of the speaker as good looking or handsome
Personal preferences[a]	Personal preferences of individual subjects
Avoiding extremes	Avoiding extremes in appearance such as very long or short hair, unusual appearance, heavy makeup, or even "very perfect" hair or "really gorgeous" appearance
Appropriate	Appearance appropriate to the topic and situation
Neat	Appearance not sloppy or unkempt
Dress	
Appropriate	Dress keeping in tone with the formality or informality of the occasion and topic
Neat	Dress not sloppy, dirty, or disarrayed
More formal	Coat and tie, no very casual clothes
Not gaudy or flashy	Dress not loud, unusual, or drawing attention to itself
Casual	No coat and tie, more casual
Avoiding extremes	Dress not too formal or too informal
Age	
Not too young or old	Speaker generally older than college age, but not elderly

Table 3 (continued)

Characteristics	Explanation
Topic-related	Topic appropriate for speaker's age group
College-age	Speaker of average college age
Sex	
Male	Males considered more effective, less anxious
Topic-related	Topic relevant for speaker's sex
Race	
White	Whites considered more effective, less anxious
No accent	Race is a factor only if the speaker's accent is hard to understand
Topic-related	Topic relevant to the speaker's race, prefer not to hear blacks criticize whites
Height and Build	
Avoiding extremes	Prefer speakers who are not overly tall or short, neither too slender or obese
Unclassified	
Appealing to all ages	Speaker is equally effective with audiences of all ages
Not effeminate	Prefer not to listen to male speakers who are effeminate

[a]This characteristic is composed of individual idiosyncratic preferences, such as preferences for bearded males, unbearded males, partially bald males, and speakers who do not wear glasses.

Table 4

Frequencies and Mean Importance Ratings of Physical Characteristics Associated with the Effective, Nonanxious Speaker

Characteristic	Frequency	Mean Importance Rating
General Appearance		
Attractive	11	1.73
Personal preferences	9	1.89
Avoiding extremes	9	1.67
Appropriate	3	2.00
Neat	3	2.00
TOTAL	35	1.80
Dress		
Appropriate	7	2.00
Neat	7	1.86
More formal	4	2.25
Not gaudy or flashy	4	1.50
Casual	4	1.25
Avoiding extremes	2	2.00
TOTAL	28	1.82
Age		
Not too young or old	21	1.24
Topic-related	4	1.50
College-age	1	1.00
TOTAL	26	1.27
Sex		
Male	10	1.40
Topic-related	3	1.33
TOTAL	13	1.38
Race		
White	6	1.50
No accent	4	1.75
Topic-related	3	1.00
TOTAL	13	1.46
Height and Build		
Avoiding extremes	10	1.20
TOTAL	10	1.20

Table 4 (continued)

Characteristic	Frequency	Mean Importance Rating
Unclassified		
Appealing to all ages	1	3.00
Not effeminate	1	3.00
TOTAL	2	3.00
TOTAL	127	1.73

rating of 1.89. This characteristic is composed of the personal idiosyncratic preferences of the subjects—for example, preferences for speakers who did not slouch, had beards, did not have beards, did not wear glasses, were partially bald, did not have beady eyes, and other such specific, individual preferences. This characteristic is so varied that perhaps its greatest value is the insight it gives into the way physical characteristics which are apparently unrelated to public speaking are sometimes associated by students with the effective, nonanxious speaker. Also frequently cited in the general appearance category was the characteristic of avoiding extremes in appearance, with nine citations and a mean importance rating of 1.67. The subjects who mentioned this characteristic seemed to prefer speakers who were of average appearance, whose looks were in no way distracting.

In the category of dress, the characteristic of appropriate dress was mentioned seven times, and was given a mean importance rating of 2.00. Most of these citations implied that the speaker should not be underdressed; for example, should not wear blue jeans to a formal occasion. Others, however, implied that both overdressing and underdressing were to be avoided. It must be noted that the characteristic of appropriate dress is not the same as avoiding extremes in dress. While appropriate dress refers

to attire that is suited to the occasion, dress that avoids extremes refers to clothes that are neither too formal nor too informal, no matter what the occasion. Another frequently mentioned characteristic of dress was the neatness of the speaker's dress. This characteristic, with seven citations and a mean importance rating of 1.86, was concerned exclusively with the absence of sloppiness in the speaker's dress.

By far the most frequently expressed preference among either speaking or physical characteristics was for a speaker who was neither too young nor too old. This characteristic was cited 21 times, with a mean importance rating of 1.24. In general, the subjects seemed to feel that the speakers who were older than the general college age but not yet elderly—the most prevalent range given was 30-50 years of age—were more effective and less anxious than younger or older speakers. The extremely low mean importance rating, however, indicates that this age preference was not an important determinant of the subjects' perceptions of the speaker. Two other physical characteristics with relatively high frequencies had to do with the categories of sex and height and build. Under sex, 10 subjects expressed a preference for male speakers. This characteristic was given a mean importance rating of 1.40. It is notable that no subjects expressed a preference for female speakers. In regard to height and build, 10 citations and a mean importance rating

of 1.20 were given to the characteristic of avoiding extremes. The subjects who cited this characteristic seemed to prefer speakers of average physical size, neither too tall or short nor too slender or obese.

The second interview question was stated in such a way that one of the most frequent answers was not recorded. The question asked what effect the various physical characteristics had on the subjects' judgments of a speaker's effectiveness and level of anxiety. One answer often received was "no effect." When this factor is considered, it becomes obvious that the subjects actually placed little emphasis on some of the physical characteristics. The categories of sex, race, and height and build all received 13 or fewer citations, which means that over 60% of the subjects reported no effect for those characteristics on their judgments of a speaker's effectiveness and lack of anxiety.

A comparison of the relative importance placed upon the speaking and physical characteristics of the effective, non-anxious speaker reveals that physical characteristics, with an overall mean importance rating of 1.73, were considered less important than speaking characteristics, with an overall mean importance rating of 2.58. This finding was not unexpected, since all but one of the subjects in this study were enrolled in a public speaking course which emphasized most of the speaking characteristics. It should be noted,

however, that the subjects did indicate that the physical characteristics of a speaker affected their judgments of that speaker's effectiveness and lack of anxiety, and though they were not as important in that judgment as the speaking characteristics, the physical characteristics should not be ignored.

The precise-general distinction also seemed to affect the subjects' perceptions of the physical characteristics of the effective, nonanxious speaker. In proportion to their numbers, the individuals in the precise group mentioned the physical characteristics of the nonanxious speaker more often than did the general group. A large part of this difference was due to the emphasis placed by the precise group on the category of general appearance. Although the general group contained over twice as many subjects as did the precise group, over half of the citations of the general appearance characteristics came from the subjects in the precise group. This emphasis was pronounced in the characteristic of personal preferences, where all nine citations came from the precise group. It would seem that the subjects in the precise group not only emphasize the specific technical competencies of the speaker, but also look for specific appearance characteristics.

