

South Dakota State University

Open PRAIRIE: Open Public Research Access Institutional Repository and Information Exchange

Electronic Theses and Dissertations

1958

An Experimental Study to Determine the Effect of a Speech of introduction Upon the Persuasive Speech that Followed

Barbara Kersten

Follow this and additional works at: <https://openprairie.sdstate.edu/etd>

Recommended Citation

Kersten, Barbara, "An Experimental Study to Determine the Effect of a Speech of introduction Upon the Persuasive Speech that Followed" (1958). *Electronic Theses and Dissertations*. 2516.
<https://openprairie.sdstate.edu/etd/2516>

This Thesis - Open Access is brought to you for free and open access by Open PRAIRIE: Open Public Research Access Institutional Repository and Information Exchange. It has been accepted for inclusion in Electronic Theses and Dissertations by an authorized administrator of Open PRAIRIE: Open Public Research Access Institutional Repository and Information Exchange. For more information, please contact michael.biondo@sdstate.edu.

72-581
6747
5.0

AN EXPERIMENTAL STUDY TO DETERMINE THE EFFECT
OF A SPEECH OF INTRODUCTION UPON THE
PERSUASIVE SPEECH THAT FOLLOWED

By

Barbara Kersten

A thesis submitted
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the
degree Master of Science at South Dakota
State College of Agriculture
and Mechanic Arts

May, 1958

SOUTH DAKOTA STATE COLLEGE LIBRARY

127

**AN EXPERIMENTAL STUDY TO DETERMINE THE EFFECT
OF A SPEECH OF INTRODUCTION UPON THE
PERSUASIVE SPEECH THAT FOLLOWED**

This thesis is approved as a, creditable, independent investigation by a candidate for the degree, Master of Science, and acceptable as meeting the thesis requirements for this degree; but without implying that the conclusions reached by the candidate are necessarily the conclusions of the major department.

Deposit

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The author of this paper wishes to thank Dr. Donald E. Sikkink, who served as advisor. His advice and inspiration were greatly appreciated.

I would also like to thank Dr. Rex Cox for his help with the statistical problems involved in this thesis. I also appreciated the cooperation of the entire Speech Department staff.

BJK

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
INTRODUCTION	1
EXPERIMENTAL METHODS	4
Introduction	4
Establishing Criteria for a Speech of Introduction	5
Subjects	12
Persuasive Speech	14
Measuring Devices	14
Testing	19
Statistical Methods	20
RESULTS	23
Speeches of Introduction	23
Sex Differences	27
Approximate College Grade Averages	27
Initial Opinion	27
Mean Scores on Ratings of Introductions	30
Mean Scores on Ratings of the Persuasive Speech	33
INTERPRETATIONS AND CONCLUSIONS	35
Analysis of Speeches of Introduction	35
Analysis of Sex Differences	36
Analysis of Approximate College Grade Averages	36
Analysis of Initial Opinion	37
Analysis of Mean Scores of the Introductions	38
Analysis of Mean Scores of the Persuasive Speech	39

Implications for Further Research	39
Summary of Results	40
LITERATURE CITED	42
APPENDIXES	45
List of Textbooks Consulted That Did Not Mention Speech of Introduction	45
"Desirable" Speech of Introduction	46
"Undesirable" Speech of Introduction	48
Rating Scale for Speeches of Introduction	50
Persuasive Speech	51
First Shift-of-Opinion Ballot	56
Second Shift-of-Opinion Ballot Used by the Groups Hearing the Speeches of Introduction . .	57
Second Shift-of-Opinion Ballot Used by the Control Group	59
Raw Data	60

LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
1	List of Basic Textbooks Consulted and the Criteria Found in Each Textbook	6
2	The Ratings Found in Testing if the Speeches of Introduction Were Different	13
3	Similarity of Characteristics of the Three Audiences	15
4	Comparison between the Total Number of Shifts of Opinion in the Desirable Presentation with the Number of Shifts in the Undesirable Presentation	24
5	Comparison between the Total Number of Shifts of Opinion in the Desirable Presentation with the Number of Shifts in the Control Group	25
6	Comparison between the Total Number of Shifts of Opinion in the Undesirable Presentation with the Number of Shifts in the Control Group	26
7	Comparison between the Total Number of Shifts of Opinion Between the Sexes with Each Group and within the Entire Population	28
8	Comparison between the Total Number of Shifts of Opinion between the Students with Grades in the Upper $\frac{1}{2}$ and those Students with Grades in the Lower $\frac{1}{2}$ of the Group within Each Presentation Group	29
9	Comparison between the Total Number of Shifts of Opinion as to Initial Opinion	31
10	Comparison between the Mean Rating of the Desirable Introduction with Mean Rating of the Undesirable Introduction	32
11	Comparison between the Mean Rating of the Persuasive Speech as Rated in Each Presentation	34

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Basic textbooks in the area of public speaking frequently contain information concerning the importance of speeches of introduction. One author in describing the basic purpose of such speeches states that the speech of introduction should " . . . secure for the speaker a favorable hearing."¹ Other authors suggest that a speech of introduction " . . . deftly prepares the way for the speaker's message to reach his listener,"² and that the introducer should be " . . . a salesman in the limited sense that you are exciting a feeling of anticipation"³ McBurney and Wrage further advise the introducer to " . . . think of yourself as a go-between, a situation-maker."⁴

The authors consulted recommend that to achieve these purposes a speech of introduction should focus attention on the speaker without containing personal comments about the

¹Giles W. Gray and Waldo W. Braden, Public Speaking: Principles and Practices (New York, 1951), p. 246.

²Elwood Murray, Raymond H. Barnard, and J. V. Garland, Integrative Speech (New York, 1953), p. 332.

³Eugene E. White and Clair R. Henderlinder, Practical Public Speaking: A Guide to Effective Communication (New York, 1951), p. 316.

⁴James H. McBurney and Ernest J. Wrage, Guide to Good Speech, 4th ed. (Englewood Cliffs, N. J., 1956), p. 295.

the introducer, should focus attention on the subject without discussing it, and should build the speaker's prestige without embarrassing him by over-praise.

Despite this agreement among authors, there appears to be no direct experimental evidence to support the assumption that the effectiveness of a persuasive speech is influenced by the speech of introduction which precedes the communication. However, indirect evidence to support this assumption comes from studies dealing with the ethos, which is understood to be the character and the reputation of the speaker. Typical research dealing with the variable of ethos is an experimental study by Stanley F. Paulson.⁵ Ethos was varied experimentally in Paulson's study by postulating speakers of varying prestige. The same persuasive speech was presented to one group with the announcement that the speaker was an authority in the field, and to a matched group with the announcement that the speaker was a college student. This study resulted in a statistically significant difference as measured by shifts of opinion in favor of the speaker who was an authority in his field.⁶ Although this evidence cannot be used in direct support of the importance of speeches of introduction, it

⁵Stanley F. Paulson, "The Effects of the Prestige of the Speaker and Acknowledgement of Opposing Arguments on Audience Retention and Shift of Opinion," SM, XXI (Nov., 1954), 267-271.

