

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 064 745

CS 200 105

AUTHOR Jones, Tom; Di Salvo, Vince
TITLE A Computerized Content Analysis of the Perceived Criterion Categories for the "Speech to Inform" of Inexperienced and Experienced Basic Course Students.
PUB DATE [Dec 71]
NOTE 12p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Speech Communication Association (57th, San Francisco, Calif., Dec. 27-30, 1971)

EDRS PRICE MF-\$0.65 HC-\$3.29
DESCRIPTORS Behavior Theories; Communication (Thought Transfer); *Composition (Literary); *Computer Programs; *Content Analysis; Creative Writing; Data Analysis; Factor Analysis; Questionnaires; Rhetoric; *Speech Curriculum; Speech Skills; Undergraduate Study; *Word Frequency

IDENTIFIERS WORDS System

ABSTRACT

A computerized content analysis of the "theory input" for a basic speech course was conducted. The questions to be answered were (1) What does the inexperienced basic speech student hold as a conceptual perspective of the "speech to inform" prior to his being subjected to a college speech class? and (2) How does that inexperienced student's perspective change after being exposed to speech training? A questionnaire was administered to undergraduate students at Bowling Green State University requesting them to write a "lecturette" on the subject "The Important Things to Consider for a Good 'Speech to Inform'". This was done at the first meeting of the quarter and at the end of the quarter. The WORDS System, developed by the University of Rochester Medical School, was used to analyze the data collected by stripping words of their endings and editing out prepositions, conjunctions, relative and personal pronouns, and the "to be" and "to have" verb forms. The concept of the WORDS System is that sufficient meaning exists in the association of "a word with itself and other words to conduct meaningful analysis". Results indicate that (1) students come to a basic course with much more awareness of speech-communication than might be expected, and (2) the student's principal concern is toward effective delivery; however, experienced students seemed to recognize a greater importance in the organization of ideas, while both groups seemed equally concerned with the importance of "interesting material and topics."
(Author/LS)

ED 064745

**A Computerized Content Analysis of the
Perceived Criterion Categories for the
"Speech to Inform" of Inexperienced and
Experienced basic course students.**

**Tom Jonas, University of Wisconsin-Platteville
Vince Di Salvo, University of Nebraska**

~~FE 002 968~~
CS 200 105

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE
PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS
STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION
POSITION OR POLICY.

**"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS
COPYRIGHTED MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED
BY Tom Jonas and Vince
DiSalvo**

**TO ERIC AND ORGANIZATIONS OPERATING
UNDER AGREEMENTS WITH THE U.S. OFFICE OF
EDUCATION. FURTHER REPRODUCTION OUTSIDE
THE ERIC SYSTEM REQUIRES PERMISSION OF
THE COPYRIGHT OWNER."**

Current emphasis on behavioral objectives for basic speech courses (Barker and Kibler, 1971) led the researchers to question the issue of "theory input" for a course, and in particular the more refined issue of which concepts are "taught" as compared to those which are supposedly "learned". The researchers were intrigued with the questions of (1) "What does the inexperienced basic speech student hold as a conceptual perspective of the speech to inform prior to his being subjected to a college speech class?" and (2) "How does that inexperienced student's perspective change after having been exposed to speech training?"

It seemed obvious to the researchers that a system of analysis was needed that was not predicated on a priori categorization; rather than imposing categories on the data, the researchers wanted the categories to develop from the research itself. This in effect was to allow the categories as perceived by the students to evolve from the data base.

Procedure

The WORDS system developed by Howard Iker and Norman Harway at the University of Rochester Medical School answered the research need. The expressed goal of the WORDS system was to content analyze textual data and thus allow the researcher to "discover what his data are about without having to furnish a priori categorizations within which to classify these data" (Gerbner, 1969, 381).

The researchers decided to design an unassuming questionnaire to be administered to the undergraduate speech students at Bowling Green State University at the first meeting of the quarter and at the end of the quarter. The procedure included having the course instructors in each of the drill sections ask their students to take

out a piece of paper and write a lecturette of approximately 100 words on the topic of "The important things to have for a good 'speech to inform'". At the first meeting of the television lecture sessions, the proctors were asked to write only the title on the blackboard, to announce that section number was the only identification requirement, that the answers would not be graded and that the research was part of on-going research to improve the basic course at Bowling Green State University. At the final television lecture meetings of the spring quarter, a sheet of paper with the same instructions was distributed and collected.

