

South Dakota State University

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

Electronic Theses and Dissertations

1961

A Study of the Problem of Exemption from the Basic Speech Course

Joyce E. Milliken

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

Recommended Citation

Milliken, Joyce E., "A Study of the Problem of Exemption from the Basic Speech Course" (1961). *Electronic Theses and Dissertations*. 2779.

<https://openprairie.sdstate.edu/etd/2779>

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.

**A STUDY OF THE PROBLEM OF EXEMPTION
FROM THE BASIC SPEECH COURSE**

BY

JOYCE E. MILLIKEN

**A research report submitted
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the
degree Master of Education, Department
of Speech, South Dakota State
College of Agriculture
and Mechanic Arts**

June, 1961

SOUTH DAKOTA STATE COLLEGE LIBRARY

2441 a

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The author wishes to express her appreciation to Dr. Donald Sikkink for his patient but critical advisement; the members of the speech staff, Clarence Denton, Gayland Draegert, Wayne Hoogestraat, and Paul Seymour for their willing cooperation in the experiment; Delia Howe for her patience and precise typing; and her husband, Robert, for his encouragement and critical suggestions.

J. E. M.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter	Page
I. INTRODUCTION	1
Statement of the Problem	1
Purpose of this Research	2
General Methods Employed	2
II. SURVEY OF BASIC COURSE EXEMPTION PROCEDURES IN OTHER SCHOOLS	4
Purpose	4
Method	4
Summary of Findings	5
Responses to the Questionnaire	5
Details of Procedures in Certain Schools	6
III. THE EXPERIMENT	11
Purpose	11
Method	11
Procedure for Collecting the Data	12
Analysis	13
Results	14
IV. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	18
Conclusions	18
The Survey	18
The Experiment	19
Recommendations	20

	Page
Implications for Further Research	20
LITERATURE CITED	22
APPENDICES	23
Double Card of Inquiry Sent to Schools	24
Letter to Schools Indicating They Had Information	25
Follow-Up Letter	26
Data Sheet	27
Rating Sheet	28
Follow-Up Message to Instructors	29
Scattergrams for Correlations	30

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
I. CO-EFFICIENTS OF CORRELATION OF THE STANDARD SCORE WITH EACH MEASURE	15
II. SCORES FOR ALL STUDENTS RECEIVING A "4" RATING	16

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Statement of the Problem

A four-credit basic speech course as a required part of the core curriculum at South Dakota State College became effective at the May 25, 1960, faculty meeting.¹ Those members of the Ad Hoc committee studying communication had received from the Speech Department a recommendation that the department be allowed to explore the adoption of a procedure by which "students of exceptional ability in speech be excused from the basic speech course if suitable measuring instruments and a feasible plan can be developed by the speech department." The committee verbally approved and encouraged that recommendation.²

As a result of this action, the proposed course description for the 1961-62 catalogue will include the following statement. "Students with a strong high school background in speech or previous training of some type in speech are encouraged to contact the department of speech concerning the method of securing an exemption from the basic course in order to take an advanced course as a substitute."³

¹South Dakota State College Faculty Bulletin, June 7, 1961. Official minutes of South Dakota State College faculty meeting on May 24.

²A Report to the Faculty of Recommendations Made on Core Curriculum, p. 4.

³Letter to Dr. Frank G. Schultz, Dean of Science and Applied Arts Division, from Dr. Donald E. Sikkink, Head of Speech Department, May 26, 1960.

A review of the professional journals in speech showed no studies which dealt directly with the problem of exemption. Thus this project was undertaken to provide information from which the speech department could evolve an exemption-advancement program for select students.

Purpose of this Research

It was the aim of this paper to investigate the problem of student exemption from the basic course in order to determine:

1. The extensiveness of such a policy in other institutions.
2. The measures used by other institutions in carrying out such a policy.
3. The most reasonable standard to measure the objectives of the basic course at South Dakota State College.
4. The ability of speech staff members to identify students who should be exempt.
5. The relationship between a measure of an oral performance and certain other available measures.
6. The desirability of an exemption program.