⁶Paulson, p. 270.

does suggest that the assumption held by textbook authors about the importance of such speeches may be tenable.

The present study was designed as a direct measurement of that assumption. The hypothesis tested was the following: A speech of introduction which corresponds to the established criteria, as set forth by the authors of basic textbooks, will have a stronger effect on the shift of opinion in the direction advocated by the persuasive speech than a speech of introduction that does not correspond to the established criteria.

CHAPTER II

EXPERIMENTAL METHODS

Introduction

The hypothesis of this experimental study was tested by taking the following steps:

1. A survey of speech textbooks was made to establish the recommended criteria for a speech of introduction.
2. Two speeches of introduction, one that did correspond with the established criteria and one that did not correspond to these criteria, were written.
3. The two speeches of introduction were then rated to determine how effectively they did or did not correspond to the established criteria.
4. A persuasive speech was written.
5. The subjects used in this study were divided into three groups. Group A heard one of the speeches of introduction and the persuasive speech. Group B heard the other speech of introduction and the same persuasive speech. Group C (Control Group) heard only the persuasive speech.
6. The effectiveness of the presentations in the three groups was tested by using the Woodward Shift-of-Opinion ballot and a rating scale.

Establishing Criteria for a Speech of Introduction

The establishment of the recommended criteria for a speech of introduction was the first step in designing this study. A survey was made of thirty-four basic public speaking textbooks published in the last ten years. Of this group twenty-one of the textbooks contained information concerning speeches of introduction. Table 1 shows the textbooks dealing with speeches of introduction, and Appendix A shows the textbooks that did not mention speeches of introduction.

The textbooks surveyed in this study recommended that a speech of introduction should do the following:

1. Focus attention on the speaker without making personal comments about the introducer.
2. Focus attention on the subject without discussing the subject.
3. Build the speaker's prestige without embarrassing the speaker by over-praise.

This exact terminology was not used in all textbooks, but the same content idea appeared to be implied. For example, Bryant and Wallace recommended that an introducer promote the purpose of the speech by " . . . directing favorable attention toward the speaker by referring to his qualifications."⁷ McBurney and Wrage stated that the introducer should establish

⁷Donald C. Bryant and Karl R. Wallace, Fundamentals of Public Speaking (New York, 1947), p. 234.

TABLE 1.--The List of Basic Textbooks
Consulted and the Criteria Found
in Each Textbook

Textbooks Consulted	Criteria Found		
	Focus attention on the speaker with- out making per- sonal comments about the intro- ducer.	Focus attention on the subject without dis- cussing the subject.	Build the speak- er's prestige without embar- rassing the speaker by over- praise.
<u>Speech Composition*</u> William Brigrance	X	X	X
<u>Speech: Its Techniques</u> William Brigrance	X	X	X
<u>Fundamentals of Public Speaking</u> Donald C. Bryant Karl R. Wallace	X	X	X
<u>Oral Communication</u> Karl R. Wallace Donald C. Bryant	X	X	X
<u>Speech: Dynamic Communication</u> Milton Dickens	X	X	X
<u>Public Speaking: Principles and Practice</u> Giles W. Gray Waldo W. Braden	X	X	X

*The list of literature cited contains the entire description
of the books.

"TABLE 1--Continued."

	Speaker	Subject	Prestige
<u>The Art of</u> <u>Good Speech</u> James H. McBurney Ernest J. Wraga	X	X	X
<u>Guide to</u> <u>Good Speech</u> James H. McBurney Ernest J. Wraga	X	X	X
<u>Fundamentals</u> <u>of Speech</u> Ray C. McCall	X	X	X
<u>Principles of</u> <u>Speech</u> Alan Monroe	X	X	X
<u>Integrative</u> <u>Speech</u> Elwood Murray Raymond H. Barnard J. V. Garland	X	X	X
<u>The Fundamentals</u> <u>and Forms of Speech</u> Andrew T. Weaver Ordean Q. Ness		X	
<u>Practical Public</u> <u>Speaking: A Guide</u> <u>to Effective</u> <u>Communication</u> Eugene R. White Clair R. Henderlinder	X	X	
<u>Effective Speaking</u> <u>for Every Occasion</u> Willard H. Yeager	X	X	X
<u>Essentials of</u> <u>General Speech</u> Craig A. Baird Franklin H. Knower	X	X	X

"TABLE 1--Continued."

	Speaker	Subject	Prestige
<u>Dynamic Public Speaking</u> George M. Glasgow	X	X	X
<u>The Fundamentals of Speaking</u> Wilbur E. Gilman Bower Aly Loren D. Reid	X	X	X
<u>A Guide to Effective Public Speaking</u> Lawrence H. Mount	X	X	X
<u>Principles of Effective Speaking</u> William P. Sandford William H. Yeager		X	X
<u>Principles and Types of Speech</u> Alan Monroe	X	X	X

the speaker's qualifications to speak.⁸ Both of these examples were classified under Number Three above, building the speaker's prestige. The degree of agreement among authors on these items is shown in Table 1. Twenty authors recommended that the introducer focus attention on the subject, eighteen recommended that the introducer focus attention on the speaker, and eighteen recommended that the introducer build the speaker's prestige.

Speeches of Introduction

Two speeches of introduction were written according to the established criteria. The length of both speeches was two minutes. One of the speeches of introduction was written to correspond to the established criteria (See Appendix B for a copy of the speech of introduction), and the other was written so that it violated the established criteria. (See Appendix C for a copy of that speech of introduction.) The latter speech of introduction violated the criteria by making personal comments about the introducer, discussing the subject, and over-praising the speaker. The speech of introduction that corresponds to the established criteria will be referred to during the remainder of this study as the "desirable" speech of introduction; the introduction that does not

⁸ James H. McBurney and Ernest J. Wraga, The Art of Good Speech (New York, 1953), p. 532.

correspond to the established criteria will be referred to as the "undesirable" speech of introduction.

Both speeches of introduction were presented in written form to the seven regular staff members of the Speech Department of South Dakota State College for their evaluation. The staff members were given a summary of the established criteria and a copy of both speeches. They were asked to answer two questions:

1. Do you think the speeches of introduction correspond to the established criteria?
2. How could the speeches be changed to better correspond to the established criteria?