The data was keypunched onto data cards for processing by the WORDS system on the IBM 360, model 75 at Bowling Green State University. The conceptual perspective grounding the WORDS system is that "sufficient meaning" exists in the association of "a word with itself and other words to conduct meaningful analysis". After "stripping" words of their endings to basic word "roots" and editing out prepositions, conjunctions, relative and personal pronouns, and the "to be" and "to have" verb forms, the data was processed through the programs necessary to develop the 215 x 215 correlation matrix of the 215 most-frequently-occurring words of the data base. That matrix from the data base of 30 sections was then factor analyzed for five factors by a principal components method and then subjected to a Kaiser varimax rotation. From previous research, (DiSalvo and Bochner, 1970), the researchers decided to limit the factors to five. Because the principal components method was used, the five factors were produced. The researchers predicted that the five "categories" of the first content analysis ("inexperienced" students) would contain a strong "delivery" factor, but that the categories of the first analysis would not differ "significantly" from the categories

of the second analysis ("experienced" students).

Results

Both experienced and inexperienced basic course students often employed such words as "audience, speech, inform, subject, interest, topic, speaker, fact, consider, and know" in their lecturettes on the speech to inform. In general the vocabulary seemed to indicate three factors of delivery, organization, and interest. While the factor structures were predetermined by the researchers at five, only easily identifiable factors were produced in each of the factoring runs--delivery, particularly visual concepts; and organization, particularly, outlining. Students in the inexperienced groups tended to comment about the most important things that "probably" should be included; that since they did not have the technical terminology they would "suppose" that such and such was "possibly" needed. Such words have a much higher incidence level as well as influence in the factor structures of the inexperienced groups. The experienced groups had a much greater tendency to organize their answers in terms of "First, Second, etc." and these words also have relevance to the resulting factor structures. The categories resulting from the inexperienced students' factor structures were named "Content, Purpose, Organization, Delivery, and Experience" although the "Delivery" factor is the most easily recognized. The categories resulting from the experienced students' factor structure were more easily identifiable as "Organization, Experience, Idea (Topic), Delivery, and Demonstration."

Conclusions

The results of the factor structure, when coupled with the original texts of the lecturettes, are generally indicative of two concepts: (1) students come to a basic course with much more awareness of basic speech-communication than might be expected, and (2) the students' principal concern is toward effective delivery; however, experienced students seemed to recognize a greater importance in the organization of ideas, while both groups seemed equally concerned with the importance of "interesting" material and topics.

For this type of research, the WORDS system has a great potential for the speech-communication discipline; however, some revision of the system of twenty-eight programs and its main "coordinating" program would also be in order to allow the analysis of a larger data base. This revision is also necessary in order to include more than the top 215 most frequently occurring words for the principal components factor analysis, and a second revision is needed to open the space parameter of one of the allocation programs to allow handling a larger amount of input data. The latter restriction limited the researchers to processing approximately one-half of the sections' data they collected.

Nonetheless, the research has merit in that it represents an attempt to statistically derive "categories" for the basic speech to inform. Further analysis can now follow with the more traditional content analysis by using the established categories from the factor structure.

Of course, this research is slanted toward the student's perspective by going to the student himself for the often criticized paper and pencil response; nonetheless, the researchers

argue that this study has merit since it is the first survey-questionnaire in-class research conducted without the hamstrings of a priori categorization, and thus should be less subject to what Rosenthal called "experimenter bias" (1968, 1969) than previous questionnaire research. Such research not only attempts to ascertain what the student "wants", but also attempts to discern what he "gets" in relation to what he already "has".