In order to determine if a single model is possible, it is necessary to determine the effect of relevant subject

variables on the subjects' perceptions of the nonanxious speaker. In addition to the precise-general variable, the subject variables of sex and locus of control were also investigated to obtain an indication of the effect such variables have on the speech anxious students' perceptions of the effective, nonanxious speaker. It must be noted that the small size of the sample and the use of a subjective method of analysis make any conclusion only tentative, and caution is necessary in any interpretation of the results.

In relation to speaking characteristics, females tended to cite more characteristics in proportion to their numbers than did males. In particular, females tended to place more emphasis on the categories of delivery and speaker-audience relationship. Under the category of delivery, the three characteristics of eye contact, no fidgetiness, and smiling were mentioned almost exclusively by females, while the characteristic of naturalness was mentioned exclusively by males. The category of speaker-audience relationship provided the greatest contrast between males' and females' perceptions of the nonanxious speaker. Almost 70% of the citations of the characteristics in this category were by females, with the greatest difference found in the characteristics of topic relevance and audience comfort.

Males, on the other hand, seemed to pay more attention to the categories of speaking style and confidence and

control, although the difference between males and females in these categories was small. The category of speaking style offers an interesting comparison of the approaches taken by males and females in judging a speaker's effectiveness and lack of anxiety. In the characteristic of effectiveness, which was concerned with the speaker's ability to adequately explain the ideas in the speech and "get the message across," all of the citations were from males. Yet the citations of the characteristics of a well-organized speech and clear language were all from females. It would seem that males are concerned with the speaker's overall effectiveness, while females are more concerned with the speaker's specific language skills. Males also tended to place more emphasis on the confidence and control characteristics, although this emphasis was pronounced only in the characteristic of control, which included such considerations as the speaker's steadiness and ability to adapt to the speaking situation.

To summarize the difference between males' and females' perceptions of the speaking characteristics of the effective, nonanxious speaker, it appears that females are concerned more with the relationship established between the speaker and the audience, and with the delivery characteristics of the speaker. It is interesting to note that two of the delivery characteristics mentioned almost exclusively by

females, eye contact and smiling, are behaviors which would appear to greatly affect the relationship between the speaker and audience. Males seemed to be more concerned with the categories of speaking style and confidence and control, although the difference was not pronounced. In particular, males seemed to prefer speakers who were effective in getting their message across and who seemed in control of the speaking situation.

As females tended to cite more of the speaking characteristics than males, males tended to be more concerned with the physical characteristics of the speaker than were females. Approximately 46% of the subjects were male, but, in each category of physical characteristics, half or more of the citations were from males. While this difference was very slight, it is interesting to note that it is a consistent difference, occurring in all of the categories of physical characteristics. In the category of general appearance, males seemed to place more emphasis on the attractiveness of the speaker, while females seemed more concerned that the speaker's appearance not be extreme. The category of dress provides an interesting contrast between males and females. The characteristics of appropriate dress and casual dress were cited almost exclusively by males, while just the opposite is true of the characteristics of formal dress and dress that is not gaudy or flashy.

There seemed to be a preference among males for speakers who are not overdressed, while females tended to prefer speakers who are not underdressed. The category of sex also provided an interesting contrast. Most of the subjects who expressed a preference for male speakers were themselves male, while all of the subjects who stated that the effect of the speaker's sex depended on the topic of the speech were female. One last characteristic in which there was a great difference between males' and females' responses was in the category of race. Almost all of the subjects who stated a preference for white speakers were male.

To summarize the sex differences among the subjects in regard to the physical characteristics of the effective, nonanxious speaker, it seemed that males were more concerned with the speaker's physical attributes. Where a preference was expressed, males seemed to prefer white male speakers who were attractive and who dressed appropriately. Females, on the other hand, seemed more concerned with a speaker who avoided extremes in appearance, and who spoke on a topic relevant to their own sex.

The variable of locus of control was measured by Rotter's (1966) Internal-External Locus of Control Scale (I-E Scale). The subjects' scores on this scale ranged from 2 to 21, with a median score of 11. Those subjects who scored below the median were designated as internals, while those who scored above the median were designated as

externals. Although differences existed in several of the individual characteristics, the overall citations of both the speaking and physical characteristics were almost evenly divided between internals and externals.

The speaking characteristics showing the greatest difference between internals and externals were in the category of delivery. Seven of the ten subjects citing the characteristic of no fidgetiness were internals, while all eight of the subjects citing eye contact scored at or above the median I-E Scale score. Other characteristics showed slight differences, with internals citing the characteristics of effectiveness, knowledge, and control more often than externals, while the external group dominated the characteristics of a well-organized speech, nonreliance on notes, and frankness. There was similarly little difference between internals and externals in regard to the physical characteristics. Internals cited the general appearance characteristics more often than did externals, with most of the difference found in the characteristics of personal preferences and a neat general appearance. Internals also seemed to prefer neat dress more than externals, while externals were slightly more concerned with the speaker's height and build.

In general, it seems that the variable of locus of control had little effect on the subjects' perceptions of the effective, nonanxious speaker. Differences were observed in

some of the individual characteristics, but the low number of subjects citing these characteristics, and the subsequently small absolute difference between the number of citations from internals and externals, means that caution is required in interpreting these results.

CHAPTER IV

DISCUSSION

The purpose of this study was to answer three questions concerning speech anxious students' perceptions of the effective, nonanxious speaker. These questions concerned the characteristics associated by such students with the nonanxious speaker, the possibility of one model exhibiting these characteristics, and whether these characteristics would be useful in the development of an effective model for reducing students' speech anxiety. The first question was answered by the subjects' responses in the interview employed in this study. These responses were presented in the previous chapter, but several aspects of the subjects' view of the effective, nonanxious speaker deserve further consideration.

In their perceptions of the effective, nonanxious speaker's characteristics, the subjects did not concentrate exclusively on the speaker, although most of their responses concerned the speaker's delivery and overall appearance of confidence and control. However, some attention was paid to the speech itself and to the relationship established between the speaker and the audience. This finding points out the interrelationship between the speaker, the speech,

and the audience in any public speaking situation, and the necessity of considering all three factors in the development of a model.

The majority of the subjects' responses to the first interview question concerned the speaker. The category of delivery was concerned with the speaker's overt behaviors while speaking. These characteristics include those generally associated with the nonanxious speaker, such as no rigidity, no fidgetiness, eye contact, no monotone, and interest and enthusiasm. The category of confidence and control includes those characteristics related to the speaker's calmness, confidence, steadiness, and ability to adapt to the speaking situation. These two categories together give a picture of a speaker who generally fits the common conception of an effective, nonanxious speaker, a speaker who is loose, relaxed and natural-looking before the audience, who employs the behaviors of an effective public speaker, and who projects an image of a confident speaker in control of the speaking situation.

