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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Origin and Statement of the Problem

There are few vocations that utilize speaking skills as frequently as those of the teacher and the minister. Because of his belief in the importance of his message, Professor Frederick Manthey, instructor at Martin Luther Academy, said, "A Christian will do his utmost to further the message of the Gospel in order that this saving message may not be hindered." As a result, it would seem appropriate that young men and young women preparing for the preaching, teaching, or lay ministry of the church would certainly have need for speech training.

Therefore, the purpose of this study was to determine how completely the speech education offered in the private high schools of the Wisconsin Evangelical Lutheran Synod during the 1968-1969 school year met the criteria provided by the Speech Association of America.

This particular group was chosen for three reasons. First, the high schools of the Wisconsin Evangelical Lutheran Synod (hereafter referred to as WEIS) are concerned with preparing students for the preaching, teaching, or lay ministry of the church. Secondly, as a member of WEIS and the wife of a pastor, I have a special personal concern that our schools do all they can to prepare our
laymen, teachers, and ministers to be effective communicators. The third and final reason this particular group was selected for study was the lack of information available concerning the speech education programs in the WEIS high schools.

Procedure to be Followed

Survey of Literature

A survey was conducted to discover previous studies relating to high school speech programs. The following publications were consulted:


As a result of this survey, five studies were discovered which appeared to treat subject matter similar to the current study. They were:
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However, upon closer examination it was discovered that only the Hoebel study was similar in subject matter to the present inquiry.

The Hoebel study was an attempt to discover certain information about the speech programs in the Lutheran High Schools of the Wisconsin and Missouri Synods. Hoebel divided his study into four categories: (1) course offerings, (2) extra-class activities, (3) teacher preparation, and (4) school philosophy concerning the value of speech to the student. The procedure he used to gather the information was a dual questionnaire—one questionnaire was sent to the principal in each of the forty-one secondary schools and one was sent to the speech teacher(s) in each of the schools. The format of the two questionnaires was the same, although the questions were different. Both questionnaires were organized according to the four categories listed above.

Briefly, the Hoebel study reported the following information concerning speech education in the Lutheran high schools of the Missouri and Wisconsin Evangelical Lutheran Synods.
1. A basic course in platform speaking was reported in only sixteen high schools. (Twenty-five teachers in forty-one schools reporting.) No advanced speech course in any of the twenty-five schools was reported.

2. Although student, faculty, and administration interest in extra-class activities was very good, actual opportunities for participation in such activities were somewhat limited.

3. Few of the teachers majored or minored in speech in college yet most of them felt adequately qualified to teach speech.

4. Although there was considerable appreciation on the part of the Lutheran educator of the value of speech in the curricula, problems of funds, scheduling, and adequate manpower stood in the way of a more adequate program of speech in the Lutheran secondary schools.

5. "there is much room for improvement in the secondary schools of the two synods."

Despite the Hoebel study, the present inquiry appears to be justified for several reasons. Hoebel included both the Wisconsin Evangelical Lutheran Synod and the Lutheran Church—Missouri Synod. In his reporting of data, Hoebel made no differentiation between the two Synods—thus there is no accurate record of the speech education program in the WELS high schools.

The Hoebel study was completed in 1964 and thus is over five years old. It is quite probable that there have been some changes in personnel as well as curriculum in the WELS high schools since 1964.

Hoebel reported an 82.9 percent return of his questionnaires, whereas, the present study represents a 100 percent return of the questionnaires. Thus the present study is a more complete record of the speech education programs in the WELS high schools.
Finally, the Hoebel study was conducted to determine the nature and extent of speech education in Lutheran high schools. It was primarily a survey with no criteria used to evaluate the speech education programs reported. The present study uses criteria provided by the Speech Association of America to evaluate the speech education program within the high schools.

Establishing of Criteria

The Speech Association of America provided the following two standards for the evaluation of the speech programs in high schools:


2. Speech Association of America, Teacher Certification Standards Adopted by the Speech Association of America at National Convention, December, 1968.

These two criteria were used to evaluate the speech education programs in the WELS high schools. A complete statement of the criteria is recorded in Chapter II.

Survey of High Schools

The names and current addresses of the twelve WELS high schools were procured from the 1969 Yearbook and Directory of the Wisconsin Evangelical Lutheran Synod,² so that information could be obtained from these schools. A list of names and addresses appears in Appendix A on page 68.

A questionnaire based on the Speech Association criteria was formulated in order to obtain the information necessary for an
evaluation of the speech education programs in WELS high schools. This questionnaire was mailed to the principals of the twelve high schools with the instructions that it should be completed by the staff member responsible for the speech program. In the event there was no speech program, the principal was instructed to complete the necessary information and return the questionnaire. Chapter III includes a detailed explanation of the questionnaire. A copy of the questionnaire appears in Appendix D on pages 71-81.

Tabulation of Results

Responses to each question and sub-question in the questionnaire were tabulated and integrated with other random items of evidence. From this data an evaluation was made as to how completely the speech education offered in the private high schools of the Wisconsin Evangelical Lutheran Synod during the 1968-69 school year met the criteria provided by the Speech Association of America.

Summary and Conclusions

A summary of the purposes, methods, and results of the study, and the conclusions drawn from the study are presented in Chapter IV.
FOOTNOTES

1 Frederick Manthey, "Improving our Gift of Speech", The Lutheran Educator, IX (February, 1969), p. 11.

CHAPTER II

CRITERIA

As was indicated in Chapter I, the evaluative criteria for the quality of speech education offered in the high schools of the Wisconsin Evangelical Lutheran Synod were procured from publications of the Speech Association of America.

Criteria for Evaluation of Speech I

The primary standard used to evaluate the speech education program was "Criteria to Evaluate Speech I in the Senior High School," The Speech Teacher Vol. XVII, No. 3, September, 1968. The authors of the article, Henrietta H. Cortright, Doris S. Niles, and Dorothy Q. Weirich, are all teachers in the field of speech. In addition, Miss Niles and Mrs. Weirich are members of the Editorial Advisory Board of The Speech Teacher.

The criteria, as recommended by these authors, were organized within the pattern set by the editors of Evaluative Criteria, a manual published each decade since 1940 by the National Study of Secondary School Evaluation. This manual has provided the bases for accreditation of all senior high schools in the United States except California.

The first three sections of the Cortright, Niles, and Weirich criteria included general and specific objectives for the
speech students as well as a discussion of the special characteristics of speech. Since this material was not relevant to the present inquiry, it was excluded from consideration. The following requirements were designated as essentials for the Speech I course:

1. Speech is [should be] designated as a separate subject field.
2. At least one semester of speech is [should be] provided for all students; one full year is desirable.
3. The personnel of the class is [should be] limited to students in the tenth, eleventh, and twelfth grades.
4. The maximum enrollment of the class is [should be] limited to twenty-five students (a goal of twenty is desirable) in order that each student may participate frequently and receive constructive criticism.
5. With emphasis upon individualized instruction, opportunities [should be] offered to students with varying abilities to learn from each other and to work together.
6. The class is [should be] scheduled to meet daily for a period of one hour.
7. In schools where a form of flexible or modular scheduling is used, the equivalent of five hours per week in basic speech training is [should be] required.
8. The fundamentals course is [should be] designed as a prerequisite for all other courses in the speech subject field, such as debate, dramatics, advanced interpretation, radio, and television.
9. The speech course is [should be] taught by a fully certified teacher accredited in speech.

Cortright, Niles, and Weirich suggested the following criteria to be used in evaluation of instructional procedures in the high school fundamentals of speech course:
1. Patterns of thought are [should be] taught.
   a. Clear, discriminating, perceptive patterns of thought are [should be] required.
   b. Independent and individual thinking is [should be] stressed.
   c. Various organizational patterns for development of speeches are [should be] studied.
   d. Valid research, accurate and careful use of authority and evidence, and original thought are [should be] used to support these organizational patterns.

2. Use of acceptable language is [should be] taught.
   a. Acceptable English usage is [should be] stressed.
   b. The development of a more extensive vocabulary, careful articulation and acceptable pronunciation, and a fine discrimination in the use of words are [should be] given attention.
   c. Language which is appropriate to the subject, the speaker, the audience, and the occasion is [should be] emphasized.
   d. The development of good oral style in speech composition is [should be] encouraged.
   e. Oral style, as distinguished from written style, is [should be] stressed.

3. The effective use of the voice is [should be] taught.
   a. The importance of voice in communication is [should be] emphasized.
   b. The characteristics of a good voice are [should be] stressed.
   c. The steps in voice production are [should be] presented.
   d. The basic skills in the use of voice quality, pitch, inflection, volume, force, projection, resonance, emphasis, and time including rate, pauses, and duration of syllables are [should be] developed.

4. The use of action is [should be] taught.
   a. Action to release and control muscular tension is [should be] explained and demonstrated.
b. Purposeful and meaningful action by the speaker is [should be] required.

c. Good coordination is [should be] developed in walk, posture, gestures, and facial expressions.

d. Poise and self-confidence are [should be] developed so that adjustment to changing situations and adaptations to different audiences can be made with ease.

e. Effective action is [should be] shown to be a powerful means of offering the audience a deeper understanding of the speaker's meaning.

f. Skill in the handling of audio-visual aids is [should be] developed.

g. The need for appropriate appearance is [should be] emphasized.

5. Skills of listening and observing are [should be] taught.

a. The purposes of listening and observing are [should be] presented.

b. Techniques for effective listening are [should be] stressed.

c. The ability to think clearly is [should be] developed.

d. The abilities to perceive critically, to weigh, and to evaluate are [should be] encouraged.

e. Thoughtful analysis and creative thinking are [should be] required of both the speaker and the listener.