All seven of the staff members answered yes to the first question. However, two of the staff members suggested that the difference between the introductions was too obvious. This evaluation was studied, but no change was made in the introduction because it was felt that the hypothesis of the study could best be tested if the introduction were distinctly different; and it was assumed that students would not be as sharply aware of such difference as were teachers in the area of speech.

The two speeches of introduction were then recorded by Herman Felstehausen, a student unknown to most of the subjects, who had had two years of radio experience. A Radio Corporation of America tape recorder, The Diplomat, Model 8TH3, was used

to make this recording at a speed of three and three-fourths inches per second.

The recorded introductions were played to twenty-nine students enrolled in two speech classes as a means of further testing whether the introductions were different.

The subjects in this group were told they were helping in a research project. They were asked to listen carefully and to answer a few questions about the speech of introduction. The two introductions were played successively, and reference was made to these speeches as Introduction One and Introduction Two.

After hearing the two introductions the students were given five questions to answer. (See Appendix D for a copy.) The five questions were:

1. Which one of the speeches of introduction focused attention on the speaker rather than on the person doing the introducing?
2. Which one of the speeches of introduction focused attention on the subject without discussing it?
3. Which one of the speeches of introduction established the speaker's prestige without embarrassing the speaker by over-praise?
4. Which one of the speeches of introduction left you with the most anticipation toward hearing the main speaker?

5. Which one of the speeches of introduction was the more effective?

The subjects were given a choice among three answers:

1. Speech No. 1.
2. Speech No. 2.
3. Both Speeches were the same.

The responses to these questions reveal that between 70% and 90% of the subjects indicated that the "desirable" speech of introduction focused attention on the subject and speaker, built the speaker's prestige, left them with the most anticipation for hearing the speech, and was the more effective. Table 2 shows specifically how each speech of introduction was rated on the five questions.

Subjects

The three hundred thirty-seven students used in this study were enrolled in the basic courses in Oral Communication at South Dakota State College. The subjects were tested in December, 1957. The majority of the eighty-nine students in each experimental group was composed of freshman and sophomores.

The three groups of subjects used in this study were matched exactly as to their initial opinions. For example, for each person in Group A initially in favor of the proposition, one person in Group B and one person in Group C were initially in favor of the proposition. Subjects were matched on initial opinion because the amount of attitude shift on

**TABLE 2.--The Ratings Found in Testing if the
Speeches of Introduction
Were Different**

Question	Number in- dicating No. 1 fit the recommended criteria.	%	Number in- dicating No. 2 fit the recommended criteria.	Number in- dicating that both speeches were the same.
No. 1				
Focused attention on the speaker	27	93.1	2	0
No. 2				
Focused attention on the subject	25	86.2	4	0
No. 3				
Built the speaker's prestige	24	82.7	2	3
No. 4				
Greater anticipation toward the speaker	21	72.4	6	2
No. 5				
The more effective	26	89.6	2	1

the Woodward Ballot is to some extent dependent on initial opinion. Woodward, in testing the shift-of-opinion ballot, found that subjects initially undecided shifted their opinion twice as often as subjects initially in favor or opposed to the proposition.⁹ Table 3 presents data which indicate the groups were also similar in other respects.

Persuasive Speech

The persuasive speech used in this study was nine minutes long and supported the proposition: "The United States Government should continue its Foreign Aid Program." (See Appendix E for a copy of the persuasive speech.) This subject was chosen because of current interest in the topic, the assumption that the students would have varied opinions on the proposition, and the availability of research material that could be used in writing the speech. This speech was recorded on tape by Leon Halstead. Halstead was selected because he had speaking experience, and because it was believed the experimental subjects would not recognize his voice.

Measuring Devices

The Woodward Shift-of-Opinion ballot was used to measure shift of opinion, while a five-point rating scale was used to measure the effectiveness of the persuasive speech and the

⁹Howard S. Woodward, "Measurement and Analysis of Audience Opinion," EJS, XIV (1928), 104.

TABLE 3.--Similarity of Characteristics
of the Three Audiences

Variable	"Undesirable" Introduction Audience	"Desirable" Introduction Audience	No Introduction Audience
Initial Opinion	Matched 7 - Opposed 16 - Undecided 66 - Favorable		
Number of Subjects	89	89	89
Men	76	78	78
Women	13	11	11
College Average Grade	2 A's 38 B's 48 C's 1 D	2 A's 37 B's 49 C's 1 D	2 A's 37 B's 49 C's 1 D

speeches of introduction.

The Woodward ballot determined only whether a positive shift, a negative shift, or none at all had occurred. Monroe in describing the ballot said, "the individual auditor records only a qualitative shift; the only quantitative index of the effectiveness of the speech is the number or proportion of auditors recording a shift."¹⁰ In scoring the ballots collected in this study only a shift in direction was scored and not the amount of shift. For example, if a person initially in favor of the proposition was more strongly in favor of it after hearing the presentation, a plus shift was recorded. If the person had shifted to the undecided category, it was scored as a minus. The total number of shifts was then added algebraically and divided into the number of possible shifts to determine the proportion.¹¹

Alan Monroe, after studying the ballot, drew the conclusion that " . . . the Woodward Ballot is the best single device for evaluating the effectiveness of speeches in terms of the change of opinion produced by them"¹² Millson in an experimental study found that "the ballot seems to be

¹⁰ Alan H. Monroe, "The Measurement and Analysis of Audience Reaction to Student Speaker--Studies in Attitude Changes," Bulletin of Purdue University, Studies in Higher Education, XXIX (Sept., 1936), 24.

¹¹ Monroe, p. 20

¹² Monroe, p. 15.

an adequate technique for recording actual change of opinion within the audience in response to a student speaker."¹³

This ballot has been used frequently in studies dealing with opinion change. For example, Franklyn S. Haiman¹⁴ and Stanley F. Paulson¹⁵ used it in recent experimental studies in the field of speech.

The Woodward ballot was used twice in this study. The first ballot was completed by the subjects before they heard the speech. They were asked to indicate their opinion on the proposition, "The United States Government should continue its Foreign Aid Program," by indicating which statement below best expressed their opinion.

1. I agree with the above proposition.
2. I am undecided.
3. I disagree with the above proposition.

Also on the sheet were spaces to list age, sex, class and approximate grade average. (See Appendix F for a copy of the ballot.)

¹³William A. D. Millson, "Problems in Measuring Audience Reaction," GJS, XVIII (1932), 636.

¹⁴Franklyn S. Haiman, "An Experimental Study of the Effects of Ethos in Public Speaking," SM, XVI (September, 1949), 192.

¹⁵Stanley F. Paulson, "The Effects of the Prestige of the Speaker and Acknowledgment of Opposing Arguments on Audience Retention and Shift of Opinion," SM, XXI (Nov., 1954), 269.