Under the category of speaker-audience relationship, the characteristic of topic relevance is of particular interest. This characteristic is related to the topic's relevance to the audience and the audience's interest in and agreement with the ideas presented in the speech. While only nine subjects cited this characteristic, it was

considered to be highly important, with a mean importance rating of 2.89. The most obvious implication of this finding in the development of a model is that the speech the model delivers should be on a topic that is interesting to the observers and which presents ideas with which they can generally agree. This last requirement precludes the use of persuasive speeches and speeches on controversial topics. Persuasive speeches attempting to encourage a specific behavior or change a general attitude run the risk of encountering opposition and disagreement which may affect the observers' perception of the model. Controversial topics run the same risk, although such topics are attractive because of their interest value. Controversial topics should also be avoided, however, because while the interest value may be high, the risk of encountering disagreement is also high. The challenge in selecting a topic for the modeled speech is to find one that is interesting to the observers, but which is not likely to encounter disagreement. One possible approach is to choose a topic relating to some aspect of the observers' lives, and present an informative speech on that topic. For example, with college students the modeled speech could inform the observers about a service or program available to them on campus.

Other characteristics relating to the speaker-audience relationship but cited less frequently than topic relevance

include the speaker's directness, the audience's comfort with the speaker, and the audience's perception of the speaker as sincere. Directness refers to the speaker's ability to appear to be talking individually with each member of the audience. While not mentioned specifically by the subjects, it seems reasonable to assume that this characteristic is related to the delivery characteristics, especially eye contact. The rather unusual characteristic of audience comfort includes such considerations as the speaker's general manner—not overbearing or condescending, for example—and the entertainment value of the speech. The characteristic of sincere also seemed to be related to other characteristics. Two subjects seemed to associate it with nonreliance on notes, and references were made to the relationship between sincerity and the characteristics of eye contact and directness.

The category of speaking style is concerned with the variables of the speech itself. The most frequently cited characteristic in this category was conversational style, with 10 citations and a relatively high mean importance rating of 2.80. This characteristic was concerned with the relaxed informality of the speech, so that the speaker seemed to be just "carrying on a conversation." While conversational style relates primarily to the written style—the language—of the speech, it is also intimately connected

with other characteristics. One subject summed up conversational style as a style in which the speaker was "not giving a speech or preaching, just talking." This response seems to imply an entire manner of speaking, which emphasizes some delivery characteristics—such as no rigidity, no monotone, interest and enthusiasm, and naturalness—while placing less emphasis on such delivery characteristics as no fidgetiness and no articulated pauses. Delivery characteristics, however, are not the only characteristics which seem to be associated with conversational style. Calm appearance, nonreliance on notes, and frankness, under the category of confidence and control, seem related to this concept, as well as the speaker-audience relationship characteristic of directness. The concept of conversational style, then, implies a manner of speaking which is relaxed and informal, and which is concerned more with the speaker's use of everyday language, a calm and natural appearance, and a direct, one-to-one relationship with the audience. At the same time, less emphasis is placed on a more formal "oratorical" style.

When considered in this fashion, none of the subjects' responses to the first interview question precludes a conversational style. Most of the delivery characteristics, for example, do not seem necessary for a speaker in adopting a conversational style, yet all can be incorporated in that

style. The only seemingly necessary delivery characteristics in this style are no rigidity, no monotone, interest and enthusiasm, and naturalness. None of the remaining delivery characteristics, however, are antagonistic to a conversational style. In fact, several are quite naturally associated with this style, such as eye contact and smiling. The others—no fidgetiness, smooth voice, clear voice and no articulated pauses—are characteristics which would seem to neither add to nor detract from the conversationality of a speech.

It is similarly possible to incorporate the speaking characteristics in the other categories into a conversational model. In fact, the two categories of confidence and control and speaker-audience relationship seem to be natural correlates, though not prerequisites, of a conversational style. Some of the other speaking style characteristics, however, do not seem so naturally related to this style. The use of humor certainly is, but not the other characteristics. A well-organized presentation, the lack of digression from the topic, clear, concise language—these characteristics are not usually associated with "carrying on a conversation." A conversational style does not exclude these characteristics, however, and the inclusion in the model of the appropriate characteristics that are associated with a conversational style can probably overcome any adverse

effects the inclusion of these characteristics may bring about.

Conversational style, in summary, appears to be a manner of speaking which is relaxed and informal, in which the speaker uses everyday language and appears calm and natural, and which fosters a direct, one-to-one relationship with the audience. This style contrasts with the stereotyped "oratorical" style, which is more formal and exaggerated. In terms of the development of a nonanxious public speaking model, the salient factor concerning a conversational style is that it can include the various speaking characteristics cited by the subjects, whether those subjects were concerned with the conversationality of the speech or not. It would appear that a model speaker who displays a conversational manner of speaking would quite naturally evidence most of the characteristics cited by the subjects, and those characteristics which would not naturally result from such a manner of speaking could easily be incorporated into a conversational model.

The physical characteristics associated with the effective, nonanxious speaker by the subjects tended, for the most part, to revolve around the theme of avoiding extremes. When a preference was expressed, the subjects seemed to prefer speakers who were not unusual. Throughout the interviews, subjects kept expressing preferences for

speakers who did not appear out of the ordinary, who avoided extremes in dress, who were neither too young nor too old, or whose height and build were not too far from the norm. Even preferences for such characteristics as an attractive, appropriate and neat general appearance or appropriate and neat dress follow this pattern, since physical ugliness or an inappropriate and sloppy appearance and dress would serve to make the speaker unusual. The two major exceptions to this trend concerned the sex and race of the speaker. While preferences for male and white speakers were expressed, no preferences for female and black speakers were found. These findings may be accounted for by looking at the characteristics of the subjects themselves.

In regard to the sex of the speaker, it may well be that effective, nonanxious public speaking is more consistent with the male role in our culture than with the female role. The activity of public speaking is traditionally associated with the conduct of public affairs, and the conduct of public affairs in our culture has been dominated, at least until recently, by males. It appears reasonable, therefore, to speculate that the activity of public speaking is perceived by many in our society, including apparently several of the subjects in this study, as primarily a male activity.

In regard to the expressed preference for white speakers, two factors must be considered. First is the relatively low

number of citations, six, given to this characteristic, and the relatively low importance placed upon it, as reflected by the mean importance rating of 1.50. It would seem that few of the subjects expressed a preference for white speakers, and those tended to place little importance on that preference. The second consideration is that the sample was weighted heavily in favor of whites. In fact, only one subject was black, and this subject reported no effect for the speaker's race. Several times during the interviews, subjects commented that they had heard very few if any black speakers, and thus the vast majority or even all of the effective, nonanxious speakers they had heard were white. It was striking that, when asked about the effect of the speaker's race, most subjects tended to think in terms of black and white speakers. No mention was ever made of any other race. Even subjects who reported no effect for race often stated that feeling as no preference for either black or white speakers.

In summary, the general trend in the subjects' perceptions of the effective, nonanxious speaker's physical characteristics was toward a speaker who was normal or not unusual in appearance, and who was neither too young nor too old. While there was a slight preference for white speakers and a larger one for male speakers, these preferences seem attributable to the subjects' lack of exposure to black

speakers and the prevailing societal view of public speaking as predominantly a male activity.