General Methods Employed

This paper involved two major methods of investigation: The field questionnaire and the controlled experiment.

The first method, discussed in detail in Chapter II, was in the form of a two-step fact-finding questionnaire: (1) A "yes-no" query including six questions was sent to 297 selected speech departments and

(2) an open-ended request for information about the program and procedure of exemption was sent to those schools indicating availability of material.

The second method, developed in Chapter III, involved the comparison of several possible measures of exemption, including a judgment by staff members of an oral performance with a standard established previous to the experiment. Measurement devices were selected which are accessible and which provide usable scores for all South Dakota State College students.

CHAPTER II

SURVEY OF BASIC COURSE EXEMPTION PROCEDURE IN OTHER SCHOOLS

Purpose

A survey of the literature available on the subject of basic course exemption indicated that little has been written on this topic. Thus, a survey of colleges and universities was undertaken (1) to determine the extent of exemption practice, (2) to analyze the methods used by institutions that practice exemption, (3) to study material validating their exemption program, and (4) to discover any published research done on this topic but not found by this writer.

Method

During the summer of 1960, 297 speech departments in colleges throughout the United States were selected from the Speech Association of America Directory on the basis of size and likelihood of having experimented with an exemption procedure. These institutions were sent questionnaire cards requesting yes-no answers to six questions inquiring into the practice (if any) by which students are exempted from the basic course in speech (Appendix A). Of these 297, 219 schools, 74 per cent, responded. A letter was sent to those schools which indicated they had "available material validating this exemption procedure," were "also studying the problem," and to those offering comments on the questionnaire cards. In all, twenty-eight letters were sent (Appendix B).

Twenty-five replied in an open-ended fashion to this request for a detailed explanation of an exemption program in practice or being studied.

Summary of Findings

Responses to the Questionnaire

Of the 219 institutions replying to the original questionnaire cards, a summary of the answers to the six questions asked is reported below. The difference in total number of responses for each item is due to phrasing the questions in such a way that a "no" answer at several points would make it unnecessary to provide further answers.

A basic course in speech was required of all or some of the students in 177 of the 219 institutions. (Of the 42 answering "no" to this question, no further information was asked.)

Of the 177 answering "yes" to question 1, 76 indicated that a particular procedure is used to exempt students from the basic course. (Of the 101 who answered negatively here, no further information was required.)

The procedure carries complete exemption from the basic course in 37 institutions, while 39 allow substitution of a higher level course or other means of fulfilling the requirement.

The exemption carries college credit in 19 institutions, while 42 indicated no credit was allowed for the exemption.

Thirteen institutions volunteered material to validate or explain their procedures, while nine others provided helpful comments on their

first correspondence. Six institutions indicated they are also studying the problem, and ten requested a summary of the results of this study. The results of the responses to a second communique in the form of an open-ended letter are discussed below. A follow-up request was sent to those few who did not at first respond (Appendix C).

Details of Procedures in Certain Schools

This section contained the procedures and practices explained by the people answering the request for an open-ended report of the exemption programs. It also included some comments from the original cards. A few of the letters returned indicated that the procedure explained was a process by which students needing remedial work in speech were detected. Since this is a problem altogether different from the exemption-for-superior-ability problem, these comments were excluded from the study.

Following are brief reviews of the procedures used by several schools.

At Iowa State Teachers College, under a plan adopted one year ago, all incoming students complete an "Inventory-Record" form and take a written examination over the subject matter of "speech knowledge." Those who satisfactorily pass the written test are given an oral examination. As a result of this, the student may (1) be given credit by this examination, (2) be excused from taking the course, without credit, or (3) enter an "Honors Section."

At New York University, University College of Arts and Sciences, the steps toward exemption include the following: (1) Score on the College Entrance Examination Board achievement test in English of over

600, (2) a written test over theory, and (3) an impromptu speech.