6. Types of delivery are [should be] taught.

a. Extemporaneous delivery (carefully prepared but not memorized) is [should be] used in most formal speaking occasions.

b. Impromptu speaking is [should be] used in conversations and when thoughts and information are organized during the utterance.

c. Manuscripts are [should be] used in speaking and in reading aloud where precise wording is important.

d. Memorized material is [should be] used occasionally.
The authors of the criteria, recognizing that the elements of speech are learned through doing, suggested that all of the following should be included in a basic speech course to give balance of content and adequate opportunity for practice:

1. Students should participate in informal speech.
   a. Simple get-acquainted speeches of introduction are given to establish rapport.
   b. Personal experiences are shared to create interest.
   c. Courtesy speeches (presentation and acceptance, welcome and response, introduction and acknowledgement) are given to encourage poise and self-confidence.
   d. Concise directions and explicit announcements are given to develop clarity and accuracy in speaking and listening.

2. Students should make formal speeches.
   a. Speeches to interest and to entertain are given to achieve skill in gaining and holding attention, using humor appropriately, meeting such common occasions as after-dinner and luncheon talks.
   b. Speeches to inform are given to develop skill in organizing material, with special attention given to the development of the introduction, the body, and the conclusion of the speech.
   c. Speeches to inform using visual aids such as maps, charts, objects, are presented to gain skill in their use and to show that eyes supplement ears in increasing vividness and meaning.
   d. Speeches to stimulate, impress, inspire, or arouse are made to develop independent and original thinking on the part of the students, as well as to broaden their tolerance and widen their appreciation of the points of others.
   e. Speeches to convince are given to develop one side of an argument; to use evidence (facts, figures, and quotations with authority and exact source) to support the
argument; to develop logical thinking in the preparation of a brief.

f. Speeches to persuade, including sales talks, campaign talks, and fund-raising speeches, are (should be) made to show the relationship of persuasion to human wants and desires; to illustrate the dangers of fallacious appeals, spurious argument, and unethical evidence; and to gain an appreciation of the effect of the emotional appeal.

g. Interviews are (should be) conducted with special attention to dress and appearance, social amenities, and anticipation of questions to be asked and information to be needed in the interview situation.

h. Speeches for special occasions, i.e., eulogy, tribute, dedication, commemoration, are (should be) made to make clear the characteristics peculiar to this type.

3. Students (should) participate in group discussion.

a. Group discussion is (should be) used to stir interest, to develop group awareness, to encourage wide participation, and to instill confidence.

b. Buzz sessions are (should be) used to give many individuals a feeling of involvement and to gain as many original ideas as possible.

c. Panel discussions are (should be) structured to take the form of planned conversation; to use reflective thinking in order to find the solution to a current problem.

d. Forums (following film, debate, lecture, or symposium) are (should be) used to give the audience an opportunity to ask questions and gain information, and to establish a closer relationship between the audience and the participants.

e. The symposium is (should be) used to illustrate a formal type of program in which prepared speeches on various phases of a related subject are used, and the audience is given an opportunity to question each speaker at the close of the program.

4. Students (should) participate in parliamentary procedure. Parliamentary procedure is (should be) used, in the classroom and in related school activities, to teach the standard procedures for conducting business, the order in which business is conducted, the principles and purposes of parliamentary law, and the reasons for the order of precedence of motions.
5. Students \( \text{should} \) participate in interpretative reading.
   a. Printed information is \( \text{should be} \) read orally to improve skills of oral communication.
   
   b. Prose selections (editorials, speeches, descriptions, illustrative stories and anecdotes, and inspirational material) are \( \text{should be} \) read to develop skill in conveying the thought, emotion, and mood.
   
   c. Poetry selections (lyric, humorous and narrative) are \( \text{should be} \) read to develop skill in conveying the structure, the sound, the mood, the meaning of the author to the listener.
   
   d. Group reading is \( \text{should be} \) done to convey more richness of meaning than the individual voice can convey.

The Cortright, Niles, and Weirich criteria also establish standards for necessary instructional materials that should be available to the student in speech:

1. Textbooks, supplementary texts, handbooks, programmed instructional materials, and curriculum guides are \( \text{should be} \) selected by the speech staff with approval of the administration.

2. Abridged and unabridged dictionaires, a thesaurus, and a book on usage are \( \text{should be} \) made readily accessible in sufficient numbers for instruction.

3. Collections of speeches, literary anthologies, a book of quotations, and a recent almanac of facts are \( \text{should be} \) made available in the classroom.

4. Pamphlets, magazines, newspapers, and paperbacks are \( \text{should be} \) made available for use.

5. Teacher-prepared materials, professional magazines, and journals in the field of speech are \( \text{should be} \) used.

6. Audio-visual materials (projectors, recorders, record players, radios, television sets, and public address equipment) are \( \text{should be} \) utilized.

7. Tapes, records, transparencies, and video-tapes, both commercial and teacher-prepared, are \( \text{should be} \) used.
8. Other physical equipment including bulletin board, chalk board, speaker's stand, easel, and pointer is (should be) furnished.

The above mentioned criteria were utilized in preparing the questionnaire used to gather data relative to the evaluation of the high school speech education programs of the Wisconsin Evangelical Lutheran Synod.

Criteria for Instructor Evaluation

The Speech Association of America provides standards for the certification of speech teachers. These standards were affirmed as an official Speech Association position adopted at its December, 1968, convention. The standards were printed in the "1968 Action Report of the Ad Hoc Committee on Certification of Secondary School Teachers," originally prepared under the auspices of the Central States Speech Association. The copy of the "1968 Action Report" was procured from Dr. William Work, Executive Secretary of the Speech Association of America. The suggested standards for teachers of speech and directors of speech activities are as follows:

1. The teacher of speech courses in the secondary schools shall:
   a. Have a major in speech and
   b. Complete a master's degree in speech within the first five years of teaching.
   c. Be certified to teach only those courses in which he has had academic preparation.

2. The director of speech activities in the secondary schools shall:
   a. Have at least a minor in speech and
   b. Be certified to direct only those activities in which he has had academic preparation and practical experience.
Questions based on the criteria above were formulated and included in the questionnaire in order to gather data relative to determining the degree to which speech teachers and directors of speech activities in the Wisconsin Evangelical Lutheran Synod's high schools met the designated standards.

Criteria for Evaluation of Extra-Curricular Speech Activities

No established criteria were used for the evaluation of the extra-curricular speech programs in WELS high schools. Rather, the evaluation of such programs was based on the following four items: 1) the availability of extra-curricular speech activities, 2) the total number of students participating in such activities in each school, 3) the number of participation incidents for individual students, and 4) the qualifications of speech activities instructors. Qualifications of the speech activity instructors were evaluated in terms of the criteria provided by the Speech Association of America.
FOOTNOTES


2Ibid., p. 217.

3Ibid., p. 218.

4Ibid., p. 219.

5Ibid., pp. 220-221.

6Ibid., pp. 222-223.

7Ibid., pp. 222-223.


CHAPTER III

SPEECH EDUCATION IN WELS HIGH SCHOOLS

Information Gathering and Tabulation

In order to collect the necessary information to evaluate the speech education programs in the Wisconsin Evangelical Lutheran Synod high schools, a ten-page questionnaire was formulated. The questionnaire was based entirely on the aforementioned criteria provided by the Speech Association of America (See Chapter II). Because of the great detail in the criteria, it was necessary to prepare a proportionately detailed questionnaire in order to ascertain whether the speech education being provided met the criteria.

Although the questionnaire was lengthy, two items contributed to ease in answering the questions. The questionnaire was distinctly divided into four categories or parts: Part I dealt only with the basic speech course or Speech I, Part II dealt only with the basic speech training outside of the Speech I course, Part III covered the advanced speech course, and Part IV dealt with extra-curricular speech activities. The individual completing the questionnaire could thus eliminate those parts which did not pertain to his speech program. The second contributing factor in ease of answering the questionnaire was the method of answering. In most instances, the questionnaire could be answered by merely putting a check before that aspect of speech being offered in a given high school.
In addition to the check system mentioned above, the respondent was afforded the opportunity to make additional comments in the category marked "other". Space was allowed for a check here as well as for the addition of categories not printed in the questionnaire.

Prior to sending out the questionnaire, several colleagues in the Speech Department who had at some time taught speech at the secondary level were asked to review it for ambiguities. Minor adjustments were made in the questionnaire. These were the addition of extra lines where names and authors of textbooks were asked as well as where names of plays were requested.

On April 19, 1969, the questionnaires were mailed to the twelve schools listed in Appendix A. A cover letter, which appears in Appendix B, explaining the purpose of the questionnaire and the intent of the writer was enclosed along with a self-addressed stamped envelope for returning the questionnaire.

On May 16, 1969, a second letter and questionnaire were mailed to each of the five schools which had at that time not returned the completed questionnaire. A copy of the follow-up letter appears in Appendix C. As a result of this follow-up letter, four more questionnaires were returned.

On June 2, 1969, a phone call was made to the twelfth and final school which had not returned the questionnaire. As a result, the final questionnaire was returned. A telephone call was also made to one of the respondents on June 7, 1969, for the purpose of clarifying materials in his questionnaire.
Content of Questionnaire

Part I of the questionnaire dealt solely with the basic speech course or Speech I. The first ten questions in this part of the questionnaire were based specifically on the Cortright, Niles, and Weirich criteria. The eleventh and final question of Part I was intended to determine the qualifications of the instructor. Specific sub-questions within this eleventh question were formulated using Action Report F submitted by the Ad Hoc Committee on Certification of Secondary School Teachers, CSSA to the SAA convention, December, 1968.

Since it is the practice in some schools to include speech training within the framework of another course, Part II of the questionnaire was formulated to determine the extent of this practice in the WEIS high schools. If speech was taught as part of another class (e.g. English or journalism), the number of weeks spent on actual speech training within this framework was requested. If more than four weeks were spent on speech, the respondent was asked to also complete Part I of the questionnaire. Since four weeks is almost one-fourth of the class time in a semester, it was felt that the instructor might have time to cover several items recommended for the Speech I course. As a result, he was requested to supply that information by completing Part I of the questionnaire.

Although no criteria were established for an advanced speech course, the writer included Part III in the questionnaire to determine the availability of such a course to the students in the WEIS high
schools. It was also thought that such a course might compensate for any inadequacies in the Speech I course.