One strikingly noticeable trend in the subjects' overall perceptions of the effective, nonanxious speaker, including both speaking and physical characteristics, was the low number of citations for all of the individual characteristics except the preference for a speaker who was neither too young nor too old. With this exception, no other individual characteristic was cited by more than 11 subjects, or approximately 31% of the sample. The preference for a speaker who was generally older than college age but not yet elderly was cited by 21 subjects, but the subjects who cited this characteristic did not place very much importance on it, giving it a mean importance rating of 1.24. The low number of citations for almost all of the individual characteristics raises an important point in regard to the feasibility of a single model: Is such a model possible if the age of the effective, nonanxious speaker is the only characteristic which seems to be generally agreed upon by public-speaking-anxious students?

The question of the possibility of a model that can be perceived as an effective, nonanxious speaker by all speech anxious individuals is certainly affected by the subjects' apparently differing perceptions of the characteristics of such a speaker, but this is not the only consideration.

Another factor is whether or not the different characteristics associated with such a speaker are mutually exclusive or contradictory. If the various characteristics are not contradictory, it may well prove possible to incorporate several different views of an effective, nonanxious speaker into one model.

The various speaking characteristics cited by the subjects do not seem to be mutually exclusive, although care must be taken when trying to combine some of the various characteristics into one model. The characteristics of the use of humor and no rambling, for example, could prove antagonistic if the humorous devices used in the speech are perceived as irrelevant to the topic. Such a difficulty can be easily overcome, however, if care is taken to use humorous devices that are relevant to the topic. Jokes which make a point, humorous stories as illustrations, or other humorous techniques which serve not only to get laughs but also to support the contentions of the speech are examples of humor which can be readily incorporated into a speech without seeming totally irrelevant to the ideas the speech is presenting. If care is taken to avoid such problems, it appears reasonable to conclude that no mutually exclusive characteristics are cited among the speaking characteristics.

Indeed, not only are the speaking characteristics not mutually exclusive, but in many cases the various

characteristics seem to be compatible. The categories in which the characteristics were grouped—delivery, speaking style, confidence and control, and speaker-audience relationship—point out the relationships between some of the characteristics. Even more importantly, direct references by the subjects indicate the relationships between characteristics, relationships which often cut across categories. For example, one subject in citing the speaker's sincerity stated that the effective, nonanxious speaker "acted genuine, had good eye contact, didn't read the speech." This response indicates a connection between the characteristics of sincerity, eye contact, and nonreliance on notes. This is not an isolated example, because numerous other subjects cited several characteristics together, indicating connections between these characteristics. Nor are direct references by subjects the only indications between various characteristics. Implicit in the confidence and control characteristic of calm appearance, for example, is a relationship with the delivery characteristics. Common sense tells us that no rigidity and no fidgetiness are characteristics which would tend to give a speaker a calm appearance. The difference seems to be in the way in which the subjects perceived the appearance of the speaker. Some subjects appeared to perceive only a calm-appearing speaker, while others seemed to perceive a speaker who exhibited unnervous behavior and

therefore appeared calm. Both groups were looking for a speaker who appeared calm instead of nervous. They were just paying attention to different manifestations of the same attribute.

In essence, this distinction between the subject who perceives a calm-appearing speaker and the subject who perceives a speaker who exhibits appropriate behaviors and characteristics is at the heart of the previously discussed distinction between the precise and general groups. The precise group tended to perceive the more specific individual characteristics, while the general group tended to perceive the more general, less specific characteristics. This distinction is not just between subjects who cited specific instead of general characteristics, however, because in their responses the general subjects often indicated that they perceived the relationship between the general and specific characteristics. For example, the subject who stated that the effective nonanxious speaker was sincere, had good eye contact, and did not read the speech implied that the combination of good eye contact and nonreliance on notes was at least partially responsible for the speaker being perceived as sincere. In this manner, the citations of the more specific characteristics often came from the subjects in both the precise and general groups, but the citations for the more general characteristics, such as

those in the category of speaker-audience relationship, tended to come primarily from the general group.

From this analysis of the subjects' responses to the first interview question, it can be seen that the speaking characteristics do not contain mutually exclusive characteristics, and in fact, the various speaking characteristics seem to be interrelated. This interrelation between the various characteristics can be summarized by returning to the concept of a conversational model. Using this conception as the primary guideline, it is possible to outline a tentative model incorporating the various characteristics cited by the subjects. A model which adopts a conversational style will adopt many of the characteristics cited, because many are related to or associated with this style. The remaining attributes can also be easily incorporated into this style. It appears reasonable that, by employing a conversational style, a model can be perceived as exhibiting the speaking characteristics of the effective, nonanxious speaker by most speech anxious individuals.

In developing a single model, however, it is also necessary to consider the physical characteristics associated with the effective, nonanxious speaker. The problem of the low number of citations is again encountered with these characteristics, but unlike the speaking characteristics, several of the physical characteristics appear to be mutually

exclusive. These mutually exclusive characteristics are found in the categories of dress, general appearance and age.

In the category of dress, four subjects cited a preference for more formal dress, such as a coat and tie, while four others cited a preference for more casual dress, in one instance specifically citing a preference for male speakers who are not wearing ties. The more formal characteristic was given a fairly high importance rating of 2.25, however, while the characteristic of casual dress was rated at 1.25. It would seem that the subjects expressing a preference for a more formally dressed speaker were more adamant in their position, but an analysis of the individual responses reveals that both groups were not as rigid in their stands as it may appear. The citations of casual dress were often stated as a preference for speakers who were not dressed "too formally" or "over-conservatively," implying a certain latitude of acceptance for speakers who were dressed more formally than others. Also, the characteristic of more formal dress was in each instance coupled with other characteristics of dress, such as neatness, or nice-looking or well-tailored clothes. It would seem that a certain amount of latitude is also implied. It appears probable that a middle ground can be found by relying on the other characteristics of dress—appropriate, neat, not gaudy or flashy, and avoiding extremes—as the guiding factors.

By employing a model that is well-dressed, wearing neat, nice-looking clothes, but not wearing a business suit or even a sport coat and tie, it seems possible that both groups can be satisfied. Overly casual, sloppy or dirty clothes should be avoided, as should strictly formal wear. One possibility is the currently fashionable open-collar leisure suits, which seem to be a compromise between a coat and tie and more casual wear.

The general appearance characteristic of personal preferences, by its very nature, also provides contradictions with other characteristics, since this characteristic was composed of idiosyncratic preferences of individual subjects. Some of the individual citations, such as preferences for speakers who are not dirty, who do not wear glasses, who do not slouch, or who do not have flat noses or bleary and beady eyes, do not provide problems, since they are characteristics the normal or not unusual-appearing speaker would naturally exhibit. Other citations, however, are troublesome. Two subjects cited preferences for bearded speakers, while one preferred speakers with no beards. One subject also cited a preference for a partially bald speaker. These characteristics were not considered very important, however, and were not mentioned by more than two subjects each. It would seem appropriate, therefore, to follow the guidelines of avoiding an unusual appearance, and employ a model who was not bearded

or bald. The contradiction in the category of age is also minor when the frequency and importance rating are considered. One subject expressed a preference for a college-age speaker, giving this preference the lowest importance rating, as opposed to 21 subjects who cited a preference for an older speaker. The disparity of frequencies in this case indicates that the contradiction can be ignored.