San Diego State has adopted a system by which the basic course is waived without credit or bypassed to a higher level course on the indication of outstanding ability shown in (1) "excellence in a given speech" or (2) "unusual previous experience." No criteria for these categories was offered.

At Baylor University all freshmen are required to take regular speech and hearing tests. Applicants for exemption must have passed this test. On a student's request, he is granted an interview with the head of the department during which time he is quizzed on background. On the basis of this interview, the department head makes the decision on exemption. Baylor began the program in the fall of 1960 and it is still in the planning stages.

A fairly detailed procedure is in practice at Colorado University which allows several alternatives. (1) High School speech courses can substitute for the basic course as a prerequisite for upper division courses. (2) A person who qualifies for the advanced oral communication course may request a special exemption examination consisting of a demonstration of basic platform speaking before two members of the department. (3) The student's advisor may, upon his own discretion, advise the student to by-pass and take a more advanced course.

The University of Minnesota has for some time used the policy of petition for either exemption from the basic course or credit by examination. Upon the approval of the department staff, the examination is given, consisting of an interview to determine background, a written

test over the text and an oral performance examination. The department is in the process of revamping the exemption policies.

Denison University offers a proficiency examination. This consists of a ten-minute prepared speech, an impromptu speech, and a written examination over the text. Occasionally, a student who has a strong high school speech background may "skip" the two-hour requirement.

The speech department at Macalester College administers a proficiency test, normally to all sophomores, unless they indicate they choose to take the course. Passing the proficiency test is the requirement for graduation. The test consists of an information sheet, a prepared speech, an interview session with the panel of judges, and oral reading. If the student does not pass the proficiency test, he has one of many courses recommended to him. The passing of the proficiency test is the requirement, and, while the speech courses are only recommended, the student usually takes them before he attempts the test a second time.

At Washington Square College, New York University, a similar plan is followed. Each student is required to take a speech test consisting "of a paragraph of general material, a series of loaded sentences, a verse of poetry, and samples of free speech elicited by questions on his background." About 50 per cent of the students are assigned to one of the three courses: Speech Improvement, Voice Improvement, or Effective Oral Communication.

At the University of Arkansas, exemption is initiated by the

student's requesting information. The student may be "written off" after a brief interview with the head of the department. If not, he is requested to present his case to a committee of three, who conduct a "semi-formal hearing." For this meeting, the student is asked to "be prepared to present his case by (1) stating his knowledge of the plan for exemption, (2) sketching in his background of previous training and experiences, (3) how this exemption would affect his plans for graduation The committee is free to interrupt at any point and ask for any additional information. The decision is made immediately."

Monmouth, Butler, and Bowling Green have policies of exemption which consist of a speech, oral reading and written examination.

Buena Vista exempts students on the basis of "exceptional students" rather than a standardized testing program.

Augustana of Rock Island allows the by-passing of the basic course to an advanced course, upon evidence of two years of high school speech. "Exceptional students," as identified by the instructor, are allowed to by-pass at the University of Illinois, University of California at Santa Barbara, and Idaho State College.

These reports indicated frequent use of the following procedures in the exemption programs in practice: Petition forms and information sheets; decisions based on college placement test, English proficiency test, academic record, and evidence of sufficient speech work in high school; oral performance, including original speech and/or oral reading; written test over subject matter.

Evident in the replies from these schools was a concern about the

problem of developing an efficient procedure which is reliable and yet provides an advantage to enough students to justify its operation. Many reporters, after presenting the fundamentals of the process, lamented its fallacies. New York University indicated only about a dozen in 400 freshmen are exempted. The University of Arkansas and San Diego State indicated only about five per cent of the students are affected. At Baylor there are only three or four requests each year. Denison has had "no takers" for this petition. The University of Minnesota is revamping because "the whole thing is a mess and does not work very well."

With these indications from people who have worked with the problem, it was evident that while exemption procedure is a difficult problem there would be much value in further study of the possible measures which might be used.