Part IV of the questionnaire, dealing with extra-curricular speech activities, represents an attempt to determine the extent of participation in speech activities within the WEIS high schools. It was thought that perhaps some of the goals of the Speech I course could be met in these activities. Questions in this section represent an attempt to determine 1) the availability of extra-curricular speech activity, 2) total number of students participating, 3) number of participation incidents for individual students, and 4) qualifications of speech activities instructors. Again the questions concerning the teacher's qualifications were based on Action Report F of the SAA Convention, December, 1968.3

Responses to Part I of the Questionnaire

Of the twelve questionnaires sent out, twelve were returned for a one hundred per cent response. Of these twelve, one principal replied that his school had "no formal speech course--the only training in speech that our students receive is incidental in the English classes." However, he did not fill in Part II of the questionnaire.

Of the twelve returned questionnaires, eleven instructors indicated that some speech training was offered to the students in their respective schools. Four of the respondents indicated that a Speech I course was offered. In addition, one respondent indicated that more than four weeks was spent on speech in an English class,
noted that the school teaching speech for 6-8 weeks in an English class is the school offering just three hours of speech per week. Thus the range is from a minimum of twenty-four hours a year to a maximum of 180 hours a school year spent on speech training.

Two schools met the Cortright, Niles, Weirich criterion by offering Speech I five days per week and one hour per day. Two other classes met five days per week, however, the class periods were shorter. The final class failed to meet the criteria in either frequency of class meeting or total hours.

Number of Students in Speech I Class

The fourth question in Part I asked: "What is the average number of students in each class of Speech I?" The responses indicated that two classes averaged twenty students, one class twenty-six students, one class "twenty-five to thirty" students, and the fifth class averaged thirty students. As might be expected in this item, the two schools with the lowest total enrollment were the schools with an average of twenty students per class, whereas the school with the highest total enrollment was the school which averaged thirty per class.

The criterion states that classes should be limited to twenty-five students with twenty students being more desirable. Thus two of the five schools met this standard while the other three classes averaged over twenty-five students per class.
so he filled out Part I of the questionnaire as requested.

Length of Course

The length of the course varied. One school offered a full year course in Speech I, two schools provided a Speech I course of one semester in length, one school offered Speech I for one quarter or nine weeks, and a fifth instructor indicated the course was of 6-8 weeks duration in an English class. Thus, only three of the twelve WELS high schools fulfill the criteria of at least a one semester Speech I course.

Frequency of Class Meeting

The third question in Part I asked "How many times a week does the class meet?" Table I indicates the responses to this question.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TIMES PER WEEK CLASS MEETS</th>
<th>TOTAL HOURS PER WEEK CLASS MEETS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>3 1/2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>4 1/6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>3 3/4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3 1/2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The high school offering the full year course is also the school that offers the five hours per week of speech. It should be
Textbooks Used in Speech I

Question number six asked the respondent to list the textbook(s) and authors of textbooks used in the Speech I course. Four of the five schools listed at least one textbook, with one school using two texts in Speech I. The school offering 6-8 weeks in the senior English class listed no textbook.

Those textbooks listed were:


Carlile, Clark S., *38 Basic Speech Experiences.*

Irwin, John, and Rosenberger, Marjorie, *Modern Speech,* and

Irwin, John, and Rosenberger, Marjorie, *Preparing and Presenting a Speech.*

In a letter from the publisher, it was learned that *Preparing and Presenting a Speech* is a paperback edition of a unit in *Modern Speech.* This particular unit encompasses seven chapters and 167 pages in *Modern Speech.* This textbook was reported as the text used in the nine weeks Speech I course. Two other instructors indicated the use of *Modern Speech* by Irwin and Rosenberger. Carlile's *38 Basic Speech Experiences* was used in addition to *Modern Speech* in one classroom.

Elements of Speech Taught in Speech I

Beginning with question number seven, the attempt was to determine the content of the Speech I course. Table II (page 25) indicates the responses to the question: "Which of the following
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE 2</th>
<th>NUMBER OF WELS SCHOOLS TEACHING VARIOUS ELEMENTS OF SPEECH IN SPEECH I</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>5</strong> <strong>a.</strong> Patterns of thought</td>
<td><strong>5</strong> various organization patterns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>4</strong> research (information gathering)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>2</strong> accurate use of authority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>5</strong> <strong>b.</strong> Use of acceptable language</td>
<td><strong>4</strong> use of evidence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>3</strong> original thought</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>1</strong> other elements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>5</strong> <strong>c.</strong> Effective use of the voice</td>
<td><strong>0</strong> resonance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>4</strong> quality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>3</strong> volume</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>2</strong> force</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>4</strong> projection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>5</strong> <strong>d.</strong> Use of action</td>
<td><strong>0</strong> other?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>4</strong> poise and self-confidence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>3</strong> skill in handling audio-visual aids</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>2</strong> purpose of action explained</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>2</strong> emphasize need for appropriate appearance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>0</strong> other?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>5</strong> <strong>e.</strong> Listening and observing skills</td>
<td><strong>0</strong> other?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>2</strong> techniques for effective listening</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>3</strong> ability to perceive critically and to evaluate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>2</strong> thoughtful analysis by listener as well as speaker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>0</strong> other?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>5</strong> <strong>f.</strong> Types of delivery</td>
<td><strong>0</strong> other?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>3</strong> memorized</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>1</strong> other?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;outline&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>2</strong> manuscript</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
elements of speaking are taught in the basic course?"

The responses in Table 2 indicate that all five schools offering the Speech I course included the teaching of "patterns of thought." The various organizational patterns were also included in the speech education program of all five schools. Research or information gathering was taught in four of the five schools with the school teaching speech for six to eight weeks in the English class omitting this aspect. The weakest area in this category appears to be that of the accurate use of authority with only two of the five schools reporting its inclusion in the speech course. Students in two other classes had access to this information since the textbooks used contained instruction in the accurate use of authority. Four of the five instructors reported including material on the use of evidence. Thus it appears that the use of evidence was taught in a majority of cases, however, the accurate use of authority was actually taught in only two instances. Three of the five schools indicated that original thought was included in teaching patterns of thought, and in two other classes the textbook provided such information. The three schools including instruction in original thought were the schools where speech was taught in the 11th and 12th grades, whereas those schools offering speech to the 9th and 10th graders did not include "original thought." One respondent indicated that "other elements" were taught under this category; however, he did not furnish additional information in the spaces provided.

All five schools also indicated that "Use of acceptable language," was included in their speech curriculum. Responses shown
in Table 2 (see page 25) indicate that most of the schools do emphasize language or style to some degree. Also, all five of these respondents checked item number six--"language appropriate to audience, situation, subject, and speaker."

Item c, "Effective use of the voice," was also checked by all five instructors. There was a wide diversity among items in this particular category. Only two schools indicated that time was spent teaching the steps in voice production, although one instructor indicated in random comments that he included instruction in the voice mechanism in his course of study. One other instructor used a textbook covering the voice mechanism. Four of the five indicated that quality of the voice was discussed in the speech class. Under the items of "volume, force, and projection" there may have been some confusion. The criteria included all three of these items but did not delineate among them. Unless the respondents were highly skilled in the area of speech, there may have been a lack of understanding on these three items. At any rate, Table 2 (see page 25) indicates that five respondents included instruction in volume, two included instruction in force, and three included work on projection. None of the five spent class time on resonance, although one textbook did discuss resonance quite completely. Four questionnaires indicated that instruction on rate was included in the curriculum while three included some work on the use of pauses. The results of this portion of the questionnaire indicate that the majority of these five schools taught vocal characteristics; however, two failed to establish the
source of this vocal production since only three instructors included instruction in the steps in voice production or the voice mechanism.

The same problem can be noted in item d of the questionnaire, "Use of action." Four of the five indicated the use of action was included in the curriculum, although the basis for action seemed to be overlooked in two of those four classes. Responses in Table 2 (see page 25) indicate that only two of the respondents spent time explaining the purpose for using action in a speech. The textbook provided this information in two additional instances. All recognize the need for developing poise and self-confidence in the speaker, yet only two indicate discussion of an item very closely related—the "need for an appropriate appearance." Three of the four respondents in this category indicated they include skill in the handling of visual aids.

Although students spend much time in a speech course in listening and observing, only three of the respondents indicated that listening was included in their course of study. Only two of these three reported that they suggest techniques for effective listening. All three did discuss the "ability to perceive critically and to evaluate." The next logical step in this process would be for the listener to thoughtfully analyze what has been said; however, only two courses offer this training. The responses to the listening segment of the questionnaire indicate that perhaps speakers were trained in these speech courses, although, unfortunately, listeners were not taught to critically evaluate what was said.
The different modes of delivery were taught in all five Speech I courses. The most popular mode of delivery was the impromptu speech as indicated in four out of five instances. One respondent replied in the "other" category that he included speaking from an outline. This individual perhaps was indicating the use of the extemporaneous mode of delivery since he did not check extemporaneous. Three of the five did indicate that an extemporaneous delivery was taught. Two respondents indicated the use of the manuscript speech in their classroom. The memorized speech was used by three of the five teachers. Four of the five schools stressed variety in types of delivery. However, one school offered training in only two types of delivery--impromptu and the memorized speech.

Instructional Activities

Question number eight asked: "Which of the following instructional activities are taught in the basic course?" Responses to this question can be seen in Table 3 on page 30.