In summary, it appears possible to develop a model with physical characteristics which are generally associated with the effective, nonanxious speaker. The guiding factor in this development should be the tendency of the subjects to perceive the effective, nonanxious speaker as an individual whose physical characteristics are not extreme. That is, the model should have no unusual characteristics. Such a person would be fairly attractive, neat in appearance, dressed well but not overly formally or casually dressed, and of average height and build. The subjects also seemed to perceive the effective, nonanxious speaker as a white male between 30 and 50 years of age.

In determining the feasibility of a single nonanxious model, one further consideration remains. This consideration is the effect of such subject variables as sex and locus of control on the subjects' perceptions of the effective, nonanxious speaker. While it is interesting to note that these variables had some effect on the subjects' perceptions, this

effect has become a moot point in terms of the development of a single model. The effect of these variables makes no difference, since it has been determined that it is possible to incorporate the various characteristics cited by all subjects in one model. In reality, only minor effects were found for these variables, although the effect of both variables should not be entirely dismissed without further, more rigorous research.

Even though it appears possible to develop a model that can be perceived by all speech anxious students as nonanxious—in other words, a model which exhibits the various characteristics perceived by these students as associated with the effective, nonanxious speaker—a final question remains. This question is whether a model which exhibits all the characteristics cited as pertinent to an effective, nonanxious speaker will be an effective model for reducing speech anxiety. Research into the effect of model characteristics on the outcome of modeling has indicated that several of the attributes of the model can affect such outcomes, and the findings of this study should be evaluated in light of such research. The model's similarity to the observer is often viewed as a factor facilitating modeling. This view is based on research which indicates that observer-perceived similarity to the model facilitates imitative behavior (Burnstein, Stotland, & Zander, 1961; Rosekrans, 1967;

Stotland & Hillmer, 1962; Stotland & Patchen, 1961; Stotland, Zander, & Natsoulas, 1961). Bandura (1971), however, questions the therapeutic effect of observer-model similarity, stating that "it would appear from the available evidence that similarity is unlikely to exert a sizeable influence on modeling outcomes" (p. 690). This statement is made with reservations, though, because of the possibly differing effects of observer-model similarity along the response dimension selected for modification and similarity on other dimensions.

Observer-model similarity along the response dimension under treatment can have, according to Bandura (1971), a dual effect. If there is too much disparity between observer and model, the modeling effects can be negated by the observer's perception of the model as having some expertise. For example, if speech anxious students observed a model delivering a flawless speech without any manifestations of anxiety at all, they could perceive the model as a trained, capable, experienced public speaker and thus not operating under the same conditions and handicaps as they are. Such a perception could effectively negate any positive modeling effects. On the other hand, Bandura (1971) notes that the observation of negative affective expressions in others can arouse fear and avoidance responses in the observer. Therefore, if the model is shown manifesting the same anxiety that the observer would

it could trigger even more anxiety in the observer and thus retard the rate of vicarious extinction. The research investigating the effect of observer-model similarity along the dimension of fearfulness has been somewhat contradictory.

The possibility of negative effects from the observation of fearful models is based on research in largely nontherapeutic situations (Craig, 1968; Lazarus, Speisman, Mordkoff, & Davison, 1962; Miller, Murphy, & Mirsky, 1959). Investigations of the therapeutic effect of the observation of fearful models have had mixed results. Geer and Turteltaub (1967) found fearful models ineffective in reducing animal-avoidance behavior, while Meichenbaum (1971) found fearful models more effective than fearless models in reducing such behavior. The former study, however, employed a model too fearful to even approach the fear stimulus. The latter study employed a model who was only initially fearful, but who gradually overcame that fear and finally approached the fear stimulus in a nonfearful manner. Additionally, the model employed in the latter study also exhibited techniques for coping with anxiety, such as taking slow, deep breaths. These differences in the models may account for the differences in the results of these two studies. Kornhaber and Schroeder (1975) also compared fearful and nonfearful models in the reduction of animal-avoidance behavior, but their fearful model performed the required approach behavior in a consistently

fearful manner without exhibiting anxiety-coping techniques. This study found no significant difference in the effectiveness of fearful and nonfearful models.

Before attempting to determine the implications of these studies in the development of a public speaking model, one further consideration remains. Modeling involves the observation of a model performing the "fear-provoking behavior without experiencing adverse consequences" (Bandura, 1969, p. 175). In studies of the reduction of animal-avoidance behavior by modeling, such as the three studies discussed above, the adverse consequences usually involve possible harm the animals may inflict. It is quite simple to control these consequences in a modeling sequence designed to reduce animal-avoidance behavior, no matter how fearful or nonfearful the model is. In a modeling sequence to reduce speech anxious behavior, however, the fearfulness of the model has a great effect on such consequences. Speech anxious students can often deliver a speech—they often cannot avoid it because of course requirements—but they do so at the cost of painful mental anguish and physical discomfort, such as headaches, nausea, or difficulty in breathing (Clevenger, 1959; Ickes, 1971; Phillips, 1968). Speech anxiety, therefore, becomes in a sense its own adverse consequences. The anxiety symptoms themselves are often uncomfortable or painful. A public speaking model perceived

as exhibiting anxious behavior, then, is also perceived as experiencing adverse consequences while performing the desired behavior. Such a perception could result in a failure to reduce the observer's anxiety, or even an increase in that anxiety.

This line of reasoning indicates the undesirability of a public speaking model that is similar to the observers in speech anxiety; that is, the undesirability of a fearful model. Such a model could well be perceived as suffering adverse consequences while delivering the speech. It therefore seems reasonable to conclude that a fearless public speaking model would be of the greatest benefit. If, for any reason, it would prove desirable to establish observer-model similarity along this dimension, Bandura (1971) suggests doing so by depicting the model as an individual who was at one time just as anxious or fearful as the observers are now. Such a procedure could establish at least minimal observer-perceived similarity to the model on the dimension of fearfulness without running the risk of diminishing the effectiveness of the model.

Besides observer-model similarity on the dimension of fearfulness, similarity on other dimensions may also affect the outcome of modeling. Bandura (1971) implies that such similarity may be of some limited efficacy, but the factors regulating that efficacy are still largely unknown. The

question of the effect of observer-model similarity is of particular concern in determining the appropriate sex, age, and race of a public speaking model.

O'Sullivan, Gilner, and Krinski (1973) report an interaction effect between sex of the observer and sex of the model in a modeling sequence designed to reduce college students' snake-avoidance behavior. In this experiment, groups of male and female subjects observed a male model fearlessly interacting with a snake. Only the male subjects significantly reduced their snake-avoidance behavior. The experimentors attributed this result to the stereotyped sex-roles in American culture. The female subjects seemed to perceive the male model's fearless interactions with the snake as consistent with his sex-role, and not at all relevant to them.