CHAPTER III

THE EXPERIMENT

Purpose

The literature on the subject of exemption contained only a few studies which correlated judged speech ability and other possible measures of speech ability. No research was found which definitely established a reliable and efficient method by which a student might be exempted from the basic course and allowed to substitute a higher level speech course to fulfill the requirement in speech.

The survey of a sample of departments of speech revealed that those few schools which had an organized program of exemption had established such a procedure without an extensive program of research.

Because of the limited information available on this topic, it was the purpose of this part of the study to explore a procedure by which exemption might be granted. This pilot study, if successful in indicating possible trends, can be followed by further studies in the Department of Speech at South Dakota State College.

Method

Subjects for the experiment were 113 members of the Speech 10 course, winter quarter, 1961.

The measures collected for each student included (1) an evaluation of one oral assignment, (2) the verbal score on the School and College Aptitude Test (hereafter referred to as SCAT), (3) the total

score on the SCAT, (4) the English placement test given and standardized locally, (5) the story comprehension score on the Trigg's Diagnostic Reading Test, (6) vocabulary test score on the Trigg's Reading Test, and (7) total comprehension scores on the Trigg's Reading Test, (8) answers to a background data sheet dealing with high school speech course work, (9) answers on same sheet dealing with high school extra-curricular speech, and (10) a total score on background (including information on out of school speech activity).

These measures were compared with a judgment of speech ability made by the instructor after nine class periods. This standard was chosen on the assumption that this extended observation was the most reliable measure that can be established of the student's speech ability.

Procedure for Collecting the Data

Shortly before the quarter began, the staff who were to be teaching the students with which the study would be concerned were given the following instructions.

First Period

1. Each instructor, on the first day of class, will pass out data sheets to be filled out by all students (Appendix A). These you will collect and give to me, without studying them. (I will return these after the third class period).
2. The instructor will assign a two to three minute speech due during the second class period with the following instructions:

"This speech will be a two to three minute speech and will be given next class period."

Further explanation should be avoided, but, if necessary, should indicate only that it is for the purpose of observing the level of ability before any instruction.

Second Period

3. At the beginning of class period two, announce that the time clock will ring at the end of three minutes. Each instructor will listen to the assigned speech, rating each student on the chart on page 2 (Appendix B). I am asking you to take no steps to acquaint yourselves with the students until after you have returned these rating sheets to me.

After Ninth Period

4. Immediately following the ninth class period, each instructor will be asked to complete the second rating sheet which I will give you. Avail yourself of any and all information about your students which will enhance your rating of the student at this time. Please reread the objectives of the course before rating of the students. Return these sheets to me.

Materials needed (Appendices D and E) were given to the instructors. A reminder note (Appendix F) was put out two days before the ninth class period. These instructions were carried out.

Analysis

The data sheets and first rating sheets were returned to the author immediately. This information, along with the other scores listed above and acquired from the permanent files in the office of Student Personnel, was placed on IBM cards. Correlations were run between the standard of speech ability (ninth period evaluation) and each of the ten possible measures of speech ability. The Pearson product moment coefficient of correlation was calculated and these were tested for significance at either the 1 per cent or 5 per cent levels.

In addition, a limited case analysis was made of the fifteen students who received a rating of "4" (has superior ability) in either the initial or the standard rating or both. The purpose of such analysis was to see if there were specific contrasts in any of the tests for this

subgroup.

Results

The results of the experimental study of the ten possible measures of speech ability are given in Table I. The results of the limited case analysis are given in Table II. Scattergrams for each of the correlations are shown in Appendix G.

1. The correlation between the standard and the first speech was .41, significant at the 1 per cent level.
2. The correlation between the standard and the verbal score on the SCAT was .35, significant at the 1 per cent level.
3. The correlation between the standard and the question "Have you participated in extracurricular speech?" was .34, significant at the 1 per cent level.
4. The correlation between the standard and total comprehension on the reading test was .29, significant at the 1 per cent level.
5. The correlation between total background score (including a question on out of school speech activity) and the standard was .19, significant at the 5 per cent level.
6. The correlation between the background question dealing with high school speech course and the standard was .15, not significant.
7. The correlation between the total SCAT score and the standard was .13, not significant.