TOP 215 MOST FREQUENTLY OCCURRING WORDS ON PRE-TEST AND POST-TEST

<u>Jodi Ed 1</u>		<u>Jodi Ed 2</u>		<u>Jodi Ed 1</u>		<u>Jodi Ed 2</u>	
speech	628	audience	562	take	29	clear	28
inform	546	speech	512	detail	28	aid	27
audience	354	should	428	ease	28	help	27
interest	234	inform	389	example	28	question	26
must	221	subject	273	group	28	relate	26
good	220	in	271	necessitate	27	age	25
no	219	interest	248	tell	27	center	25
topic	214	know	215	base	26	research	25
importance	209	no	190	little	26	follow	24
speaker	196	will	186	pick	26	body	23
subject	183	good	185	question	26	ease	23
fact	176	topic	185	confuse	25	talk	23
give	174	consider	175	level	25	think	23
know	170	speaker	161	long	25	state	22
consider	163	give	133	voice	25	visual	22
many	145	importance	121	main	24	new	21
will	143	all	102	sure	24	possible	21
present	129	many	99	want	24	gesture	20
listen	115	fact	87	cover	22	manner	20
make	110	make	83	conclude	21	bore	19
matter	107	present	83	contain	21	limit	19
person	80	point	71	probable	21	listen	19
do	77	choose	68	word	21	tell	19
attend	74	time	62	certain	20	confident	18
understand	66	matter	61	explain	20	learn	18
point	64	purpose	58	famous	20	opinion	18
use	63	speak	58	outline	20	thorough	18
clear	662	idea	54	part	20	write	18
talk	62	conclude	53	purpose	20	be	17
get	599	first	53	remember	20	know	17
keep	59	use	52	deliver	19	analytic	17
speak	557	main	51	hear	19	background	17
well	56	deliver	50	new	19	communicate	17
able	54	organize	50	show	19	decide	17
way	53	understand	47	state	19	experience	17
try	49	able	46	write	19	include	17
order	48	order	46	course	18	like	17
enough	47	introduce	44	feel	18	long	17
bore	46	remember	44	help	18	say	17
say	46	type	42	opinion	18	sex	17
organize	42	occasion	41	time	18	make	16
idea	41	general	40	body	17	accurate	16
manner	39	specify	40	convey	17	concern	16
go	38	need	39	logic	17	find	16
may	38	sure	38	general	16	answer	15
hold	37	attend	36	prepare	16	base	15
possible	36	prepare	36	aid	15	content	15
research	34	try	36	contact	15	enthusiasm	15
follow	33	want	36	mean	15	feel	15
justice	33	one	35	support	15	level	15
relate	33	person	33	thorough	15	little	15
choose	32	way	32	visual	15	mind	15
think	32	effect	30	eye	14	persuade	15
type	30	keep	30	next	14	voice	15
introduce	29	pick	30	read	14	analyze	14

TOP 215 WORDS, Cont.

Jodi Ed 1	Jodi Ed 2	Jodi Ed 1	Jodi Ed 2
summary	14	complete	14
aspect	13	explain	14
back	13	put	14
comprehend	13	word	14
concise	13	choose	13
end	13	contain	13
look	13	determine	13
entertain	13	example	13
learn	13	famous	13
look	13	intelligence	13
message	13	kind	13
mind	13	logic	13
relevant	13	mean	13
short	13	next	12
source	13	contact	12
answer	12	create	12
deal	12	detail	12
decide	12	develop	12
effect	12	down	12
lecture	12	fresh	12
like	12	outline	12
lose	12	several	12
loud	12	summary	12
suppose	12	organize	11
background	11	aware	11
begin	11	demonstrate	11
define	11	eye	11
discuss	11	feedback	11
draw	11	fit	11
final	11	group	11
form	11	hold	11
need	11	relevant	11
object	11	support	11
simple	11	secondly	10
student	11	ask	10
bring	10	necessitate	10
communicate	10	origin	10
language	10	own	10
note	10	plan	10
rather	10	process	10
start	10	finally	9
aware	9	classic	9
brief	9	compose	9
complete	9	convey	9
correct	9	establish	9
data	9	expose	9
even	9	react	9
express	9	simple	9
find	9	statistic	9
leave	9	study	9
pertain	9	style	9
quite	9	term	9
reliability	9	give	8
vary	9	try	8
approach	8	account	8
avoid	8	add	8
basic	8	attitude	8
	8	back	8
		classic	8
		concern	8
		describe	8
		educate	8
		fashion	8
		figure	8
		full	8
		hand	8
		minute	8
		own	8
		precise	8
		prove	8
		specify	8
		statistic	8
		accurate	7
		adequate	7
		appear	7
		arrange	7
		ask	7
		content	7
		desire	7
		doesn't	7
		else	7
		enjoy	7
		evident	7
		exact	7
		gain	7
		humor	7
		illustrate	7
		instance	7
		kind	7
		natural	7
		select	7
		slow	7
		step	7
		technical	7
		truth	7
		usual	7
		valid	7
		value	7
		work	7
		add	6
		aids	6
		assume	6
		authority	6
		clarify	8
		concise	8
		cover	8
		describe	8
		element	8
		end	8
		expect	8
		factor	8
		hear	8
		leave	8
		major	8
		move	8
		proper	8
		provide	8
		retain	8
		same	8
		select	8
		show	8
		suit	8
		warm	8
		inform	7
		remember	7
		second	7
		take	7
		adequate	7
		alloted	7
		appropriate	7
		arouse	7
		avail	7
		avoid	7
		bring	7
		define	7
		difficult	7
		force	7
		involve	7
		language	7
		material	7
		message	7
		obtain	7
		part	7
		probable	7
		ready	7
		see	7
		spatial	7
		step	7