Responses found in Table 3 indicate that four of the five schools offering Speech I included informal speaking in the curriculum. The only school not including informal speaking in the curriculum was the school teaching speech in the 6-8 weeks of the English class. The most popular form of informal speaking was the personal experience speech with all four instructors indicating it was part of their curriculum. Introductory speeches, courtesy speeches and conversation were taught in two schools. In addition, all the textbooks included information on introductory speeches.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4 a. Informal speaking</th>
<th>1 practice in giving directions and announcements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2 introductory speeches</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 personal experience speeches</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 courtesy speeches (i.e. presentation, acceptance, etc.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 conversation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 other?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5 b. Formal speaking</th>
<th>5 speeches to persuade</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5 speeches to inform</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 speech to inform using visual aids</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 speeches to stimulate, impress, inspire, or arouse.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 speeches to convince</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 other?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2 c. Group discussion</th>
<th>0 forums (following film, debate, lecture, etc.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2 group discussion (i.e. round table type)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 buzz sessions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 panel discussions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 symposiums</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 other?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1 d. Parliamentary procedure</th>
<th>0 reasons for order of precedence of motions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 procedures for conducting business</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 principles and purposes of parliamentary law</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 other?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2 e. Oral interpretative reading</th>
<th>0 group reading</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 printed information</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 prose selections</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 poetry selections</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 other?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 1 f. Debate | |
|-------------| |

| 3 g. Dramatics | |
|---------------| |

| 2 h. Radio-TV | |
|---------------| |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2 i. Other?</th>
<th>(1) Speech Mechanism, (1) Telephone Conversation, (1) Social Introductions (1) Expose class to competitive forensics even though no forensics program.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1) Speech Mechanism</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1) Telephone Conversation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1) Social Introductions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1) Expose class to competitive forensics even though no forensics program.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**TABLE 3**

**NUMBER OF WELLS SCHOOLS INCLUDING SPECIFIED INSTRUCTIONAL ACTIVITIES IN SPEECH I**
and courtesy speeches. In only one instance were students subjected to neither instructional nor textbook information on conversation. While only one school offered training in giving directions and announcements, the textbooks in two additional classrooms provided this information.

One school taught only the personal experience speech in informal speaking while another respondent indicated that all five of the categories in informal speaking were taught. Thus, a wide range exists in the teaching of informal speaking. The textbooks cover the material in informal speaking quite completely, so where actual classroom instruction was not available, the textbook information was available.

Respondents from all five schools replied that formal speaking was taught in their Speech I course. As Table 3 (see page 30) indicates, speeches to inform, speeches to convince, and speeches to persuade were included in the curricula of all five schools. On the other extreme, speeches for special occasions were not taught in any of the schools, but again all four textbooks included instruction in this area. Speeches to stimulate, impress, inspire, or arouse were taught in four of the schools, and three schools made use of the informative speech assignment using visual aids. Only two schools offered training in the use of speech in an interview and a third class had access to this information in the textbook it was using. It appears that, as reported, all five schools taught at least three types of formal speaking in the Speech I course.
Group discussion was taught by only two of the five schools. In a third, the textbook contained complete information on group discussion. The two schools including group discussion reported teaching both round table type discussion and buzz sessions. One school reported having taught the use of panel discussion as well. However, forums and symposiums were neglected. Again, however, students in three of the schools had access to this information in their textbooks. It was noted that one of the two schools teaching group discussion was the school whose Speech I course encompassed two semesters. It should also be remembered that one of the five schools taught Speech I only during a 6-8 week period of an English class, while still another instructor spent only a quarter (approximately nine weeks) teaching Speech I. The time factor in the latter two cases is probably a determinant in that it would be impossible to adequately cover all five of the recommended instructional activities in that short amount of time.

Only one school reported teaching parliamentary procedure. And in this instance only the procedure for conducting business was taught. Textbooks in three instances included a unit on parliamentary procedure. Apparently the teaching of parliamentary procedure in the WELS high schools is inadequate.

Oral interpretative reading was taught in two instances and included in the textbook in a third instance. Both of the schools teaching oral reading made use of prose selections while one made use of printed information and the other used poetry selections in the
teaching of oral reading. In no instances was group reading taught, but again, students in three classrooms used texts with this information. The length of the course probably also had an effect on the extent of the teaching of oral reading. However, regardless of the reasons, the teaching of oral interpretative reading in the WEIS high schools was also inadequate.

Although debate, dramatics, and radio-television were not included in the Cortright, Niles, and Weirich criteria, these three items were included in the questionnaire in an attempt to determine if these activities were included in the Speech I course in any school. Returns from this part of the questionnaire indicate that all three activities were included in the Speech I curriculum of the high school that teaches Speech I for a full year. In addition, two other respondents indicated that dramatics was included in the curriculum of the Speech I course—one indicating that this was true only "to a limited degree." The school teaching speech in the 6-8 weeks of an English class indicated that dramatics was taught. However, the questionnaire did not provide for details in this category and it is quite possible that the English class read and discussed plays—which could be considered dramatics. Due to insufficient information, it was not possible to draw any conclusions about this particular instance. In addition to the full year Speech I course including radio-television work, one other respondent indicated radio-television was taught "to a limited degree." It does not seem that any of the WEIS high schools taught debate,
dramatics, and radio-television to the exclusion of the recommended activities of the criteria.

Two respondents indicated that other additional instructional activities were included in their Speech I course. One respondent replied that "The speech mechanism, telephone conversation, and social introductions" were also included in his course of study. The teacher of the full year course wrote that he "exposed the class to competitive forensics even though we don't have a forensics program here." Since this was reported in Part I of the questionnaire, it must be assumed this is part of the course curriculum.

In evaluating the instructional activities of the Speech I classes in the five schools, formal speaking seems to be covered quite thoroughly. Informal speaking was taught to a lesser degree, yet students were subjected to informal speaking in four of the five instances. The areas of group discussion, parliamentary procedure, and oral interpretative reading, however, are somewhat neglected. It is also interesting to note that of the five activities recommended by the criteria, one school taught all five to some degree, one school included four of the five, two schools taught only two of the five, and the fifth school taught only one of the five recommended activities--the school with the 6-8 week speech course in the English class. So the length of the course in these instances was generally proportionate to the breadth of activities covered.
Instructional Materials Available

Question number nine asked: "Which of the following instructional materials are available to the students?" Table 4 indicates the responses to this question.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NUMBER OF WEIS SCHOOLS HAVING SPECIFIED INSTRUCTIONAL MATERIALS AVAILABLE TO SPEECH I STUDENTS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>a. In the classroom?</th>
<th>b. In the school?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4 dictionary</td>
<td>0 recent almanac</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 thesaurus</td>
<td>2 literary anthology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 collections of speeches</td>
<td>1 other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 book of quotations</td>
<td>&quot;supplementary texts&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 pamphlets</td>
<td>2 pamphlets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 other non-book materials?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Four instructors indicated that dictionaries were available in the classroom for student use, two reported literary anthologies were in the classroom and one instructor indicated that supplementary texts were available in the classroom for student use.

If the classrooms are to be judged by the Cortright, Niles, and Weirich criteria, the WEIS classrooms are ill equipped with instructional materials. However, one respondent did indicate that although these materials were not available in the classroom, nonetheless, "the school library included a thesaurus, collections of speeches, book of quotations, and a recent almanac." It might be that other schools also have this material available in the school
library. However, since the criteria specified "in the classroom" the classroom was judged to be inadequately equipped with instructional materials.

In addition to asking if newspapers and magazines were available in the school, inquiry was made as to the names of newspapers and magazines in the school library. All schools reported that several local papers were available. In addition, specific newspapers mentioned were: The New York Times, National Observer, Chicago Tribune, Minneapolis Tribune, and the Milwaukee Sentinel. Judging from the list of newspapers reported, in all five schools, Speech I students have access to an adequate supply of newspapers.

Magazines mentioned most frequently were: Newsweek, Time, Life, National Geographic, Holiday, U. S. News and World Report, and Sports Illustrated. One respondent, after listing eight magazines, summarized by saying, "and sundry others." Another respondent replied "Too numerous to catalog--about 65 different magazines." A third teacher replied: "We have what I would consider an 'adequate' library in our school. Our students also have access to the Milwaukee Public Library. I encourage my students to use the Public Library." Based on the list of available magazines reported, this writer would say that Speech I students in these five schools have adequate informational sources for gathering materials for speeches.

Two schools reported the presence of vertical pamphlet files with current material available to the students. The availability of pamphlets in these five schools seems inadequate, since only two
of the five reported their presence.

**Availability of Audio-Visual Aids**

Question number 10 asked: "Which of the following audio-visual aids are available for use in the classroom?" Table 5 below shows the responses received to this question.

**TABLE 5**

**NUMBER OF WELS SCHOOLS HAVING SPECIFIED AUDIO-VISUAL AIDS AVAILABLE FOR USE IN THE SPEECH I CLASSROOM**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>a. projectors</th>
<th>b. recorders</th>
<th>c. record players</th>
<th>d. radios</th>
<th>e. television sets</th>
<th>f. public address equipment</th>
<th>g. bulletin board</th>
<th>h. chalk board</th>
<th>i. pointer</th>
<th>j. speaker’s stand</th>
<th>k. other &quot;access to auditorium during class-time.&quot;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All five schools have six of the ten items recommended in the criteria. In addition, four of the five have another two items. Thus we have a major inadequacy in just two of the ten areas, those areas being the availability of television sets and a pointer. It is the opinion of this writer that the pointer is relatively insignificant, thus only one major inadequacy remains.

**Qualifications of Instructors**

The eleventh question in Part I of the questionnaire was intended to determine the qualifications of the instructors in the Speech I classes. Question eleven asked: "What speech training has
the classroom instructor(s) of the basic speech course had?' One respondent reported a second instructor for the course so six instructors were listed. Table 6 indicates the responses to this question.

TABLE 6

NUMBER OF WEIS INSTRUCTORS HOLDING SPECIFIED DEGREES AND HAVING TRAINING IN DESIGNATED AREAS OF STUDY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Degrees</th>
<th>Undergraduate majors</th>
<th>Undergraduate minors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2 B.A.</td>
<td>1 English</td>
<td>1 History</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 B.S.</td>
<td>1 Elem. Education</td>
<td>1 Journalism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 B.Ed.</td>
<td>1 Education</td>
<td>1 Philosophy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 Liberal Arts</td>
<td>1 English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 Music</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 Speech</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Graduate majors</th>
<th>Graduate minors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2 English</td>
<td>1 History</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 Library Science</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All six instructors who taught the Speech I course held bachelor's degrees: two Bachelor of Arts, three Bachelor of Science, and one Bachelor of Education. Undergraduate majors reported were: speech, English, elementary education, education, liberal arts, and music. Undergraduate minors listed were: history, journalism, philosophy, and English. Two of the respondents indicated they were doing work at the graduate level at the present time. Both had major areas in English, and the minor areas were history and library science.