TABLE I. CO-EFFICIENTS OF CORRELATION OF THE STANDARD SCORE
WITH EACH MEASURE

	Number of subjects	r	Level of significance
Evaluation of a speech	113	.41	.01
SCAT--verbal	94	.35	.01
Background--extracurricular	113	.34	.01
Reading--total comprehension	112	.29	.01
Background--total	113	.19	.05
Background--high school courses	113	.15	Not significant
SCAT--total	94	.13	Not significant
Reading--story comprehension	112	.09	Not significant
Reading--vocabulary	112	.05	Not significant
English placement	103	.04	Not significant

TABLE II. SCORES FOR ALL STUDENTS
RECEIVING A "4" RATING

Standard	Speech	SCAT		English	Reading			Background			
	Evaluation	Verbal	Total	Placement	Story	Vocab	Comp	1	2	3	Total
4	4	52	84	102	16	37	70	1	3	0	4
4	4	53	89	90	16	37	70	2	2	0	4
4	4	57	105	91	20	32	68	1	0	0	1
4	4	50	90	107	18	53	90	0	0	0	0
4	4	59	96	---	19	44	81	0	3	0	3
*4	3	29	70	65	16	38	71	0	3	0	3
4	3	56	106	109	19	53	89	3	3	0	6
4	3	50	99	111	20	54	92	0	2	1	3
4	2	61	99	67	18	41	77	1	0	0	1
3	4	44	65	66	16	50	80	2	3	1	6
3	4	50	96	108	20	55	90	1	3	1	5
3	4	53	97	59	17	41	76	0	0	0	0
3	4	39	80	78	15	37	64	2	0	0	2
3	4	38	68	90	14	27	56	1	0	0	1
3	4	45	94	80	20	45	81	1	3	1	5
3	4	21	58	30	8	24	45	0	2	0	2
3	4	--	---	61	12	42	68	2	1	0	3
2	4	41	78	91	20	41	72	1	0	0	1
2	4	49	92	87	20	45	83	1	0	0	1

*A foreign student who likely used English as a second language at the time of testing.

8. The correlation with Reading Story comprehension was .09, not significant.
9. The correlation between the Reading Vocabulary score and the standard was .05, not significant.
10. The correlation between the English Placement test and the standard was .04, not significant.
11. All subjects receiving a "4" on the standard rating, with the exception of a student having a language barrier, had raw scores on the verbal SCAT scale of 50 (seventy-fifth percentile). (Table II)
12. The other scores in Table II revealed no pattern that could be used for prediction.

CHAPTER IV

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The author of this study was concerned with the problem of exemption from the required basic course in oral communication at South Dakota State College. A survey of the professional journals in speech showed no studies which dealt directly with this problem. The two methods used to study the problem were a survey of speech departments and an experiment with students in the first quarter of the basic oral communication course.

Conclusions

The Survey

The data acquired from the institutions involved in the survey revealed that the following are common elements in exemption procedures: Petition forms, information sheets, college placement tests, English proficiency tests, academic records, evidence of sufficient work in speech in high school, oral performances, and written tests over subject matter in the basic course.

The following could tentatively be concluded from the exemption programs reported in Chapter II:

1. No institution describing the practice of an exemption program reported any research to support the procedure followed.
2. Most schools reporting on their practice of exemption suggested that the small number of students affected did not

warrant the function.

3. Several institutions indicated that fallacies in the system made it undesirable and indicated need and plan for further study and revision of the program in practice.