The second ballot, given after they had heard the speech, allowed the students to express a possible change in opinion by adding two choices so that the scale had five possibilities:

1. I agree more strongly with the above proposition.
2. I agree with the above proposition.
3. I am undecided.
4. I disagree with the above proposition.
5. I disagree more strongly with the above proposition.

(See Appendix G for a copy of the ballot used by the "desirable" and "undesirable" groups and Appendix H for a copy of the ballot used by the control group.)

A five point rating scale was used to measure the effectiveness of the persuasive speech and the speeches of introduction. The scale was included on the second shift-of-opinion ballot. The scale ranged from 1 (not effective) to 5 (very effective). The two questions concerning effectiveness were:

1. I considered the speech of introduction:

1	2	3	4	5
Not		Average		Very
Effective		Effectiveness		Effective

2. I considered the speech:

1	2	3	4	5
Not		Average		Very
Effective		Effectiveness		Effective

Research by Monroe,¹⁶ Schmid,¹⁷ and Edwards¹⁸ supports the use of a five point rating scale. These authors advanced the opinion that a five point rating scale is an adequate means for measuring the intensity of the subjects' attitudes.

Testing

The subjects in this study were divided into three different groups. Group A heard the "desirable" speech of introduction and the persuasive speech. Group B heard the "undesirable" speech of introduction and the persuasive speech. Group C (Control Group) heard only the persuasive speech. The groups were tested in their classrooms during their regular speech classes over a period of three days. The different presentations were rotated to offset any effect of time difference on the results.

The same instructions were given to each group. They were told they were helping in a research project and that this was a listening exercise. They were also told that this testing would have no effect on their grades because there was no way of connecting individual names with individual ballots.

¹⁶Monroe, p. 19

¹⁷Calvin F. Schmid, "Scaling Techniques," Scientific Social Surveys and Research, Pauline V. Young, 3rd ed. (Englewood Cliffs, N.J., 1956), p. 338.

¹⁸Allen I. Edwards, Experimental Design in Psychological Research (New York, 1956), p. 5.

The first shift-of-opinion ballot was given to each group before they heard the recording. They were asked to fill in the ballot. A code number was stapled on the first sheet. Each student was told to tear off the number, to record it in the blank provided on the sheet, and to keep the number.

After the recording had been played, the second ballot was given to the subjects. The subjects were told to record their code numbers, indicate their present opinions on the proposition, and rate the speeches.

Statistical Methods

The "t" score test of significance for use with proportions was used to determine the significance of differences in shift of opinion which occurred between the different presentations.

The "t" score can best be defined by the following formula:

$$t = \frac{\text{Difference between proportions}^{19}}{\text{Standard Error}}$$

$$\text{Difference between proportions} = 1st \% - 2nd \%$$

¹⁹William G. Cochran and Gertrude M. Cox, Experimental Designs, 2nd ed. (New York, 1957), p. 102.

$$\text{Standard Error} = \sqrt{\frac{p_1 q_1}{N_1 - 1} + \frac{p_2 q_2}{N_2 - 1}}$$

$$p_1 = 1\text{st}\%$$

$$q_1 = 100\% - 1\text{st}\%$$

$$p_2 = 2\text{nd}\%$$

$$q_2 = 100\% - 2\text{nd}\%$$

$$N = \text{Total Population}$$

A "t" test was also used to determine the significance of differences between the mean ratings of effectiveness of the two introductions. The formula used in this case was:

$$t = \frac{\bar{x}_1 - \bar{x}_2}{\frac{s_{x_2}^2}{n_2}}$$

In testing the significance of the differences between the three group ratings on the effectiveness of the persuasive speech, analysis of variance was used. Analysis of variance is similar to the "t" test, but it deals with more than two items.²¹ The formula used was:

$$F = \frac{\text{Mean of Squares Between Groups}^{22}}{\text{Mean of Squares Within Groups}}$$

The "t" test of significance is adequate for any experiment that involves only two comparisons. The analysis of

²⁰ Allen L. Edwards, Statistical Methods for the Behavioral Sciences (New York, 1954), p. 254.

²¹ Edwards, Statistical Methods, p. 340.

²² Edwards, Statistical Methods, p. 321.

and the corresponding test of significance based upon the "F" distribution permits dealing with three separate items.²³

In this study the analysis of variance, as the name indicates, deals with variances. "In the simplest case [as in this one] the total sum of squares is analyzed into two parts: a sum of squares based upon the variation between the group means."²⁴ After the division, the "F" value or variance is determined by dividing the larger variance by the smaller variance.²⁵ The five per cent level of significance was chosen as the desired level of significance in this study because of its frequent use.²⁶

²³Edwards, Statistical Methods, p. 315.

²⁴Edwards, Statistical Methods, p. 315.

²⁵Edwards, Statistical Methods, p. 321.

²⁶E. F. Lindquist, A First Course In Statistics: Their Use and Interpretation In Education and Psychology, Revised ed. (Cambridge, Mass., 1942), p. 107.

CHAPTER III

RESULTS

Speeches of Introduction

The purpose of this study is to measure the effect of a "desirable" speech of introduction on a persuasive speech as compared with the effect of an "undesirable" speech of introduction on the same persuasive speech.

Table 4 shows the total number of opinion shifts recorded by the group who heard the "desirable" speech of introduction and the persuasive speech as compared with the group who heard the "undesirable" speech of introduction and the same persuasive speech. There were twenty-seven shifts recorded by the "desirable" presentation group and fifteen shifts recorded by the "undesirable" presentation group. This difference was statistically significant at less than the 5% level.

Table 5 shows the total number of opinion shifts recorded by the group who heard the "desirable" speech of introduction and the persuasive speech as compared with the group who heard only the persuasive speech (Control group). There were twenty-seven shifts for the "desirable" presentation and fifteen shifts for the control group. This difference was statistically significant at less than the 5% level.

Table 6 shows the total number of opinion shifts recorded by the group who heard the "undesirable" speech of introduction and the persuasive speech as compared with the

TABLE 4.--Comparison between the Total Number of Shifts of Opinion in the "Desirable" Presentation with the Number of Shifts in the "Undesirable" Presentation

	N	No. of Shifts	%	% Difference	S.E.	"t"
"Desirable" Presentation	89	27	30.3	13.5	.0629	2.14*
"Undesirable" Presentation	89	15	16.8			

*Significant at less than the 5% level.

TABLE 5.--Comparison between the Total Number of Shifts of Opinion in the "Desirable" Presentation with the Number of Shifts in the Control Group

	N	No. of Shifts	\bar{x} Difference	S.E.	"t"
"Desirable" Presentation	89	27	30.3		
			13.5	.0629	2.14*
Control Group	89	15	16.8		

*Significant at less than the 5% level.