Three of the respondents recorded no undergraduate hours in speech. One respondent reported having completed four quarter hours
of speech at the undergraduate level, and another instructor com-
pleted three semester hours of speech at the undergraduate level.
The individual with the speech major indicated that he had completed
thirty-nine semester hours in speech.

At the graduate level, five reported no hours of speech. One
individual recorded having completed three quarter-hours of speech.
This individual was one who reported no undergraduate speech credits.
Thus four of the six respondents reported having some speech credits
at either the graduate or the undergraduate level.

However, in only one instance does the instructor of the
Speech I course meet the requirements as established in the criteria.25
The criteria state the teacher of the Speech I course should have a
major in speech and complete a master's degree in speech within the
first five years of teaching. The individual with the major in
speech has taught speech for four years but has not begun any work
toward a master's degree. Two of the respondents reported no
training in speech, and as mentioned previously, three of the others
also had inadequate speech training.

Four respondents reported the number of years they had been
teaching speech. One man taught speech for six years, another for
five years, another for four years, and the fourth has just completed
his first year. According to the criteria the individual having
taught speech for six years should at this time have attained a
master's degree. However, he is an individual who has taken no
speech credits at either the graduate or undergraduate level, although
he is working on a graduate degree in English. The individual having taught five years is also working on a graduate degree in English and has completed a total of only three quarter-hours of speech.

The criteria specify that the teacher of Speech I should be certified to teach only those courses in which he has had academic preparation. In answer to this question in the questionnaire, three instructors replied that they had such academic preparation, even though only one instructor has taken more than two speech courses. Three instructors replied they had no such academic preparation.

Additional comments received in questionnaire returns indicate a feeling of inadequacy on the part of WELS speech teachers. For example, one instructor wrote: "Pastor called to be Dean of Students and English instructor. At present working on a degree in English in summer school." Another wrote: "My training for secondary education has come primarily from summer school and is not yet complete."

Responses to Part II of the Questionnaire

Part II of the questionnaire was intended to determine if any speech training was offered in a class other than a Speech I class for less than four weeks.

Six respondents indicated that some speech training was offered to students in English classes for less than four weeks. In addition one instructor indicated in Part IV that dramatics was included in an English class. One of the schools that offered a
Speech I class also includes "about four weeks" of speech training in English classes as well.

Length of time spent on speech within the English classes varied. As mentioned above, one school spent "about four weeks" on speech. Two respondents indicated that three weeks were spent on such assignments, two replied that two weeks were spent on speech, and one replied that it "varies from year to year and teacher to teacher."

Content of speech within these English classes was quite varied also. One instructor replied:

I spend approximately four days introducing the students to public speaking, then they get up before the class to speak on various assigned topics. Unfortunately we have only enough time to have each student speak twice.

Another reply stated:

At present not much correlation from grade to grade. Each teacher as he finds time tries to include a unit on speech in his English class.

Four of the completed questionnaires indicated in depth what speech activities were included in the English class. These responses are tabulated in Table 7.
TABLE 7
NUMBER OF WELS SCHOOLS TEACHING SPECIFIED SPEECH ACTIVITIES IN THE ENGLISH CLASSES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Speech to inform</th>
<th></th>
<th>Introductions</th>
<th></th>
<th>Panel discussions</th>
<th></th>
<th>Speech analysis</th>
<th></th>
<th>Rudiments of speech making</th>
<th></th>
<th>Dramatics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>a.</td>
<td></td>
<td>g.</td>
<td></td>
<td>h.</td>
<td></td>
<td>i.</td>
<td></td>
<td>j.</td>
<td></td>
<td>k.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>b.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>c.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>d.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>e.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>f.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The speech to inform appears to be the most frequently used speech activity in the English classes, with three indicating the inclusion of this activity. Speeches to convince and to persuade were reported by two of the respondents, as was oral interpretative reading. The instructor indicating that panel discussion was taught noted that this was "worked into the English class." It sounded as though the panel discussion was used as a teaching device in the English class and not taught as a speech activity. The instructor indicating that speech analysis was done in the class stated that each student "analyzed one sermon and one political speech." It should be mentioned that this school is a seminary prep school. The instructor indicating in Part IV that drama was included in an English class reported that three plays or portions of plays were produced by this English class. Plays presented were: Pygmalion by George Bernard Shaw, She Stoops to Conquer by Oliver Goldsmith, and The Wall by Millard Lampell.
The speech training offered as part of an English class, though inadequate in terms of the criteria, nonetheless, does expose students in WEIS high schools to a variety of speech situations.

Responses to Part III of the Questionnaire

Questions in Part III of the questionnaire queried the instructors concerning availability and content of advanced speech courses. Replies to Part III revealed that no formal course in advanced speech was offered in any of the twelve schools. However, in three instances instructors did fill in information in this category. Two indicated that speech was taught in English classes more than one year (i.e. on two or more levels). One of the latter indicated that speech work was done in the freshman, sophomore, and senior years in the English courses. The following speech units were taught in these courses: public speaking, group discussion, parliamentary procedure, and oral reading.

The third respondent reported that forensics was taught as an extra-curricular activity but indicated it was not a formal course. No previous speech training was a prerequisite for this forensics activity. The instructor reported that public speaking, oral reading, and dramatics were "taught" in this manner, with no textbook used. The teacher in this situation held a B.A. Degree with an undergraduate major in English, minor in languages, and a graduate major in social work. He reported taking no speech credit at either the undergraduate or graduate level. He reported that he had no academic preparation to teach in this area and explained his
position by saying, "Somebody had to take the position." He has taught forensics activities for three years in this situation.

Part III of the questionnaire may be summarized very briefly by saying that for all practical purposes, there was no advanced speech course taught in any of the WEIS high schools during the 1968-69 school year.

Responses to Part IV of the Questionnaire

Question number one in Part IV of the questionnaire asked: "Which of the following speech activities are available outside of the classroom?" Ten of the twelve returned questionnaires reported some extracurricular speech activity. Responses to this question are tabulated in Table 8.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Schools Offering</th>
<th>Debate</th>
<th>Discussion</th>
<th>Dramatics</th>
<th>Radio-Television</th>
<th>Oratory</th>
<th>Extemporaneous Speaking</th>
<th>Declamation</th>
<th>Interpretative Reading</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;radio news&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As can be seen in Table 8, all eleven schools had an extracurricular dramatics program, five offered speech activity in individual events, and two provided opportunities in discussion and radio-television work outside of the classroom. Questionnaire returns
revealed that four schools offered extracurricular activity in only one area, that of dramatics; three schools provided opportunity in two areas, dramatics and individual events; and three schools had at least three categories for extra-curricular speech activity.

All five schools offering students the opportunity to participate in individual events are schools that did not offer a basic speech course. Thus, to some degree the extracurricular speech program might have compensated for the lack of basic speech training in a Speech.I course. This, of course, only benefited the small number of students who participated in individual events.

One instructor who indicated that oratory was offered as an extracurricular activity, pointed out that this was in conjunction with a contest in the American History class. The individual reporting that "radio news" was included in individual events also indicated that radio-television was available as an extracurricular activity. This may be a duplication, since this writer is familiar with the category of "radio news" which consists of the student organizing, cutting, and reading teletype news reports as if he were preparing and presenting them for radio newscasts.

Number of Students in Extracurricular Speech

Question number two in Part IV of the questionnaire asked: "What is the total number of students involved in the extracurricular speech program in the 1968-1969 school year?" Three respondents did not answer this question. One of the respondents indicated that some drama work was done in English classes, yet she included the
information in Part IV of the questionnaire. Thus the seventy students she reported as having participated in extracurricular speech activities may be rather high for that school—since she listed just two plays in addition to the drama work done in the English class. It was not clear if the seventy students she listed included those who participated in a classroom dramatics program. As a result, this figure of seventy students is not included in the calculations below. Of the remaining seven schools reporting the number of students participating in extracurricular speech activities, the range was from twenty to forty-five. The mean of the reported numbers was 32.9 and the mode was 35. A total of 230 students participated in the seven schools reporting this number. This was 13.7 percent of the total enrollment in these seven schools. The overall percentage, however, in all eleven schools would probably be lower since the three schools not reporting the number of students involved in extracurricular activities had a total enrollment almost equal to the seven schools reporting. This does not take into consideration the instructor who reported the seventy participants. Of the three schools not reporting, one reported it offered dramatics but did not indicate anywhere in the questionnaire any plays produced. Another of the three indicated that just one play was produced in conjunction with the choir. The third indicated that approximately fifty students participated in dramatics—thus having a maximum participation in that school of fifty students. If the one school producing just one play had an equal number participating,
the percentage of participation would still be only about 6 percent in these three schools. From these statistics, it can be inferred that approximately 10 percent of the total enrollment in WELS high schools participated in extracurricular speech activities during the 1968-1969 school year.

In addition to asking for the total number of participants in the extracurricular speech program, question number two in Part IV asked for a breakdown of the number of participants in terms of each activity. As might be expected, the number who participated in dramatics was considerably higher than in any other category with a total of 133 participating in this event. Six of the individuals who reported having a dramatics program did not indicate the number of participants in this activity, thus the number of 133 is not at all representative of the total number of students involved in dramatics. One of the two indicating a discussion activity responded that "10-20" students were active in discussion. Four replied to the number of students participating in individual events with a total of seventy-seven students doing so. Responses to this part of question two were not sufficient to draw any conclusions.

Question number three in Part IV asked how many of the students participating in extracurricular activities for the 1968-69 school year also participated during the 1967-68 school year. Responses indicated that 125 of the 230 participated the previous year for a 54.3 percent retention. Again the instructor reporting the participation number of seventy was not included in this figure because it
was not clear if the number was strictly an extracurricular participation figure. (A 50 percent retention was reported by this instructor.) One instructor reported that the "same" students participated both years, while on the other extreme it was reported that "none" of the students participated the previous year. This might be explained by the fact that the only play produced was given as a class play, thus limiting participation to a given year. It should be remembered that three of the respondents did not answer this question of the questionnaire, so again the figures are not conclusive.