The Experiment

The study of the possible measures of exemption suggested these conclusions:

1. The highest correlation was between the standard rating and the evaluation of the speech performance. This correlation coefficient was .41, which is statistically significant, but not high enough to be a completely satisfactory predictor for individual exemption.
2. The correlation of .35 between the standard rating and the verbal SCAT score indicated that further study of this score as a probable screening measure could be made. The analysis of the total scores on all students receiving a "4" rating revealed that those receiving the "4" rating on the standard scale (with the exception of one student having a language barrier) had raw scores of 50 or more, placing them within the fourth quartile. Of the 10 students who received a "4" on the evaluation but not on the standard, only two had scores of over 50. This suggests that a cut-off point of 50 might be used as part of a screening measure.
3. The low but significant correlations found between the standard and background questions dealing with extracurricular

work in speech and the total speech background indicated that this item might be pursued as a possible screening measure in an exemption procedure.

4. The other measures studied should probably be rejected as having correlations too low to be of value.

Recommendations

It is the opinion of the author that this study does not justify, without further substantiating research, the adoption of an exemption program at South Dakota State College. However, this study lends evidence to the assumption that an oral performance test is the most reliable measure of speaking ability. Such a test should most reasonably be the last step in any exemption process. This could be preceded by the use of a combined consideration of a background information sheet and a verbal SCAT score. The information from the schools using exemption indicates that the petition is the most functional method of initiating the process.

Implications for Future Research

Members of the staff who participated in the study were asked to give their reactions, criticisms, and suggestions for further research. Following is a summary of the items offered by the staff.

1. The list of objectives for speech evaluation seemed less than comprehensive. Therefore, an evaluation in terms of these objectives might not reflect the instructor's total reaction

to the "test speech."

2. There might be some more appropriate "test" than a random speech. The estimate of the level of ability might be more valid if the test included experiences in each type of oral performance offered in the course.
3. There seems to be a "built in" limitation in an oral test speech. The consideration of speech theory, criticism, speaker-audience relationships, etc. also have a bearing on a student's success.
4. There needs to be a higher degree of agreement among the instructors concerning criteria for judging speakers.
5. It would be desirable to add to the list of possible measures such tests as the "sociability" scale of the Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory.
6. It might be helpful to run a correlation between the standard and Gilkinson's Speaker Confidence Scale.
7. The author adds to this list the need to rework the rating scale used in evaluating the subjects. At the time these were returned, several instructors expressed their difficulty in adequately reacting to the student's performance with this scale.

In conclusion, it is the hope of the author that the results of this study may provide the groundwork which would guide the staff in a more complete evaluation of the problem of exemption.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Ball, Joe M. "The Relationship between the Ability to Speak Effectively and the Primary Mental Abilities, Verbal Comprehension and General Reasoning," Speech Monographs. XXV (November, 1958), 285.
- Cochran, John R. "A Validated Battery of Tests of Speaking and Listening Ability," Speech Monographs. (June, 1960), 81.
- Goyer, Robert Stanton. "A Study of Individual Differences in Ability and Achievement of College Students in the Organization of Ideas," unp. diss. (Ohio State, 1956).
- Kramer, Edward John Joseph. "The Relationships of the Wechsler-Bellevue and A.C.E. Intelligence Tests with Performance Scores in Speaking and the Brown-Carlson Listening Comprehension Test," unp. diss. (Florida State, 1956).
- Platt, James Harvey. "A Study of Personality Factors Common to Speaking, Listening, Writing, and Reading," unp. diss. (Denver, 1955).
- Report to the Faculty of Recommendations Made on Core Curricula. (South Dakota State College Ad Hoc Committee Report, 1960).
- Seymour, Paul J. A Student Handbook in Oral Communication. Brookings, South Dakota, 1960.
- Smith, Paul W. "An Experimental Study of Three Screening Tests for Speech Placement," unp. diss. (Southern California, 1954).
- South Dakota State College Faculty Bulletin. June 7, 1961.
- Stites, William Harrison. "A Study of Some Factors Relating to Speaking Effectiveness of the Basic Communication Students of the University of Denver," unp. thesis (Denver, 1948).