TABLE 6.--Comparison between the Total Number of Shifts of Opinion in the "Undesirable" Presentation with the Number of Shifts in the Control Group

	N	No. of Shifts	%	% Difference	S.E.	"t"
"Undesirable" Presentation	89	15	16.8	----	----	---
Control Group	89	15	16.8			

group who heard only the persuasive speech (control group). There were fifteen shifts for the "undesirable" presentation group and fifteen shifts for the control group. There was no difference between these two groups.

Sex Differences

To determine whether men and women react differently to the same stimulus, the total number of opinion shifts of the male sex was compared with the total number of opinion shifts of the female sex. Table 7 shows the results within each presentation group and within the entire experimental population. None of the comparisons resulted in a statistically significant difference.

Approximate College Grade Averages

To determine whether scholastic achievement was an influential factor in opinion shift, an analysis was made within each presentation group by comparing the subjects whose grades were in the upper one-fourth with the students whose grades were in the lower one-fourth of the group. Table 8 shows the difference that occurred within each group according to "desirable," "undesirable," and control group presentations. The differences were not statistically significant.

Initial Opinion

Since previous studies²⁷ have indicated that the amount

²⁷Woodward, p. 107.

TABLE 7.--Comparison between the Total Number of Shifts of
Opinion between the Sexes within Each Group and
within the Entire Population

	N	No. of Shifts	%	$\frac{1}{2}$ Difference	S.W.	"t"
"Desirable" Introduction						
Males	78	24	30.7	3.5	.15	.23
Females	11	3	27.2			
"Undesirable" Introduction						
Males	76	13	17.1	01.8	.112	.16
Females	13	2	15.3			
No Introduction (Control Group)						
Males	78	14	17.9	08.8	.101	.87
Females	11	1	19.1			
Total Population						
Males	229	41	17.8	00.8	.065	.10
Females	35	6	17.0			

TABLE 8.--Comparison between the Total Number of Shifts of Opinion between the Students with Grades in the Upper $\frac{1}{2}$ and Those Students with Grades in the Lower $\frac{1}{2}$ of the Group within Each Presentation Group

	N	No. of Shifts	\bar{x}	\bar{x} Difference	S.E.	"t"
"Desirable" Introduction						
Upper $\frac{1}{2}$	22	9	40.9	18.2	.141	1.29
Lower $\frac{1}{2}$	22	5	22.7			
"Undesirable" Introduction						
Upper $\frac{1}{2}$	22	2	09.5	8.6	.105	.82
Lower $\frac{1}{2}$	22	4	18.1			
No Introduction (Control Group)						
Upper $\frac{1}{2}$	22	4	18.1	8.6	.105	.82
Lower $\frac{1}{2}$	22	2	09.5			

of shift of opinion is related to initial position on an attitude scale, a comparison was made in this study of the number of shifts of opinion within each initial position on the Woodward scale. Table 9 shows the comparison of the total number of shifts of opinion between those initially opposed and those initially undecided, between those initially favorable and those initially undecided, and between those initially favorable and those initially opposed.

This table shows that those who were initially undecided about the proposition shifted their opinion more often than those initially opposed. This difference was significant at the .1% level.

The table also shows that those who were initially undecided shifted their opinion more often than those initially in favor of the proposition. This difference was significant at the .1% level.

This table also compares those initially in favor of the proposition with those initially opposed to the proposition. The difference between these two groups was not statistically significant.

Mean Scores of Ratings on the Introductions

Table 10 reveals that there was a statistically significant difference between the two speeches of introduction at the .1% level with the "desirable" speech of introduction receiving the higher score.

TABLE 9.--Comparison between the 'Total Number of' Shifts of Opinion as to Initial Opinion

	N	No. of Shifts	%	% Difference	S.E.	"t"
Initially Undecided	48	20	41.6	28.3	.105	2.69*
Initially Opposed	21	3	13.3			
Initially Undecided	48	20	41.6	27.5	.076	3.61**
Initially Favorable	198	28	14.1			
Initially Favorable	198	28	14.1	00.8	.212	.03
Initially Opposed	21	3	13.3			

*Significant at less than the 1% level.

**Significant at the .1% level.

TABLE 10.--Comparison between the Mean Rating of the
"Desirable" Introduction with the Mean Rating
of the "Undesirable" Introduction

	Mean Score	S.E.	"t"
"Desirable" Introduction	3.65		
"Undesirable" Introduction	3.17	.1	4.8*

*Significant at less than the .1% level.

Mean Scores on Ratings of the Persuasive Speech

An analysis was made of the mean score ratings given the persuasive speech by the three different experimental groups to determine whether the groups rated the speech differently. Table 11 shows that the difference was not statistically significant.

Table 11.-Comparison between the Mean Rating of the
Persuasive Speech as Rated
in Each Presentation

	Mean Score	Mean of Squares Between Groups	Mean of Squares Within Groups	F Score
Control Group	3.55			
"Desirable" Presentation	3.65	.5829	.5116	1.13
"Undesirable" Presentation	3.49			

CHAPTER IV

INTERPRETATIONS AND CONCLUSIONS

Analysis of Speeches of Introduction

Speech textbooks frequently indicate that the goal of a speech of introduction is to " . . . secure for the speaker a favorable hearing."²⁸ Involved in this statement is the assumption that a speech of introduction can have a significant influence on the effect of the persuasive speech which is to follow. The purpose of this study was to make an experimental test of that assumption.

The results of this study supported such an assumption. It was found that a persuasive speech preceded by a "desirable" speech of introduction resulted in significantly more opinion shift than the opinion shift caused by the same persuasive speech when it was preceded by an "undesirable" speech of introduction.

Thus, in this study a "desirable" speech of introduction was shown to benefit a speaker by more effectively bringing about opinion change in his audience than was done with the "undesirable" speech of introduction. The study also suggested that having no speech of introduction is just as effective as having an "undesirable" speech of introduction.

²⁸Giles W. Gray and Waldo W. Braden, Public Speaking: Principles and Practice (New York, 1951), p. 246.

Analysis of Sex Differences

Previous studies have indicated that either women or men were more likely to be affected by a single given experimental variable such as prestige. In a previous study of ethos Haiman²⁹ demonstrated a trend toward women's being more affected by prestige than men, while Paulson³⁰ found just the opposite in his study. However such differences were not statistically significant. No significant differences or trends occurred in this study when the reactions of men and women to "desirable" and "undesirable" speeches of introduction were compared.