Question number four was intended to determine how many opportunities the students had for participation in extra-curricular activities in speech. One instructor indicated that his students averaged two discussions during the school year. In the number of dramatics participation incidents, the following was reported: four responded that students averaged one participation, one replied that students averaged "1-2" participations, two replied students averaged two participations, one replied that six participations resulted, and a final instructor reported that "35" participation incidents were afforded the students. It was unclear whether these students presented the dramatic production thirty-five times or whether the instructor included rehearsals as participation incidents. It is also possible that this instructor misread the question since he did not indicate the number of students participating in dramatics earlier in the questionnaire--he merely checked dramatics.
Answers to the average number of participation incidents in individual events were as follows: one instructor replied students averaged "1-2" incidents, one replied two incidents, one reported three incidents, and again the instructor mentioned in the previous paragraph reported an average of twenty-five participation incidents. Although this is not impossible in individual events, it is again probable that this instructor misread the question.

The results of these questionnaire responses indicate that although students did have an opportunity to participate in extra-curricular speech activities, nonetheless, the participation incidents were rather limited. In dramatics the majority of students participated in just one play during the school year. In individual events the averaged incident of participation was twice—again rather low. Therefore, it appears the extra-curricular activities, although somehow compensating for an inadequacy in curriculum, nonetheless do not meet the criteria.

Question number five asked: "How many plays were produced during the 1968-69 school year?" and then asked the instructor to indicate how many one-acts and how many full-length plays were included in this number. It was learned that in the eleven schools, twelve full-length plays were produced; however, two schools produced no full-length plays while three schools produced two full-length plays in the course of the year. In addition, four schools produced a total of eleven one-acts. Those full-length plays produced were:
Gilbert and Sullivan, H. M. S. Pinafore
Richards, Grant, Who Killed Aunt Caroline?
Moliere, The Imaginary Invalid
Hayes, Marriane and Joseph, Come Rain or Shine
Kendall, Jane, Huckleberry Finn
Du Maurier, Daphne, Rebecca
Kesselring, Joseph, Arsenic and Old Lace
Francke, Caroline, Father of the Bride
Mann, R.J. Our Miss Brooks
Mississippi Melody
Music Man

The following one-act plays were produced:

Barry, Spranger, Pig of My Dreams
Martens, Anne Coulter, The Search for Wildcat McGillicuddy
Scott, Christine, Watch Out for Wally
McLellan, C.M.S., The Shirkers
Payton, Donald, The Storm
Fisher, Wm. D., Jerry Breaks a Date
Payton, Donald, Has Anyone Seen Wilbur
Conkle, E.P., No More Wars But the Moon
Martens, Anne Coulter, Not Even a Mouse
Fear is a Murderer
Fiddler on the Roof (Abridged)

Thirteen of the twenty-one plays produced were either comedies or farces, four were mysteries, three dramas, and three were musicals. Although there was some variety in the types of plays produced, nonetheless, the majority of students were exposed only to comedies and farces. This was especially true in those schools producing only one-acts.

Qualifications of Activities Instructors

Thirteen individuals were cited as instructors of extracurricular speech activities in answering question number seven, which asked: "What speech training has the extracurricular speech activities instructor had?". In addition, one respondent replied, "This work is done by class advisors with no formal speech training in most cases."
Table 9 indicates the degrees held and areas of study of the instructors of speech activities in WEIS high schools.

**TABLE 9**

**NUMBER OF WEIS ACTIVITIES INSTRUCTORS HAVING SPECIFIED DEGREES AND SPECIFIED MAJORS AND MINORS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Degrees</th>
<th>Undergraduate Major</th>
<th>Undergraduate Minor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4 B.A.</td>
<td>3 English</td>
<td>3 English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 B.S.</td>
<td>2 Education</td>
<td>2 History</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 B.D.</td>
<td>4 Languages</td>
<td>1 Journalism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 M.A.</td>
<td>1 Speech</td>
<td>1 Language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 M.S.</td>
<td>1 Liberal Arts</td>
<td>1 Phy. Ed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 M. Ed.</td>
<td>1 Science</td>
<td>0 Speech</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Ph. D.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 None</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Graduate Major</th>
<th>Graduate Minor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2 Education</td>
<td>2 Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 English</td>
<td>1 English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Social Work</td>
<td>0 Speech</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 History</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 Speech</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As can be seen in Table 9 (page 51), seven of the instructors hold bachelor's degrees, three have master's degrees, one has received a Ph. D. and one listed no degree. Undergraduate majors listed were: three in English, three in education, four in languages, one in liberal arts and one in speech. Those who listed languages as their major were either pastors called to teach or those who had taken their undergraduate work at the Synod's liberal arts college for the training of ministers. Undergraduate minors included three in English, two in history, one in journalism, and one in languages.
Graduate majors listed were: three in education, two in English, one in social work, and one in history. Graduate minors included two in education and one in English.

Table 9 (page 51) indicates that only one instructor of speech activities has a major in speech and there are no minors in speech. The criteria state that all instructors of extracurricular speech activities "shall have at least a minor in speech." Of the twelve instructors in this area, only one meets the criteria cited in Chapter II.

In addition to the individual with the speech major, it was learned that one individual had taken six semester hours of undergraduate speech, one individual had four semester hours of undergraduate speech, and one individual had three semester hours of undergraduate speech. The instructor with six hours at the undergraduate level also listed six hours of graduate level speech.

Sub-question number six under question seven asked: "Has the teacher had academic and practical experience in all areas he is coaching?" Responses to this question indicated that five of the instructors listed academic preparation and nine indicated that they had practical experience in the areas they were coaching. In addition to the five indicating the academic preparation, one respondent replied that he was "self-instructed" while another indicated participation in an "in-service workshop".

Five of the thirteen extra-curricular speech activities instructors have had some academic preparation for the activity
they were coaching and nine of them have had practical experience in that activity. Four indicated they had both academic and practical experience. Whereas the criteria state "the director of speech activities in the secondary schools shall be certified to direct only those activities in which he has had academic preparation and practical experience," it was learned that only four of the thirteen instructors have had both academic preparation and practical experience. Approximately seventy percent have had practical experience but only about forty percent have had the recommended academic preparation. The academic preparation of these instructors for their positions in extra-curricular speech activities has been inadequate.

SUMMARY

In Chapter III are recorded both the explanation of the content of the questionnaire and the tabulation of the responses received in the questionnaire. Of the twelve questionnaires sent out, there was a 100 percent return. One school offered no speech education program either curricular or extracurricular. Eleven WELS high schools offered some speech education opportunity to their students.

In none of the eleven schools does the speech education program completely fulfill the recommendations of the criteria cited in Chapter II. However, there are several instances where speech programs approached the recommended standards.

Based on the responses to the questionnaire, the following evaluative comments appear justified.
In only 25 percent of WELS high schools do students have the opportunity to take a one semester basic speech course.

Only 40 percent of the Speech I classes met the recommended five hours per week of instructional time.

In 60 percent of the Speech I classes the enrollment was higher than recommended.

Where a Speech I course was offered, there was an emphasis on formal and informal speaking and a lack of emphasis on parliamentary procedure, group discussion, and oral interpretative reading.

Where a Speech I course was offered, most of the various elements of speech were covered quite completely, i.e., patterns of thought, use of acceptable language, effective use of voice, types of delivery, and use of action. Neglected to a degree are listening and observing skills.

Where a Speech I course was offered, a sufficient amount of instructional materials and audio-visual aids were available for use by the student either in the classroom or the school.

Instructors of Speech I, with one exception, did not have majors or minors in speech.

In two-thirds of WELS high schools, some speech training was included in an English class; however, in no instance did this training fulfill the recommendations of the criteria.

Eleven of the twelve WELS high schools afforded students an opportunity to participate in extracurricular dramatics.
activities. Five offered participation in individual events.

(10) Although eleven of the twelve offered opportunities for extracurricular activities, participation incidents were limited.

(11) Of the thirteen instructors directing some extracurricular speech activity, only one had a major in speech and there were none with a speech minor—thus only one met the SAA criteria for directors of speech activities.
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CHAPTER IV

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

Summary

This study was undertaken as an attempt to determine "How completely the speech education offered in the private high schools of the Wisconsin Evangelical Lutheran Synod during the 1968-1969 school year met the criteria provided by the Speech Association of America."

In an attempt to make the above determination, two sub-steps were taken. Criteria for evaluating high school speech programs were procured from the Speech Association of America. Two sources of criteria were provided: (1) "Criteria to Evaluate Speech I in the Senior High School" by Henrietta H. Cortright, Doris S. Niles, and Dorothy Q. Weirich, and (2) Action Report F submitted by Deldee M. Hermann, Western Michigan University (Chairman, Ad Hoc Committee on Certification of Secondary School Teachers, CSSA), to the Speech Association of America Convention, December, 1968. The latter was officially adopted as a position of the Speech Association of America at its December, 1968, convention.

The second sub-step involved the formulation of a questionnaire based on the Speech Association criteria. This questionnaire was then sent to the twelve synodical schools of the Wisconsin Evangelical Lutheran Synod; all twelve responded. Results of the questionnaire
were tabulated and compared with the standards recommended by the Speech Association of America. As a result of this comparison, and in light of other miscellaneous information, a judgment was made concerning the speech education offered in the secondary schools of the Wisconsin Evangelical Lutheran Synod.

Conclusions

(1) In the majority of WELS high schools a basic speech course was either non-existent or inadequate. (Only three of the twelve schools offered a one semester basic speech course during the 1968-69 school year.)

Where Speech I was offered the following were generally found to be true:

(a) Formal and informal speaking situations were covered quite completely; however, speech related studies such as parliamentary procedure, group discussion, and oral reading were neglected.