APPENDICES

Double card of inquiry sent to schools

Letter to schools indicating they had information

Follow-up letter

Data sheet

Rating sheet

Follow-up message to instructors

Scattergrams for correlations

APPENDIX A

DOUBLE CARD OF INQUIRY

TO: Head of Speech Department

The Speech Department of South Dakota State College is conducting research regarding the exemption of qualified students from the basic course. Your cooperation in returning the attached card will be appreciated.

Sincerely,
Donald E. Sikkink
Head of Department

School _____

1. Is a basic course in speech required of all or part of your institution's students? YES ___ NO ___
2. (If "yes" to 1) Do you follow a particular procedure by which students may be exempted from this requirement? YES ___ NO ___
3. (If "yes" to 2) Does this mean complete exemption from any speech requirement? YES ___ NO ___
4. (If "no" to 3) Does this involve substitution of higher level courses or other means of completing the requirement? YES ___ NO ___
5. (If "yes" to 2) Does the policy of exemption provide college credit? YES ___ NO ___
6. (If "yes" to 2) Do you have available materials validating this exemption procedure? YES ___ NO ___

APPENDIX B

LETTER TO SCHOOLS INDICATING THEY HAD INFORMATION

Professor Robert E. Will
University of Rhode Island
Speech Department
Kingston, Rhode Island

Dear Professor Will:

This summer you received a postcard form from us requesting brief information concerning basic course exemption procedure. We sent this card to 297 speech departments, and we have had a return of 208 to date. Of these, 169 indicated that the basic speech course is required of all or some of the students; 56 stated that a particular procedure is being used to exempt some students from the basic course. We appreciate this high rate of return and you have our thanks for that cooperation.

South Dakota State College has a college-wide requirement of four quarter-hours of basic speech. The faculty feels that exceptional students should be exempt from this basic requirement and permitted to take an advanced course. Our main purpose in the postcard survey was to find those schools which have dealt with a similar problem.

Yours was one of those institutions indicating you may have some information and would be willing to correspond with us. We had hoped to prepare a questionnaire you could complete. However, we find a questionnaire would restrict your response too much. Thus, we are sending you this open request for material and information.

Would you send us any forms, tests, results of studies, committee reports, etc., that deal with the topic of basic course exemption? Also, we would very much appreciate corresponding with you in an effort to get your ideas, views, and opinions on how your program works or will work.

We realize that you are busy and that our request will take valuable time. Yet we hope, because of the importance of the topic and your own apparent interest, that we can count on your cooperation. Anything we can learn from the institutions included will help and will be shared with you.

Sincerely,

Donald Sikkink, Head
Department of Speech

APPENDIX C

FOLLOW-UP LETTER

January 11, 1961

Dr. Robert E. Will
Speech Department
University of Rhode Island
Kingston, Rhode Island

Dear Professor Will:

In answer to a questionnaire we sent you this summer, you indicated you had information available for us regarding the process of exemption you use in your basic course requirement. The first of October, we wrote requesting any forms, tests, results of studies, committee reports, or anything you may have which deals with the problem of exemption. Perhaps you mislaid the letter.

We are beginning to compile this information and would appreciate your sending us the material you have.

Sincerely,

Donald Sikkink, Head
Department of Speech

DS:dh

APPENDIX D

DATA SHEET

Name _____

Date enrolled at SDSC _____

Have you had a speech course in high school? yes _____ no _____

1 semester _____

1 year _____

more _____

Have you participated in extracurricular speech? yes _____ no _____

(Indicate the number of semesters in each activity below)

Acting part in play _____

Original oratory, extemporaneous speaking, debate _____

Declamatory speaking _____

Other _____
(Explain)

Have you had out-of-school speaking experience? yes _____ no _____

APPENDIX E

RATING SHEET

Objectives of the course:

1. The ability to do adequate and accurate research for the speech situation through listening, reading, and direct observation.
2. The ability to critically evaluate, select, and organize the information obtained for the speech situation.
3. The ability to effectively use the voice, body, and language in the speech situation.