This result is of importance to the development of a public speaking model if, as seems likely, the activity of effective, nonanxious public speaking is also viewed as consistent with the male but not the female sex-role. Such a view could reduce the effectiveness of a male model with female observers, since the observers may perceive the male model's effectiveness and lack of anxiety as irrelevant to themselves because of differing sex-roles. On the other hand, this difficulty would probably not be encountered with male observers and a female model. The male observers, if

they view effective, nonanxious public speaking as consistent with their sex-role, would be likely to consider such behavior relevant whether it comes from a male or female model. One method of overcoming the problem of differing sex-roles is to employ two models, one male and one female, so that observers would view a model of their own sex. If only one model is used, however, it seems likely that a female model would prove more effective in reducing speech anxiety, since a female model's behavior would be less likely to be perceived as irrelevant to the subjects' differing sex-roles.

The importance of observer-model similarity on the dimension of age has also been investigated, with mixed results. Bandura and Barab (1973) found that adult and child models were equally effective in reducing the snake-avoidance behavior of adult snake-phobics. Kornhaber and Schroeder (1975), however, found that children who evidenced snake-avoidance behavior reduced that behavior after viewing child models, but not after viewing adult models. The authors of the latter study attribute the apparently differing effects of the model's age on observers of different ages in terms of a discrimination view of modeling. As they state:

> . . . Adults may be more highly motivated after observing a child model and thus achieve as high a level of approach behavior as if they had been observing an adult model. Children, on the other hand, may make different discriminations during

> their observations. They may discount the performance of adults on the basis that adults have greater capabilities that make them less vulnerable to adverse consequences. As a result, children are less willing to imitate an adult model than a peer model, whereas adults are at least as willing to match the behavior of a child model as a peer model. (Kornhaber & Schroeder, 1975, p. 606)

The implications of these findings in the development of a public speaking model are unclear because of the difficulty of comparing college students with young children. It appears likely, however, that college students observing older models may make the same kinds of discriminations that children would observing adult models. The subjects in the present study, by a substantial majority, expressed a preference for speakers who were older than they were. This finding lends credence to the idea that students may perceive older models as having greater capabilities and less vulnerability to adverse consequences than they do, and thus negating the beneficial effects of the older model. To avoid this possibility, it seems best to employ a public speaking model that is of approximately the same age as the observers.

The subjects in this study also expressed a slight preference for white speakers. While no research seems to have investigated the possible effects of observer-model dissimilarity on the dimension of race, it is possible to make some tentative inferences about this question. The most

important consideration in this study, it seems, is that the sample was almost totally white. Any conclusions based on the findings of this study, therefore, are only applicable with any degree of validity at all to white audiences. It seems best, then, to follow the expressed preferences of the subjects in regard to the model's race. To prevent any adverse effects that may result from a preference for white speakers over speakers of other races in this audience, it seems reasonable to employ a white public speaking model.

From this discussion, it can be seen that observer-model similarity does not exert any consistent influence on the outcome of modeling. The influence it does exert seems related to many variables, including the particular behavior under modification, and the age and sex of the observers. Based upon the available research and the responses of speech anxious students in the interview employed in the present study, it seems probable that the most effective model to reduce the speech anxiety of college students should be similar to the subjects in age and race, but dissimilar on the dimension of public speaking anxiety itself. In addition, it appears that a female model will be more nearly equally effective in reducing the speech anxiety of both male and female speech anxious college students.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

This study was an exploratory investigation of speech anxious college students' perceptions of the effective, non-anxious speaker, in order to determine the relevant characteristics of a model for reducing such anxiety in college students. To determine these relevant characteristics, three questions were posed. First, what characteristics do speech anxious college students associate with the effective, non-anxious public speaker? Second, is it possible to develop a single model that can be perceived by all speech anxious college students as an effective, nonanxious speaker? Finally, how useful are the students' perceptions of the effective, nonanxious speaker in the development of a public speaking model?

To answer these questions, public speaking students at the University of Tennessee, Knoxville, whose responses on an introspective measure of speech anxiety indicated were suffering from a high level of such anxiety, were interviewed. These students were asked what characteristics they associated with the effective, nonanxious speaker, what effect the speaker's physical characteristics had on their judgments of that speaker's effectiveness and lack of

anxiety, and how much importance they placed on the characteristics they had mentioned. In addition, a measure of locus of control was administered to determine what effect this variable had on the subjects' perceptions of the effective, nonanxious speaker. The subjects' responses were content analyzed to determine the characteristics associated with the nonanxious speaker and the possibility of a single model, including what effect the variables of sex and locus of control had on the subjects' perceptions. Finally, the subjects' responses were evaluated using the criteria of the available research investigating the effect of relevant model characteristics on the outcome of modeling to determine the usefulness of the subjects' perceptions of the effective, nonanxious speaker in the development of a public speaking model.

The speaking characteristics perceived to be associated with the nonanxious speaker by the subjects can best be summarized as belonging to a conversational speaker. A conversational speaker exhibits a manner of speaking which is relaxed and informal, in which the speaker uses everyday language and appears calm and natural, and which fosters a direct one-to-one relationship with the audience. Such a speaker does not exhibit the stereotyped "oratorical" style which is more exaggerated. The physical characteristics associated with the effective, nonanxious speaker tended to

be those which would give the speaker a normal appearance that avoids extremes. The subjects also seemed to prefer speakers who were older than average college age, who were male, and who were white.

It was concluded that a single nonanxious model was possible. The variables of sex and locus of control seemed to have only minor effects on the subjects' perceptions of the nonanxious speaker, and, at any rate, these differences can be accommodated in one model. None of the speaking characteristics mentioned were antagonistic to each other, and all can be easily incorporated into a conversational model. Several of the physical characteristics mentioned, however, did appear to mildly contradict each other, primarily in the areas of the speaker's dress, general appearance, and age. The contradictions in the areas of general appearance and age, though, involved characteristics mentioned only once or twice, and were discounted. The contradiction in the area of dress, involving the formality or casualness of the speaker's dress, was resolved by relying on the frequently-mentioned characteristics of appropriateness and neatness of dress.

After evaluating the subjects' responses in light of the available research on relevant model characteristics, it was concluded that, for the most part, the subjects' responses were valuable in the development of a public speaking model.

It was concluded that the model should exhibit the nonfearful behavior cited by the subjects. The physical characteristics of age, sex, and race were given particular attention, resulting in several conclusions. An analysis of the available research indicated that, despite the subjects' expressed preferences for male speakers and older speakers, the most effective public speaking model for reducing the public speaking anxiety of college students would be female and of average college age. The lack of research concerning the effect of race on the model's effectiveness prevented all but the most tentative of conclusions. Since the sample was overwhelmingly white in numbers, preventing any generalizations to other than white speech anxious students, it was concluded that the model should also be white to prevent any possible adverse effects of white observers' preferences for white speakers.

It should be noted that the conclusions of this study are based on a subjective analysis of a relatively small sample of speech anxious college students, and are therefore tentative. However, the findings of this study should prove valuable in the development of an effective public speaking model for reducing college students' speech anxiety, because the findings indicate several considerations important in the development of such a model. First, attention should not be centered exclusively on the model's delivery. The subjects

attended to the behaviors of the speaker, including delivery and the speaker's appearance of confidence and control, but attention was also paid to the speech itself and the relationship established between the speaker and the audience. Second, in addition to those characteristics directly related to public speaking, attention should also be paid to the speaker's physical characteristics. Third, the characteristics of the effective, nonanxious speaker are very much interrelated, so that the presence or absence of any one characteristic affects the observer's perceptions of the other characteristics of the speaker.