(b) In several instances the background information was not presented for further instructional materials. For example, the use of the voice was taught, but voice production was neglected; the use of action was taught, but the purpose and reason for using that action was neglected; the use of evidence was taught, but the accurate use of authority was neglected. As a result, in many instances the "how" of speech-making was taught but the "why" was neglected. In other words, in many instances
the practice was provided but the fundamental understanding of the concept was lacking.

(c) Although instructional materials did not always meet the recommended criteria, in many instances, the textbooks used in the classrooms provided a supplementary source. As a result, where classroom presentation of material was weak, for example in the areas of voice, parliamentary procedure, use of evidence and the use of action, students did have access to this information in their textbooks in several classrooms.

(d) WELS high schools offering a basic speech course were generally adequately equipped with instructional materials and audio-visual aids for use by Speech I students.

(e) Although teachers of the basic speech course generally did not meet the requirements of the Speech Association of America's criteria, responses to the questionnaire, nonetheless, indicated they were aware of their inadequacies and were using self-study in an attempt to compensate for this inadequacy.

(2) Two-thirds of the WELS high schools offered some speech training in an English class.

(3) No advanced speech course was taught in any WELS high school, although one of the basic courses was a full year in length and included much of what might be taught in an advanced course.
(4) Eleven of the twelve WELS high schools offered some opportunity for participation in extra-curricular speech activities.

Regarding extracurricular speech activities:

(a) Dramatics was by far the most common activity with eleven schools offering participation in dramatics.

(b) Individual events (oratory, interpretative reading, extemporaneous speaking, declamation) were available in five schools.

(c) Although available, a limited number of students participated in extracurricular speech activities and they were limited in their number of participation incidents.

(d) Instructors of extracurricular speech activities by and large did not fulfill the requirements of the Speech Association of America's criteria for that position.

(5) Although the present status of speech education in WELS high schools is below the recommended standard in curriculum and qualifications of instructors, there appears, nonetheless, to be a growing interest in speech on the part of administration and faculty as evidenced by the following:

(a) Three respondents indicated that although they presently had no basic speech course, plans were being made to include a one semester course in the 1969-70 school year.
Several respondents requested further information regarding textbooks, course recommendations, and the results of this particular study.

The teacher-training college of WEIS is now in the process of implementing a basic speech course into its curriculum which is a further indication that the Wisconsin Evangelical Lutheran Synod has begun to recognize speech and proper speech training as important components in the preaching and teaching of God's Word.

The present study may be of value to the speech field, the Wisconsin Evangelical Lutheran Synod, and the writer. It may be of value to the speech profession for the following reasons:

(a) With the completion of this study, not only the quantity but also the quality of speech education offered in a small segment of our nation's private high schools has been made known.

(b) Those aspects of speech education which the Speech Association of America deems important, as evidenced in the criteria it provided, have now been made known and available to twelve high schools. These twelve schools may have remained unaware of such standards if it were not for this study.

(c) It is hoped that the advice sought by various schools from the writer will aid in improving not only the quantity but also the quality of speech education in the
WELS high schools.

The Wisconsin Evangelical Lutheran Synod may also benefit from the present study. These benefits may be as follows:

(a) Educators in WELS high schools have been made aware of the strengths and weaknesses of their speech education programs.

(b) Those educators contemplating the inclusion of a speech course in their curriculum have been given some guidelines through the criteria—which appeared in the questionnaire.

(c) Individuals interested in improving or implementing speech courses in WELS high schools are now aware of a resource person who perhaps more fully understands and appreciates the problems unique to its school system.

The current study has also been of benefit to the writer. Two specific values come to mind:

(a) The discipline of thorough research has left its marks well ingrained.

(b) The writer has become more convinced and inspired to promulgate the values and rewards of speech education at the secondary level, especially within the realm of the high schools of the Wisconsin Evangelical Lutheran Synod.
Implications For Further Study

This study by no means exhausts the possibilities for studies utilizing the WEIS speech programs or the Speech Association of America's evaluative criteria. Other studies such as the following might be undertaken.

(1) A study might be conducted to determine the extent of speech training available to WEIS students in the Synod's two colleges and seminary.

(2) A similar study might include the numerous elementary schools of the Wisconsin Evangelical Lutheran Synod.

(3) The current study will soon be outdated. Therefore, after a lapse of time, a similar study could be made using the same group of schools.

(4) The same criteria could be used for an evaluation of high school speech programs in any group of either private or public high schools.
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# APPENDIX A

## NAMES AND ADDRESSES OF ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICES OF WISCONSIN EV. LUTHERAN SYNOD HIGH SCHOOLS TO WHOM QUESTIONNAIRES WERE MAILED

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Name and Title</th>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Address</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Rev. Carleton Toppe, President</td>
<td>Northwestern College</td>
<td>501 Tower Road, W. Watertown, Wisconsin 53094</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Rev. Martin R. Toepel, President</td>
<td>Michigan Lutheran Seminary</td>
<td>2128 Court Street Saginaw, Michigan 48602</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Rev. Daniel W. Malchow, President</td>
<td>Northwestern Lutheran Academy</td>
<td>917 10th Ave. West Mobridge, South Dakota 57601</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Rev. Oscar Siegler, President</td>
<td>Martin Luther Academy</td>
<td>1634 Boettger Road New Ulm, Minnesota 56073</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Rev. Harold E. Warnke, Principal</td>
<td>Fox Valley Lutheran High School</td>
<td>2626 North Oneida Street Appleton, Wisconsin 54911</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Rev. Robert Krueger, Principal</td>
<td>Lakeside Lutheran High School</td>
<td>Woodland Beach Road Lake Mills, Wisconsin 53551</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Rev. Wayne Schmidt, Principal</td>
<td>Luther High School</td>
<td>Wilson Street Onalaska, Wisconsin 54650</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Mr. G.W. Kalb, Principal</td>
<td>Lutheran High School</td>
<td>251 Luedtke Avenue Racine, Wisconsin 53405</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Rev. Loren Schaller, Principal</td>
<td>Manitowoc Lutheran High School</td>
<td>4045 Lancer Circle Manitowoc, Wisconsin 54220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Mr. Morton A. Schroeder, Principal</td>
<td>Saint Croix Lutheran High School</td>
<td>110 Crusader Avenue West St. Paul, Minnesota 55118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>Rev. T.W. Zuberbier, Principal</td>
<td>Winnebago Lutheran Academy</td>
<td>475 East Merrill Street Fond du Lac, Wisconsin 54935</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX B

April 19, 1969

Rev. Loren Schaller, Principal
Manitowoc Lutheran High School
4045 Lancer Circle
Manitowoc, Wisconsin 54220

Dear Rev. Schaller:

In a recent issue of The Lutheran Educator, Mr. Frederick Manthey, instructor at Martin Luther Academy in New Ulm, emphasized the need for a Christian to improve his gift of speech in order that the saving Gospel message might not be hindered. He stated, "Men and women preparing for work in the church certainly have need of speech training." And we in our high schools certainly are preparing students for work in the church—whether it be as pastors, teachers, or laymen.

As a member of the Wisconsin Evangelical Lutheran Synod, as well as a graduate student in speech at South Dakota State University, I am interested in evaluating our WEIS high school speech education programs.

In order to conduct this study, the enclosed questionnaire is being sent to all of our WEIS high schools. Would you give this questionnaire to the teacher on your staff who is in charge of the speech education program in your school. If there is neither classroom nor extracurricular speech training, would you please fill in the information at the top of the questionnaire and return it to me.

After this questionnaire has been completed, please return it to me in the enclosed self-addressed envelope. Although names are requested in the questionnaire, no names will be used in the published results. It is my intention that this study will constitute a partial fulfillment of my thesis for my M.A. degree at South Dakota State University. In addition, I hope to publish the findings of this study in a future issue of The Lutheran Educator.

Thank you for your cooperation. If you have further questions, please feel free to address them to me.

Sincerely,

(Mrs. Mary L. Heins)

Enc.
May 16, 1969

Rev. Loren Schaller, Principal
Manitowoc Lutheran High School
4045 Lancer Circle
Manitowoc, Wisconsin 54220

Dear Rev. Schaller:

Three weeks ago I wrote regarding a study I am doing on the speech education in our Wisconsin Evangelical Lutheran Synod high schools. To this date I have received answers from seven of the twelve schools, however, the questionnaire from Manitowoc Lutheran High Schools has not yet been returned.

In order to complete my survey as well as make the information useful to our Wisconsin Synod schools, I simply must have returns from all twelve schools.

I am enclosing a second questionnaire in case the first one has been misplaced. Again would you please give this questionnaire to the teacher on your staff who is responsible for the speech program in your school. If there is no speech program would you please fill in the top of the questionnaire and indicate such.

I realize this is a very busy time of the year for teachers so I appreciate any cooperation you might give me. Thank you.

Sincerely,

Mary L. Heins
APPENDIX D

QUESTIONNAIRE FOR EVALUATION OF HIGH SCHOOL SPEECH EDUCATION IN THE WISCONSIN EVANGELICAL LUTHERAN SYNOD

NAME OF SCHOOL ____________________________________________

ADDRESS __________________________________________________

NAME OF PERSON FILLING OUT QUESTIONNAIRE ____________________________

POSITION _______________________________________________________

TOTAL STUDENT ENROLLMENT IN THE HIGH SCHOOL FOR THE 1968-69 SCHOOL YEAR ______________________________________________________

TOTAL NUMBER OF TEACHERS IN THE HIGH SCHOOL ______________________________

IS ANY SPEECH TRAINING REQUIRED FOR GRADUATION? ___Yes ___No

(If above answer is yes, please specify.)

IS ANY CLASSROOM SPEECH TRAINING OFFERED IN YOUR HIGH SCHOOL?

___Yes ___No

Part I - All of Part I concerns the basic speech course or Speech I

1. Is a basic speech course offered? ___Yes ___No

(If yes, please answer the following questions in Part I).

2. What is the length of the course?

___ one semester ___ two semesters ___ other? ___

3. How many times a week does the class meet? ___Total hours per week? ________________

4. What is the average number of students in each class of Speech I? __________________________

5. At what grade level may a student take the Speech I course?

(If more than one, please indicate.)