1 Edited from data set during a creation of Jodi Ed 3

2 Edited from data set during creation of Jodi Ed 4



FACTOR 1 <i>subject matter clarity</i>	FACTOR 2 <i>Topic & Purpose technical</i>	FACTOR 3 <i>Organization possible</i>	FACTOR 4 <i>Delivery & Visual want</i>	FACTOR 5 <i>Audience Experience</i>
92	89	82	94	90
79	87	77	92	79
77	86	76	89	79
77	86	75	88	74
74	80	74	87	72
71	78	74	87	70
71	77	71	87	70
70	77	68	86	68
68	77	64	85	68
67	76	64	85	68
66	76	63	84	67
64	74	63	83	66
62	74	62	82	64
62	72	62	81	62
61	71	62	79	62
61	71	62	78	62
60	70	60	78	61
59	70	59	78	61
58	68	59	77	60
58	67	58	75	59
57	66	57	74	58
57	65	56	74	58
56	65	56	74	58
56	64	55	74	57
55	63	54	73	56
54	61	54	72	55
55	59	54	72	55
53	58	54	71	53
52	57	54	71	52
51	56	54	71	51
51	56	54	69	51
51	55	52	69	51
51	55	51	69	50
50	55	51	69	50
50	54	51	69	50
50	54	51	67	48
50	53	50	67	48
49	51	50	67	48
49	50	50	66	47
48	49	48	66	46
basic	evident	cover	fact	relevant
logic	assume	start	understand	answer
lecture	interest	close	voice	sure
confuse	precise	order	speaker	subject
accurate	lecture	deal	will	look
opinion	opinion	thorough	make	say
appear	data	effect	listen	aspect

FACTOR 1	FACTOR 2	FACTOR 3	FACTOR 4	FACTOR 5
<i>Organization</i>	<i>Experience</i>	<i>Subject Matter</i>	<i>Delivery</i>	<i>Demonstrate</i>
89	97	87	89	88
89	88	83	85	83
88	87	82	81	82
87	87	76	79	81
87	85	75	73	79
86	84	74	71	79
86	83	71	69	77
86	83	71	69	75
85	82	71	68	67
84	81	70	67	66
82	79	68	67	65
81	77	67	67	65
81	75	67	66	64
80	73	66	66	63
80	72	66	66	62
79	72	66	66	61
78	72	66	66	61
78	72	66	66	60
78	71	63	64	60
77	71	62	64	59
77	71	62	64	58
77	69	61	63	57
75	69	61	62	56
75	69	61	62	56
73	66	58	61	56
73	63	57	61	53
72	63	56	60	53
71	63	56	58	52
71	63	52	56	51
71	63	51	56	51
70	62	51	55	50
70	61	50	55	50
70	60	49	54	50
69	59	49	54	50
66	59	48	54	49
64	58	47	54	49
63	58	47	53	49
61	58	47	53	47
69	57	47	51	47



Questionnaire-Survey

Directions to 102 Instructors: (from Jonas and Di Salvo, 354-2024)

Please write the following sentence on the board and ask your students to take out a piece of paper and write a "lecturette" of approximately 100 words. If they ask, you might tell them that their answers will not affect their grade for the course, but is part of the on-going evaluation of the 102 program (Your names are not necessary, but the section number should be written on the papers.)

Thank you.

The Sentence:

THE IMPORTANT THINGS TO CONSIDER FOR A GOOD "SPEECH TO INFORM"

- Larry Barker, Robert Kibler and Rudolph Geter
"Two Investigations of the Relationships among
Selected Ratings of Speech Effectiveness,
Comprehensions", *Speech Monographs*, 35:3,
1968, p. 400-406
- Samuel Becker, ~~Thomas~~
"The Rating of Speeches: Scale Independence",
Speech Monographs, 29:1, 1962 p. 38-44
- Donald Bryant and Kari Wallace
Fundamentals of Public Speaking, 4th Edition, 1969.
- Ted Clevenger
"Influence of Scale Complexity on the Reliability of
Ratings", *Speech Monographs*, 31:2 1964, pp. 153-156.
- Di Salvo, Vince and Art Bochner
"Simulated Speech Evaluation Process using The PROF
Technique", Paper presented at the 1970 Speech-
Communication Association Convention.
- George Gerbner, et. al.,
The Analysis of Communication Content: Developments
in Scientific Theories and Computer Techniques.
New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 1969.
- Iker, Howard
WORDS System User's Manual, University of Rochester,
1969.
- Jonas, Thomas
"The WORDS System: A Computer-assisted Content
Analysis of Chaim Perelman's 'New Rhetoric'",
Unpublished PhD Dissertation, Bowling Green State
University, 1971.
- Alan Monroe
Principles and Types of Speech, Scott ~~W.~~ Foresman
and Company, 1967.
- Wanda Mitchell,
"Planning the course," *Speech Teacher*, 28:4, 1969,
pp. 259-262.
- R.K. Tiemens
"Validation of Informative Speech Ratings by Retention
Tests," *Speech Teacher*, 14:3, 1965, pp. 211-215