CATEGORIES:

1--has almost no ability	2--has limited ability	3--has acceptable ability	4--has superior ability
-----------------------------	---------------------------	---------------------------------	-------------------------------

(Circle the number which classifies the speaker)

NAME

1. _____	1	2	3	4
2. _____	1	2	3	4
3. _____	1	2	3	4
4. _____	1	2	3	4
5. _____	1	2	3	4
6. _____	1	2	3	4
7. _____	1	2	3	4

APPENDIX F

FOLLOW-UP MESSAGE TO INSTRUCTORS

TO: Instructors of Speech 10
FROM: Joyce Milliken
SUBJECT: Experiment with Speech 10 Students

Wednesday and Thursday (February 1 and 2) are the ninth class periods of your classes. Attached to this notice are sufficient copies of the evaluation sheet for you to use one for each section. Please follow this procedure.

Immediately following the ninth class period, please read again the objectives of the basic course. With this in mind, and availing yourself of any and all information you choose (grade book, personal data sheets, criticisms of speeches, etc.), evaluate the student on the scale. I would like to have these by late afternoon, Thursday, if possible.

Thank you for your cooperation.

APPENDIX G**SCATTERGRAMS**

1. First speech to standard
2. Verbal SCAT score to standard
3. Background question 2 to standard
4. Total reading comprehension to standard
5. Total background score to standard
6. Background question 1 to standard
7. Total SCAT to standard
8. Story comprehension to standard
9. Reading vocabulary to standard
10. English placement to standard

1. FIRST SPEECH EVALUATION

		1	2	3	4	$r = .41$
Standard	4		1	3	5	
	3	1	10	17	8	
	2	4	23	30	2	
	1	1	5	3		

2. VERBAL SCAT

		10-19	20-29	30-39	40-49	50-59	$r = .35$
Standard	4			1		6	
	3		4	5	7	12	
	2	1		17	19	7	
	1			1	3	1	

3. BACKGROUND QUESTION 2

	0	1	2	3
Standard				
4	3		2	4
3	14	5	6	11
2	3	7	13	9
1	7	2		

$r = .34$

4. TOTAL COMPREHENSION

	40-49	50-59	60-69	70-79	80-89	90-99
Standard						
4			1	4	2	2
3	2	3	7	7	13	4
2	1	2	11	21	18	5
1			4	3	2	

$r = .29$

5. BACKGROUND TOTAL

		0	1	2	3	4	5	6	
Standard									$r = .19$
4		1	2		3	2		1	
3		6	7	9	3	3	5	3	
2		13	18	6	16	4	2		
1		2	6		1				

6. BACKGROUND QUESTION 1

		0	1	2	3	$r = .15$
Standard						
4	4	4	3	1	1	
3	3	14	14	8		
2	2	29	26	3	1	
1	1	4	5			

7. TOTAL SCAT

	40-49	50-59	60-69	70-79	80-89	90-99	100-109	
Standard								$r = .13$
4				1	2	3	1	
3	2	3	5	7	6	7	3	
2	1	3	8	17	7	10	3	
1			2	1	2			

8. STORY COMPREHENSION

	6-8	9-11	12-14	15-17	18-20	
Standard						$r = .09$
4				3	6	
3	1	2	8	13	13	
2		2	6	28	21	
1			2	5	2	

9. READING VOCABULARY

	20-29	30-39	40-49	50-59	
Standard					$r = .05$
4		4	2	3	
3	3	8	16	9	
2	1	17	24	16	
1	1	4	3	1	

10. ENGLISH PLACEMENT

	30-39	40-49	50-59	60-69	70-79	80-89	90-99	100-109	110-119	
Standard										$r = .04$
4				2			3	3	1	
3	3	2	1	6	7	2	7	4		
2		1	7	14	9	6	4	10	3	
1	1	1		2	1	3	1			