Analysis of Approximate College Grade Averages

Recent studies in the area of intelligence as a factor in persuasion are contradictory. Wegrocki, in a study using the Otis Advanced Intelligence Test, found the original attitude scale showed that the most intelligent students were least influenced by propaganda."³¹ However, studies reported by Hovland, Lumsdaine, and Sheffield³² provide evidence of

²⁹Haiman, p. 202.

³⁰Paulson, p. 11.

³¹H. J. Wegrocki, "The Effect of Prestige Suggestibility on Emotional Attitude." Communication and Persuasion: Psychological Studies in Opinion Change, by Carl I. Hovland, Irving L. Janis, and Harold H. Kelly (New Haven, Conn., 1953), p. 182.

³²Carl I. Hovland, Irving L. Janis, and Harold H. Kelly, Communication and Persuasion: Psychological Studies of Opinion Change (New Haven, Conn., 1953), p. 182.

positive correlations, with the more intelligent men being more influenced by propaganda than the less intelligent men.

Such studies suggest the possibility that differences between intelligence levels might be expected. It would be possible to expect that those people with a higher grade achievement level might have a tendency to be influenced to a larger degree by the "desirable" speech of introduction. However, while numerical differences in this study were in this expected direction, no significant difference occurred between the grade achievement levels analyzed.

Analysis of Initial Opinion

The successful use of the Woodward Shift-of-Opinion ballot involves, to some extent, the individual's initial position on the scale. The major conclusion concerning initial opinion drawn from this study was that a higher proportion of people who were initially undecided shifted to the side advocated by the proposition than those who were initially opposed or were initially favorable to the proposition.

This study shows that for every opinion shift that occurred in the group initially favorable to the proposition, two and two-thirds opinion shifts occurred in the group initially undecided about the proposition. Also, for every opinion shift that occurred in the group initially opposed to the proposition, three opinion shifts occurred in the group initially undecided about the proposition.

These results supported the findings of Woodward³³ in his study of the ballot, in which he concluded that people initially undecided shift twice as much as people initially opposed or initially in favor of the proposition. These results supported the need for careful matching of the comparison groups on initial opinion when a shift of opinion ballot is used in this type of research.

Analysis of Mean Scores of the Introductions

A significant difference at the 1% level occurred between the mean scores given the speeches of introduction by the two experimental groups. The mean score for the "desirable" introduction was 3.65 (3 would be average on the scale used), and for the "undesirable" introduction the mean score was 3.17. This result supported the work done early in the study in attempting to prepare introductions that were assumed to be different.

Since the content of the two speeches was nearly constant, the manner in which the information was presented, apparently, caused a difference in reaction as measured by the rating scale and the shift-of-opinion ballot. This result indicates that these experimental audiences were able to distinguish between "desirable" and "undesirable" speeches of introduction and to react accordingly.

³³Woodward, p. 107.

Analysis of Mean Scores and the Persuasive Speech

The mean rating scores on the persuasive speech by the three experimental groups were not significantly different. This result further supports the major conclusion of this study by indicating that the three audiences which rated the same persuasive speech similar in effectiveness, still had their opinions affected by the speech of introduction they heard.

Implications for Further Research

The first suggestion for further research is the repetition of this study, using a different speech and different experimental subjects.

Another suggestion for further research is that a similar study be done in which each of the three criteria for a "desirable" speech of introduction would be varied separately. In this way it might be possible to determine whether the conclusions are influenced by a single factor, and, if so, which one.

Still another suggestion for research is that a similar study could be done with a retention test used as the measure of effectiveness for the persuasive speech.

Summary of Results

1. A persuasive speech preceded by a "desirable" speech of introduction resulted in significantly more opinion

shift than the same speech preceded by an "undesirable" speech of introduction.

2. A persuasive speech preceded by a "desirable" speech of introduction resulted in significantly more attitude shift than the same speech without a speech of introduction.

3. There was no significant difference between the shift of opinion which resulted from a persuasive speech preceded by an "undesirable" speech of introduction and the same speech with no introduction.

4. There was no significant difference in opinion shift between men and women in their reaction to "desirable" and "undesirable" speeches of introduction.

5. A significantly larger proportion of subjects initially undecided shifted their opinions than subjects initially favorable to the proposition.

6. A significantly larger proportion of subjects initially undecided shifted their opinions than subjects initially opposed to the proposition.

7. There was no significant difference in opinion shift between those individuals whose grades were in the upper one-fourth of the group and those individuals whose grades were in the lower one-fourth of the group.

8. The group hearing the "desirable" speech of introduction rated this introduction significantly higher than the group hearing the "undesirable" speech of introduction.

9. There was no significant difference among the mean scores recorded on the persuasive speech rating scale by the three experimental groups.

LITERATURE CITED

BOOKS

- Baird, A. Craig, and Franklin H. Knower. Essentials of General Speech. 1st ed. New York, 1952.
- Brigance, William A. Speech Composition. New York, 1947.
- Brigance, William H. Speech: Its Techniques and Disciplines In a Free Society. New York, 1952.
- Bryant, Donald C., and Karl R. Wallace. Oral Communication: A Short Course in Speaking. New York, 1954.
- Bryant, Donald C., and Karl R. Wallace. Fundamentals of Public Speaking. New York, 1947.
- Cochran, William G., and Gertrude M. Cox. Experimental Designs. 2nd ed. New York, 1957.
- Dickens, Milton. Speech: Dynamic Communication. New York, 1954.
- Edwards, Allen L. Experimental Design in Psychological Research. New York, 1956.
- Edwards, Allen L. Statistical Methods for the Behavioral Sciences. New York, 1954.
- Glasgow, George M. Dynamic Public Speaking. New York, 1950.
- Gilman, Wilbur E., Bower Aly, and Loren D. Reid. The Fundamentals of Speaking. New York, 1951.
- Hovland, Carl I., Irving L. Janis, and Harold H. Kelley. Communication and Persuasion: Psychological Studies of Opinion Change. New Haven, Conn., 1953.
- McBurney, James H., and Ernest J. Wraga. Guide to Good Speech. Englewood Cliffs, N. J., 1953.
- McBurney, James H., and Ernest J. Wraga. The Art of Good Speech. New York, 1953.
- McCall, Ray C. Fundamentals of Speech. New York, 1949.