___ 9th ___ 10th ___ 11th ___ 12th

6. Name and author of textbook used in the Speech I course? (If more than one please list all textbooks used.)
Which of the following elements of speaking are taught in the basic course? (Please check main areas as well as sub-areas.)

___ a. Patterns of thought
    ___ various organization patterns
    ___ use of evidence
    ___ research (information gathering)
    ___ accurate use of authority
    ___ original thought
    ___ other elements

___ b. Use of acceptable language
    ___ extension of vocabulary
    ___ development of good oral style
    ___ articulation
    ___ language appropriate to audience,
    ___ pronunciation
    ___ difference in oral and written style
    ___ situation, subject and speaker
    ___ other?

___ c. Effective use of the voice
    ___ resonance
    ___ rate
    ___ steps in voice production
    ___ pauses
    ___ quality
    ___ other?
    ___ volume
    ___ projection
    ___ force

___ d. Use of action
    ___ poise and self confidence
    ___ written style
    ___ other?
    ___ skill in handling audio-visual aids
    ___ difference in oral and written style
    ___ other?
    ___ purpose of action explained
    ___ appropriate appearance

___ e. Listening and observing skills
    ___ other?
    ___ thoughtful analysis by listener as well as speaker
    ___ techniques for effective listening
    ___ ability to perceive critically and to evaluate

___ f. Types of delivery
    ___ other?
    ___ memorized
    ___ extemporaneous
    ___ other?
    ___ impromptu
    ___ manuscript

8. Which of the following instructional activities are taught in the basic course? (Again please check major areas and sub-areas.)

___ a. Informal speaking
___ introductory speeches
___ personal experience speeches
___ courtesy speeches (i.e. presentation & acceptance etc.)
___ practice in giving directions and announcements
___ conversation
___ other?

___ b. Formal speaking
___ speeches to inform
___ speech to inform using visual aids
___ speeches to stimulate, impress, inspire, or arouse
___ speeches to convince
___ speeches to persuade (i.e. sales talks, campaign speeches etc.)
___ speeches for special occasions (i.e. eulogy, dedication etc.)
___ interviews
___ other?

___ c. Group discussion
___ group discussion (i.e. round table type)
___ buzz sessions
___ panel discussions
___ forums (following film, debate, lecture, etc.)
___ symposiums
___ other?

___ d. Parliamentary procedure
___ procedures for conducting business
___ principles and purposes of parliamentary law
___ reasons for order of precedence of motions
___ other?

___ e. Oral interpretative reading
___ printed information
___ prose selections (editorials, speeches, illustrative stories etc.)
___ poetry selections
___ group reading
___ other?

___ f. Debate

___ g. Dramatics

___ h. Radio-TV
1. Other? Please indicate any other instructional activities you include in your Speech I class.

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

9. Which of the following instructional materials are available to the students?

a. In the classroom?

   ___ dictionary ___ recent almanac
   ___ thesaurus ___ literary anthology
   ___ collections of speeches ___ other? ____________
   ___ book of quotations

b. In the school? (List only major sources.)

   ___ newspapers - Names ____________________________
   ___ magazines - Names ____________________________
   ___ pamphlets - Names ____________________________
   ___ other non-book materials? ___________________

10. Which of the following audio-visual aids are available for use in the classroom?

    ___ a. projectors    ___ g. bulletin board
    ___ b. recorders     ___ h. chalk board
    ___ c. record players ___ i. pointer
    ___ d. radios        ___ j. speaker's stand
    ___ e. television sets ___ k. other?
    ___ f. public address equipment
11. What speech training has the classroom instructor(s) of the basic speech course had?

a. First instructor

(1) Name of classroom teacher

(2) Highest degree held by teacher

(3) Undergraduate major  
    Undergraduate minor

    Graduate major
    Graduate minor

(4) Number of undergraduate hours in speech?  
    Semester   Quarter

(5) Number of graduate hours in speech?  
    Semester   Quarter

(6) Number of years teaching speech?  

(7) Has the teacher had academic preparation in all areas of speech he is teaching? (i.e. for each unit — debate, discussion, oral reading etc.)  
    Yes  No
    If above answer is NO please explain:

b. Second instructor

(1) Name of classroom teacher

(2) Highest degree held by teacher

(3) Undergraduate major  
    Undergraduate minor

    Graduate major
    Graduate minor

(4) Number of undergraduate hours in speech?
c. Third instructor

(1) Name of classroom teacher ____________________________

(2) Highest degree held by teacher ____________________________

(3) Undergraduate major ______________________________________

Undergraduate minor ______________________________________

Graduate major ______________________________________

Graduate minor ______________________________________

(4) Number of undergraduate hours in speech?

Semester ____________ Quarter ____________

(5) Number of graduate hours in speech?

Semester ____________ Quarter ____________

(6) Number of years teaching speech? ____________________________

(7) Has the teacher had academic preparation in all areas of speech he is teaching? (i.e. for each unit -- debate, discussion, oral reading etc.)

Yes ___ No ___

If above answer is NO please explain: ____________________________

__________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________
Part II - Other basic speech training.

1. If no Speech I course is offered, is speech training offered as part of another course? Yes No
   (If yes, please indicate below which course.)

   ______ English  ______ Journalism  ______ Other?

2. In the above class, how many weeks of the semester are spent on speech training?

3. If more than four weeks are spent on speech training, please answer questions 2-11 in Part I of this questionnaire. (For purposes of this questionnaire, please consider the course as a basic speech course.)

4. If less than four weeks are spent on speech training, please indicate below the content of the speech unit.

Part III - Advanced Speech Courses

1. Is there a speech course(s) available to the students beyond the Speech I course? Yes No
   (If yes, please indicate below the names of the course(s).

   NAMES OF COURSES:

2. Is Speech I a prerequisite for any of the advanced courses? Yes No (Please specify)

3. Which of the following instructional activities are taught in advanced courses?
   ______ a. public speaking  ______ e. debate
   ______ b. group discussion  ______ f. dramatics
   ______ c. parliamentary procedure  ______ g. radio-television
4. What is the average number of students in the advanced class(es)?

5. Names and authors of textbooks used in the advanced classes:

6. What speech training has the classroom instructor(s) of the advanced course(s) had?
   a. Name of teacher
   b. Highest degree held by teacher
      Undergraduate major _______ Undergraduate minor _______
      Graduate major _______ Graduate minor _______
   c. Number of undergraduate hours in speech?
      Semester __________ Quarter __________
   d. Number of graduate hours in speech?
      Semester __________ Quarter __________
   e. Number of years teaching speech? ________
   f. Has the teacher had academic preparation in all areas of speech he is teaching? (i.e. for each unit--debate, discussion, oral reading, etc.) Yes _______ No _______
      If above answer is NO please explain.

Part IV - Extracurricular Speech Activities

1. Which of the following speech activities are available outside of the classroom?
   a. debate __________ e. individual events
   b. discussion __________ oratory
   c. dramatics __________ extemporaneous speaking
   d. radio-television __________ declamation
   ______ interpretative reading
   ______ other __________
2. What is the total number of students involved in the extracurricular speech program in the 1968-1969 school year? ________
   a. In debate? ______
   b. In discussion? ______
   c. In dramatics? ______
   d. In radio-television? ______
   e. In individual events? ______
   f. In other? ________

3. How many of these students also participated in the 1967-68 school year? ____________________

4. Please indicate below the average number of participation incidents each student had. (e.g. debate 5—that is the students participating in debate during the school year each averaged 5 debates.)
   a. debate ______
   b. discussion ______
   c. dramatics ______
   d. radio-television ______
   e. individual events ______
   f. other? ________

5. How many plays were produced during the 1968-1969 school Year? ______
   One-acts? ______
   Full-length? ______

6. Names of plays produced during the 1968-1969 school year?

   ___________________________________________________
   ___________________________________________________
   ___________________________________________________
   ___________________________________________________
   ___________________________________________________

7. What speech training has the extracurricular speech activities instructor had?
   a. First instructor of activities
      (1) Name of instructor _________________________________
      (2) Extracurricular activity being directed ________________
      (3) Highest degree held by teacher ________________________
Undergraduate major _______ Undergraduate minor _______  
Graduate major _________ Graduate minor ________  

(4) Number of undergraduate hours in speech?  
Semester _______ Quarter _______  

(5) Number of graduate hours in speech?  
Semester _______ Quarter _______  

(6) Has the teacher had academic preparation and practical experience in all areas he is coaching?  
Yes ___ No ___  
If above answer is No, please explain. __________________________  

(7) Number of years experience in directing speech activities?  
______________________  

b. Second instructor of activities  

(1) Name of instructor ____________________________  

(2) Extracurricular activity being directed ___________  

(3) Highest degree held by teacher __________________________  

Undergraduate major _______ Undergraduate minor _______  
Graduate major _________ Graduate minor ________  

(4) Number of undergraduate hours in speech?  
Semester _______ Quarter _______  

(5) Number of graduate hours in speech?  
Semester _______ Quarter _______  

(6) Has the teacher had academic preparation and practical experience in all areas he is coaching?  
Yes ___ No ___  
If above answer is No, please explain __________________________  

(7) Number of years experience in directing speech activities?  
______________________  

c. Third instructor of activities  

(1) Name of instructor ____________________________________  

(2) Extracurricular activity being directed _______________
(3) Highest degree held by teacher ________________________
Undergraduate major ______  Undergraduate minor ______
Graduate major ________  Graduate minor __________

(4) Number of undergraduate hours in speech?
Semester ______  Quarter ______

(5) Number of graduate hours in speech?
Semester ______  Quarter ______

(6) Has the teacher had academic preparation and practical
experience in all areas he is coaching?  ___ Yes ___ No

If above answer is No, please explain. ________________________
_________________________________________________________________________________

(7) Number of years experience in directing speech activities?
__________________________________

8. Do students participate in any other extracurricular speech
activity?
   ___ Yes   ___ No

   If yes, please specify. ____________________________________________
___________________________________________________________________
___________________________________________________________________

___________________________________________________________________

Any additional comments concerning the speech training in your high
school?