Further research is suggested to test a public speaking model based on these findings. Of particular importance is the need for testing speech anxious students' perceptions of such a model. This research could take the form of having speech anxious students rate a potential model for the appropriate characteristics. Such testing is necessary to insure that the public speaking model does possess the relevant characteristics necessary to be perceived as an effective, nonanxious speaker.

LIST OF REFERENCES

LIST OF REFERENCES

Bandura, A. Principles of behavior modification. New York: Holt, Rhinehart and Winston, 1969.

Bandura, A. Psychotherapy based upon modeling principles. In A. E. Bergin & S. L. Garfield (eds.) Handbook of psychotherapy and behavior change. New York: Wiley and sons, 1971, pp. 653-708.

Bandura, A., & Barab, P. G. Processes governing disinhibitory effects through symbolic modeling. Journal of Abnormal Psychology, 1973, 82, 1-9.

Bandura, A., Blanchard, E. B., & Ritter, B. The relative efficacy of desensitization and modeling approaches for inducing behavioral, affective, and attitudinal changes. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1969, 13, 177-199.

Bandura, A., Grusec, J. E., & Menlove, F. L. Vicarious extinction of avoidance behavior. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1967, 5, 16-23.

Bandura, A., & Menlove, F. L. Factors determining vicarious extinction of avoidance behavior through symbolic modeling. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1968, 8, 99-108.

Burnstein, E., Stotland, E., & Zander, A. Similarity to a model and self-evaluation. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1961, 62, 257-264.

Clevenger, T. A synthesis of experimental research in stage fright. Quarterly Journal of Speech, 1959, 45, 134-145.

Craig, K. D. Physiological arousal as a function of imagined, vicarious, and direct stress experiences. Journal of Abnormal Psychology, 1968, 73, 513-520.

Dalton, R. F., Jr., Sunblad, L. M., & Hylbert, K. W. An application of principles of social learning to training in communication of empathy. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1973, 20, 378-383.

Geer, J. H., & Turteltaub, A. Fear reduction following observation of a model. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1967, 6, 327-331.

Hamilton, P. K. An experimental investigation of the relation between internal-external locus of control of reinforcement and the systematic desensitization of communication anxiety. Paper presented to the Central States Speech Communication Association Convention, Chicago, April 1976.

Hill, J. H., Liebert, R. M., & Mott, D. E. W. Vicarious extinction of avoidance behavior through films: An initial test. Psychological Reports, 1968, 12, 192.

Ickes, W. K. A classical conditioning model for "reticence." Western Speech, 1971, 35, 48-55.

Kleinsasser, L. D. The reduction of performance anxiety as a function of desensitization, pretherapy vicarious learning, and vicarious learning alone (Doctoral dissertation, The Pennsylvania State University, 1968). Dissertation Abstracts, 1969, 29, 4848B. (University Microfilms No. 69-9775)

Kornhaber, R. C., & Schroeder, H. E. Importance of model similarity on extinction of avoidance behavior in children. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 1975, 43, 601-607.

Lange, D. N. An application of social learning theory in affecting change in a group of student teachers using video modeling techniques. The Journal of Educational Research, 1971, 65, 151-154.

Lazarus, R. S., Speisman, J. C., Mordkoff, A. M., & Davison, L. A. A laboratory study of psychological stress produced by a motion picture film. Psychological Monographs, 1962, 76 (34, Whole No. 553).

Mahoney, M. J. Cognition and behavior modification. Cambridge, Mass.: Ballinger Publishing Company, 1974.

McCroskey, J. C. Measures of communication-bound anxiety. Speech Monographs, 1970, 27, 269-277.

McCroskey, J. C. The implementation of a large-scale program of systematic desensitization for communication apprehension. Speech Teacher, 1972, 21, 255-264.

McCroskey, J. C., Ralph, D. C., & Barrick, J. E. The effect of systematic desensitization on speech anxiety. Speech Teacher, 1970, 19, 32-36.

Meichenbaum, D. Examination of model characteristics in reducing avoidance behavior. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1971, 17, 298-307.

Meichenbaum, D. H., Gilmore, J., & Fedoravicius, A. Group insight versus group desensitization in treating speech anxiety. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 1971, 36, 410-421.

Miller, R. E., Murphy, J. V., & Mirsky, I. A. Nonverbal communication of affect. Journal of Clinical Psychology, 1959, 15, 155-158.

Morgan, J. M. Self-modeling versus other-modeling versus practice in the reduction of public speaking anxiety (Doctoral dissertation, University of Arizona, 1970). Dissertation Abstracts International, 1970, 31, 2289B. (University Microfilms No. 70-17, 786)

O'Sullivan, M., Gilner, F. H., & Krinski, R. The influence of sex of experimentor on modeling in the reduction of fear. Behavior Therapy, 1973, 4, 535-542.

Paul, G. L. Insight vs. desensitization in psychotherapy: An experiment in anxiety reduction. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1966.

Phillips, G. M. Reticence: Pathology of the normal speaker. Speech Monographs, 1968, 35, 39-49.

Phillips, G. M., & Metzger, N. J. The reticent syndrome: Some theoretical considerations about etiology and treatment. Speech Monographs, 1973, 40, 220-230.

Rosekrans, M. Imitation in children as a function of perceived similarity to a social model and vicarious reinforcement. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1967, 7, 307-315.

Rotter, J. B. Generalized expectancies for internal versus external control of reinforcement. Psychological Monographs, 1966, 80 (1 Whole No. 609).

Spiegler, M. C., Liebert, R. M., McMains, M. J., & Fernandez, L. E. Experimental development of a modeling treatment to extinguish persistent avoidance behavior. In R. D. Rubin & C. M. Franks (eds.) Advances in behavior therapy. New York: Academic Press, 1969, pp. 45-51.

Stone, G. L., & Jackson, T. Internal-external control as a determinate of the effectiveness of modeling and instructions. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1975, 22, 294-298.

Stotland, E., & Hilmer, M. L., Jr. Identification, authoritarian defensiveness, and self-esteem. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1962, 64, 334-342.

Stotland, E., & Patchen, M. Identification and changes in prejudice and in authoritarianism. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1961, 62, 265-274.

Stotland, E., Zander, A., & Natsoulas, T. The generalization of interpersonal similarity. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1961, 62, 250-256.

Weissberg, M. Anxiety-inhibiting statements and relaxation combined in two cases of speech anxiety. Behavior Therapy and Experimental Psychiatry, 1975, 6, 163-164.

Wilson, J. F., & Arnold, C. C. Public speaking as a liberal art. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1968.

Wolpe, J. Psychotherapy by reciprocal inhibition. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1958.

Wolpe, J. The practice of behavior therapy. New York: Pergamon Press, 1969.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

PERSONAL REPORT OF PUBLIC SPEAKING APPREHENSION

This instrument is composed of 34 statements concerning feelings about communicating with other people.