- Lindquist, E. R. A First Course in Statistics: Their Use and Interpretation in Education and Psychology. Revised ed. Cambridge, Mass., 1941.
- Monroe, Alan H. Principles and Types of Speech. 4th ed. Chicago, 1955.
- Monroe, Alan H. Principles of Speech. Revised Brief ed. Chicago, 1951.
- Mouat, Lawrence H. A Guide to Effective Public Speaking. Boston, 1953.
- Murray, Elwood, Raymond H. Barnard, and J. V. Garland. Integrative Speech. New York, 1953.
- Sandford, William P., and William H. Yeager. Principles of Effective Speaking. 5th ed. New York, 1950.
- Weaver, Andrew T., and Ordean G. Ness. The Fundamentals and Forms of Speech. New York, 1957.
- White, Eugene E., and Clair R. Henderlinder. Practical Public Speaking: A Guide to Effective Communication. New York, 1954.
- Yeager, Willard H. Effective Speaking for Every Occasion. 2nd ed. New York, 1957.
- Young, Pauline V. Scientific Social Surveys and Research. Englewood Cliffs, N. J., 1956.

PERIODICALS

- Haiman, Franklyn S. "An Experimental Study of the Effects of Ethos in Public Speaking," Speech Monographs, XVI, 2 (1949), 190-202.
- Millson, William A. D. "Experimental work in Audience Reaction," Quarterly Journal of Speech, XVIII (1932), 13-30.
- Monroe, Alan H. "The Measurement and Analysis of Audience Reaction to Student Speakers," Studies in Attitude Change, Bulletin of Purdue University, Studies in Higher Education, XXVIII, 1a. (1936).

44
Paulson, Stanley F. "The Effects of the Prestige of the Speaker and Acknowledgement of Opposing Arguments on Audience Retention and Shift of Opinion," Speech Monographs, XXI, 4 (1954), 267-271.

Woodward, Howard S. "The Measurement and Analysis of Audience Opinion," Quarterly Journal of Speech, XIV, 1 (1928), 94-111.

APPENDIX A

LIST OF TEXTBOOKS CONSULTED THAT DID NOT
MENTION SPEECHES OF INTRODUCTION

- Baird, A. Craig, and Franklin H. Knower. General Speech: An Introduction. New York, 1949.
- Barnes, Harry G., and Loretta Wagner Smith. Speech Fundamentals. New York, 1953.
- Black, John W., and Wilbur E. Moore. Speech: Code, Meaning, and Communication. New York, 1955.
- Brown, Charles T. Introduction to Speech. Chicago, 1955.
- Fessenden, Seth A., and Wayne N. Thompson. Basic Experiences in Speech. New York, 1951.
- Lomas, Charles W., and Ralph Richardson. Speech: Idea and Delivery. Boston, 1956.
- Nichols, Ralph C., and Thomas R. Lewis. Listening and Speaking: A Guide to Effective Oral Communication. Dubuque, Iowa, 1954.
- Powers, David G. Fundamentals of Speech. New York, 1951.
- Smith, Raymond G. Principles of Public Speaking. New York, 1958.
- Soper, Paul L. Basic Public Speaking. New York, 1949.
- Thompson, Wayne N. Fundamentals of Communication: An Integrated Approach. New York, 1957.
- Thomssen, Lester, and Howard Gilkinson. Basic Training in Speech. 2nd ed. Boston, 1953.

APPENDIX B

"DESIRABLE" SPEECH OF INTRODUCTION

Ladies and gentlemen. Foreign aid has been a major concern of our government since the end of World War II in Europe. The recent session of Congress, with its extended discussion of foreign aid by the legislators and the administration demonstrated again the importance of this topic. In a world of so many conflicts, understanding the part played by foreign aid is extremely important to each of us.

Our speaker has had a great deal of experience in foreign affairs, as well as in business. He is graduated from Washington University with a B. A. in political science and received his M. A. degree from Harvard University Schools of Business. At the present time he is special assistant on the foreign affairs council of our government. Before going into government service he served as a business consultant with several of the large organizations including the General Mills Corporation. He is a member of Rotary, the Better Business Association, National Literary Guild, and the American Association for Better Government.

Foreign aid has always been of high importance to our speaker. He has traveled to many parts of the world and he and his family recently returned after living with the people of the underdeveloped countries of Asia, including six months

in India. He saw for himself what these people need, how they think, and what they do. Despite his awareness of this need, he realizes the tax situation of the American people.

Our speaker, Mr. John Randall.

APPENDIX C

"UNDESIRABLE" SPEECH OF INTRODUCTION

Ladies and gentlemen. As president of the local better business association, as an interested party in government and particularly in foreign aid, I have the privilege of introducing to you the speaker of the day.

Before coming here today I commented to my family, that I felt very inadequate to come before such a distinguished group. I hope I can tell you about this distinguished speaker.

I don't know exactly what the speaker wishes to say about foreign aid, but it's my opinion that foreign aid needs to be continued. At least to some of the countries of Asia. Yet, I see no need for some of this foolishness, the wastefulness that is going on. For our own good, I suppose, we should give some of our money; but let's do it on a businesslike basis.

This gentleman is a noted authority in the field of foreign affairs. He is graduated from Harvard University and Washington University in political science and business. He is now a consultant with the government, a widely read, well traveled, intellectual humanitarian. He has met the heads of the major countries of the world, visited with the common people of the underdeveloped countries--he knows how these people think. He is truly an expert.

It is now my privilege and honor to present to you a great speaker, an outstanding American, the man who should know all there is to know about foreign aid--the distinguished Mr. John Randall.

APPENDIX D

RATING SCALE

SPEECH OF INTRODUCTION

Age _____

Sex _____ M _____ F

Circle the number that best indicates your opinion on the following questions.

1. Which one of the speeches of introduction focused attention on the speaker rather than on the person doing the introducing?

1. Speech No. 1.
2. Speech No. 2.
3. Both were the same.

2. Which one of the speeches of introduction focused attention on the subject without discussing it?

1. Speech No. 1.
2. Speech No. 2.
3. Both were the same.

3. Which one of the speeches of introduction established the speaker's prestige without embarrassing the speaker?

1. Speech No. 1.
2. Speech No. 2.
3. Both were the same.

4. Which one of the speeches of introduction left you with the most anticipation toward hearing the main speaker?

1. Speech No. 1.
2. Speech No. 2.
3. Both were the same.

5. Which one of the speeches of introduction was the most effective?

1. Speech No. 1.
2. Speech No. 2.
3. Both were the same.

APPENDIX F

PERSUASIVE SPEECH

Ladies and gentlemen. As you listened to the news today, how often do you remember hearing the words defense, security, economy, Russia or foreign policy? Yes, all these words are flashed in our ears along with the word peace. Peace is the goal, the ideal of the world. Yet, we find everyone has a different theory as to obtaining peace. Our foreign policy is geared for world-wide peace. And right now a big part of our foreign policy is foreign aid. We Americans feel it is our duty to help the free people of the world live.

The recent session of Congress passed a bill giving the administration 3 billion 400 million dollars for foreign aid--a billion dollars less than President Eisenhower asked for. Our foreign aid appropriation has been continually decreasing since 1951. In 1951 over 7 billion dollars were spent for foreign aid. That is 2 and $\frac{1}{2}$ billion dollars more than will be available in 1958.

Both the Republican and Democratic administrations have had a long and hard fight to pass any of the appropriation bills for foreign aid. Both Truman and Eisenhower appealed to Congress to stop its obvious desire to drop the program altogether. Again in 1957 Ike appealed for more money and again the amount was cut. So we see that our

foreign aid is decreasing, but our money is still vitally needed in many countries of the world. This is why I want to discuss with you our foreign aid policy. It is my belief that we should continue our foreign aid for the defense of the United States, for our own well-being and to protect our economy.

First of all let's consider our military defense. How can we protect ourselves with foreign aid? One of the most obvious examples is the Marshall plan in Europe. This plan healed the ravages of war. It has brought these war torn people hope. With their restoration it was possible for them to build their own defenses. This job is finished but there still remains many under-developed areas in the world. As I traveled in the Far East I saw many countries that need roads, better transportation systems, schools, dams--they still need our help, along with our military assistance.

On May 21, President Eisenhower used strong language in calling any further cut in the program a reckless gamble with peace and freedom. The Christian Science Monitor on August 10 stated: "American aid program is widely regarded as its biggest single postwar contribution to global foreign policy." The New York Times supports foreign aid decidedly by saying: "The welfare of the United States is tied upon our foreign aid."

South Korea needs our foreign aid for their defense--

thus our own defense. Viet Nam, India, Japan--for how soon would they fall into the hands of Russian Communism if we withdrew our aid? Our hope of protecting ourselves is the protection and support of all the free countries of the world. We have helped Europe stand up against the Red regime--now we must continue to help others from falling under the sickle of communism. Our foreign aid is needed for our defense.

A second reason for continuing foreign aid is that it is also needed to advance the future well-being of our own people. We must promote the best possible economic relationships with other free countries. It's time we faced the fact--that we are no longer self-sufficient. Just as you and I no longer can live by ourselves--neither can our country live by itself. We need essential raw materials for our industries. We need markets for our manufactured goods. Markets and materials that we do not have. All indications point to the fact that more and more we depend upon outside resources for our well-being. Thus we see the need to be on a cooperative basis with the countries that have these raw materials. These raw materials are often found in the unexplored regions of underdeveloped countries. Ladies and gentlemen, it is up to us to help these countries develop to their fullest extent. Help them build dams, roads, schools and their industries. We need to do this for our own well-being, for our industry and our economy.

which brings us to the third reason. I would like to discuss for the continuation of our foreign aid as the protection of our economy. We can benefit our economy by helping the underdeveloped countries build up their sources of trade. At the present time many of these countries have only food products to offer for trade--of course, that is just what we also have a surplus of. So we see they cannot buy our capital goods by trade. This situation, we find, is just the opposite in Russia. The Stalin regime emphasized production of capital goods, leaving Russia short in foods and fibers. Therefore the slogan, "Trade, not aid" is not an effective appeal when there is little or no possibility of trade. These countries are lacking in money for investment, technical personnel, adequate standards of living--in other words, everything necessary for industry.

The need for economic aid to the countries of Asia was stated by Ernest K. Lindley of Newsweek when he said, "The underdeveloped countries of Asia cannot support their fair share of the total defense burden without outside help. If we are to have a period of 'peaceful competition,' the free world must show its superiority by out-doing Communist nations in economic development."

Clarence Hanson, special government assistant and chairman of the council for foreign economic policy sums up the need for foreign aid by stating, "If these new countries

are important to us for the collective defense of the free world and for our own long-term economic development, we must take steps to advance our objectives. Economic assistance to such new countries is the only answer."

Foreign aid is a sound investment for the United States. Foreign aid must be continued for the nation's defense, for our own well-being and for our future economy.

Ladies and gentlemen, I want you to support foreign aid.

APPENDIX F

Fill in the following blanks.

Code No. _____

Age _____

Sex _____ M _____ F

Class of 19--

Circle the letter that best fits
your college grades:

A A- B+ B B- C+ C C- D+ D D-.

Indicate on this sheet your personal opinion on the following
proposition:

"The United States Government should continue its foreign
aid program."

_____ I agree with the above proposition.

_____ I am undecided.

_____ I disagree with the above proposition.

APPENDIX G

Code No. _____

Please now indicate your opinion on the following proposition.

"The United States Government should continue its foreign aid program."

_____ I agree more strongly with the above proposition.

_____ I agree with the above proposition.

_____ I am undecided.

_____ I disagree with the above proposition.

_____ I disagree more strongly with the above proposition.

Circle the number that best indicates your opinion about the following two questions.

1. I considered the speech of introduction:

1	2	3	4	5
Not		Average		Very
Effective		Effectiveness		Effective

2. I considered this speech:

1 2 3 4 5
Not Average Very
Effective Effectiveness Effective

APPENDIX II

Code No. _____

Please now indicate your opinion on the following proposition.

"The United States Government should continue its foreign aid program."

_____ I agree more strongly with the above proposition.

_____ I agree with the above proposition.

_____ I am undecided.

_____ I disagree with the above proposition.

_____ I disagree more strongly with the above proposition.

Circle the number that best indicates your opinion on this question.

2. I considered this speech:

1	2	3	4	5
Not		Average		Very
Effective		Effectiveness		Effective

"APPENDIX I-CONTINUED."

4		M	B	4		M	B
4		M	B	4		M	B
4		F	C	4		F	C
4		F	C	4		F	C
4		F	C	4		F	C
4	-	F	B	4		F	B
4		F	B	4		F	B
4		F	B	4		F	B
3*	+	F	B	3	+	F	B
3		F	C	3		F	C
3	+	M	C	3	+	M	C
3	+	M	C	3	+	M	C
3	+	M	C	3	+	M	C
3		M	C	3		M	C
3		M	C	3		M	C
3		M	B	3		M	B
3	+	M	B	3	+	M	B
3		M	B	3		M	B
3		M	B	3		M	B
4		M	C	4		M	C
4		M	C	4		M	C
4		M	C	4		M	C
4		M	C	4		M	C
4		M	C	4		M	C
4		M	C	4		M	C
4		M	C	4		M	C
4	+	M	C	4	+	M	C
2*	+	M	C	2	+	M	C
2		M	C	2		M	C
2		M	C	2		M	C
2		M	C	2		M	C
2	+	M	D	2	+	M	D
2	+	M	E	2	+	M	E
4	+	F	C	4		M	M
4		M	C	4		M	M
4		M	C	4		M	M
4		M	C	4		M	M

3*--undecided

2*--opposed