Indicate the degree to which the statements apply to you by marking whether you (1) strongly agree, (2) agree, (3) are undecided, (4) disagree, or (5) strongly disagree with each statement. Work quickly, just record your first impression.

1. While preparing for giving a speech I feel tense and nervous.
2. I feel tense when I see the words "speech" and "public speech" on a course outline when studying.
3. My thoughts become confused and jumbled when I am giving a speech.
4. Right after giving a speech I feel that I have had a pleasant experience.
5. I get anxious when I think about a speech coming up.
6. I have no fear of giving a speech.
7. Although I am nervous just before starting a speech, I soon settle down after starting and feel calm and comfortable.
8. I look forward to giving a speech.
9. When the instructor announces a speaking assignment in class I can feel myself getting tense.
10. My hands tremble when I am giving a speech.
11. I feel relaxed while giving a speech.
12. I enjoy preparing for a speech.
13. I am in constant fear of forgetting what I am prepared to say.
14. I get anxious if someone asks me something about my topic that I do not know.
15. I face the prospect of giving a speech with confidence.
16. I feel that I am in complete possession of myself while giving a speech.
17. My mind is clear when giving a speech.
18. I do not dread giving a speech.
19. I perspire just before starting a speech.
20. My heart beats very fast just as I start a speech.
21. I experience considerable anxiety while sitting in the room just before my speech starts.
22. Certain parts of my body feel tense and rigid while giving a speech.

23. Realizing that only a little time remains in a speech makes me very tense and anxious.
24. While giving a speech I know I can control my feelings of tension and stress.
25. I breathe faster just before starting a speech.
26. I feel comfortable and relaxed in the hour or so just before giving a speech.
27. I do poorer on speeches because I am anxious.
28. I feel anxious when the teacher announces the date of a speaking assignment.
29. When I make a mistake while giving a speech, I find it hard to concentrate on the parts that follow.
30. During an important speech I experience a feeling of helplessness building up inside me.
31. I have trouble falling asleep the night before a speech.
32. My heart beats very fast while I present a speech.
33. I feel anxious while waiting to give my speech.
34. While giving a speech I get so nervous I forget facts I really know.

APPENDIX B

INTERNAL-EXTERNAL LOCUS OF CONTROL SCALE[1]

Circle the letter of the statement in each pair of statements that is closest to your opinion. Be sure to pick a statement for each pair of statements.

1) a. Children get into trouble because their parents punish them too much.
   b. The trouble with most children nowadays is that their parents are too easy with them.

2) a. Many of the unhappy things in people's lives are partly due to bad luck.
   b. People's misfortunes result from the mistakes they make.

3) a. One of the major reasons why we have wars is because people don't take enough interest in politics.
   b. There will always be wars, no matter how hard people try to prevent them.

4) a. In the long run people get the respect they deserve in this world.
   b. Unfortunately, an individual's worth often passes unrecognized no matter how hard he tries.

5) a. The idea that teachers are unfair to students is nonsense.
   b. Most students don't realize the extent to which their grades are influenced by accidental happenings.

6) a. Without the right breaks one cannot be an effective leader.
   b. Capable people who fail to become leaders have not taken advantage of their opportunities.

7) a. No matter how hard you try some people just don't like you.
   b. People who can't get others to like them don't understand how to get along with others.

---

[1]Rotter (1966). Copyright 1966 by the American Psychological Association. Reprinted by permission. The score is the total number of underlined choices.

8) a. Heredity plays the major role in determining one's personality.
   b. It is one's experience in life which determines what one is like.

9) a. I have often found that what is going to happen will happen.
   b. Trusting to fate has never turned out as well for me as making a decision to take a definite course of action.

10) a. In the case of the well prepared student there is rarely if ever such a thing as an unfair test.
    b. Many times exam questions tend to be so unrelated to course work that studying is really useless.

11) a. Becoming a success is a matter of hard work, luck has little or nothing to do with it.
    b. Getting a good job depends mainly on being in the right place at the right time.

12) a. The average citizen can have an influence in government decisions.
    b. This world is run by the few people in power, and there is not much the little guy can do about it.

13) a. When I make plans, I am almost certain that I can make them work.
    b. It is not always wise to plan too far ahead because many things turn out to be a matter of good or bad fortune anyhow.

14) a. There are certain people who are just no good.
    b. There is some good in everybody.

15) a. In my case, getting what I want has little or nothing to do with luck.
    b. Many times we might just as well decide what to do by flipping a coin.

16) a. Who gets to be the boss often depends on who was lucky enough to be in the right place first.
    b. Getting people to do the right thing depends upon ability, luck has little or nothing to do with it.

17) a. As far as world affairs are concerned, most of us are the victims of forces we can neither understand, nor control.
    b. By taking an active part in political and social affairs the people can control world events.

18) a. Most people don't realize the extent to which their lives are controlled by accidental happenings.
b. There really is no such thing as "luck."

19) a. One should always be willing to admit mistakes.
b. It is usually best to cover up one's mistakes.

20) a. It is hard to know whether or not a person really likes you.
b. How many friends you have depends on how nice a person you are.

21) a. In the long run the bad things that happen to us are balanced by the good ones.
b. Most misfortunes are the result of lack of ability, ignorance, laziness, or all three.

22) a. With enough effort we can wipe out political corruption.
b. It is difficult for people to have much control over the things politicians do in office.

23) a. Sometimes I can't understand how teachers arrive at the grades they give.
b. There is a direct connection between how hard I study and the grades I get.

24) a. A good leader expects people to decide for themselves what they should do.
b. A good leader makes it clear to everybody what their jobs are.

25) a. Many times I feel that I have little influence over the things that happen to me.
b. It is impossible for me to believe that chance or luck plays an important role in my life.

26) a. People are lonely because they don't try to be friendly.
b. There's not much use in trying too hard to please people, if they like you, they like you.

27) a. There is too much emphasis on athletics in high school.
b. Team sports are an excellent way to build character.

28) a. What happens to me is my own doing.
b. Sometimes I feel that I don't have enough control over the direction my life is taking.

29) a. Most of the time I can't understand why politicians behave the way they do.
b. In the long run the people are responsible for bad government on a national as well as on a local level.

VITA

James Brooks Holt, Jr. was born on July 31, 1949, in Kingsport, Tennessee. He attended elementary schools in Carter County and Johnson City, Tennessee, and was graduated from East Tennessee State University High School in June 1967. The following September he entered East Tennessee State University, where he was active in the university's theatre program. In June 1973 he received a Bachelor of Science degree, with majors in speech and theatre and English.

After teaching English at Rutledge High School, Grainger County, Tennessee, for one year, Mr. Holt entered the Graduate School of the University of Tennessee, Knoxville, in September 1974. He received the Master of Arts degree with a major in speech and theatre in March 1977.

The author is a member of the Southern Speech Communication Association. He is currently employed with Walters State Community College, Morristown, Tennessee.

Mr. Holt is married to the former Barbara Humphreys of Johnson City, Tennessee. He and his wife reside in Rutledge, Tennessee.