Online vs. Traditional Classroom: An Examination of Public Speaking Anxiety in Community College Students

by

Shaquille Marsh

A dissertation submitted to the Graduate Faculty of
Auburn University
in partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the Degree of
Doctor of Philosophy

Auburn, Alabama
December 16, 2017

Keywords: online, traditional, public speaking anxiety

Approved by

Maria Witte, Chair, Professor of Educational Foundations, Leadership and Technology
James Witte, Professor of Educational Foundations, Leadership and Technology
Leslie Cordie, Assistant Professor of Educational Foundations, Leadership and Technology
David DiRamio, Associate Professor of Educational Foundations, Leadership and Technology

Abstract

Most people admit to having some degree of public speaking anxiety (Hickerson, 1998). This study examined the public speaking anxiety levels of students enrolled in an online and traditional public speaking course. This study also investigated the relationship among a student's gender and the format in which the public speaking course was taken as it relates to public speaking anxiety. The population was drawn from 332 students enrolled in a large sized community college in the southeastern part of the United States during the fall semester of 2017. Student participants completed a demographic questionnaire and the Personal Report of Public Speaking Anxiety (PRPSA) developed by James McCroskey.

The independent variables for this study were the public speaking course format (online, traditional) and gender. The dependent variable for this study was the public speaking anxiety level as determined by the Personal Report of Public Speaking Anxiety (PRPSA). A one-way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) was used to determine the relationship between class format and gender as it relates to students' public speaking anxiety levels.

The results of this study found that students who enrolled in either an online or traditional public speaking course entered the public speaking classroom with low public speaking anxiety. There was no statistically significant difference between men and women and their public speaking anxiety levels who when enrolled in an online public speaking course. There was a statistically significant difference between men and women and their public speaking anxiety

levels for those who enrolled in a traditional public speaking course. Men experienced higher levels of public speaking anxiety when compared to women when completing a traditional public speaking course. Areas of further research is needed to identify why students are entering public speaking courses with low public speaking anxiety.

Acknowledgments

First, I would like to thank God and Jesus. Without them, I would be nothing. They have given me a purpose on this Earth.

I want to thank my mother, Linda Marsh, for being my rock. The constant encouragement got me through days where I felt like an imposter and had almost given up on my dreams of becoming Dr. Marsh. She is the real MVP and truly deserves this. I am the person that I am due to this special woman.

To my committee members, Dr. Maria Witte, Dr. James Witte, Dr. Leslie Cordie, and Dr. David DiRamio, I am forever grateful for your faith in me. You all supported me in a way that gave me the strength to become not only a better scholar but a better person. Thank you to my University Reader, Dr. Brigitta Brunner, for your support. You have been an example of being humble and gracious.

To the students of Pellissippi State Community College, thank you for your participation in this study. Specifically, I want to thank the faculty of the Communication Studies department, Dr. Fowler, Mrs. Kathy King, my office mates in Portable Building D-101, and all the faculty and staff at Pellissippi State who encouraged me.

This list of people to thank is endless, and I do not have enough space. However, I want to thank two of my mentors, Brent Johnson and Dr. Zachary Showers, for their support. I hope to have a positive impact on my students lives as you did for me. Thank you, Dr. Xi Lin, Dr. Chantel Tremitiere, Kristine Ball, and the SADC staff. Thank you to my professors and friends from my Samson, Alabama, Troy, Alabama, and Auburn, Alabama families for setting a solid foundation for me.

Table of Contents

List of Tables

CHAPTER I: INTRODUCTION

Overview

Thousands of college students must face their fear of public speaking by taking mandated public speaking courses in American universities each semester (Pearson, Dewitt, Child, Kahl, & Dandamudi, 2007). Each year, students may question the applicability of the basic speech course. Some students claim that presenting speeches will not be a job requirement for their future profession. Many do not realize that countless occupations require public presentations, particularly as a person moves into higher positions (McCroskey, Simpson, Richmond, 1982). The ability to construct a clear message in a public setting may establish oneself as credible and competent.

When students take a public speaking course, they typically lack confidence in their own abilities to deliver a message successfully, believe their peers will negatively judge them, and feel isolated (Rattine-Flaherty, 2014). For many students, this may be his or her first time presenting in front of a group of people. Some students may wait until their senior year of college to take a public speaking course. Jerry Seinfeld said, "According to most studies, people's number one fear is public speaking. Number two is death. Death is number two. Does that sound right? This means to the average person, if you go to a funeral, you're better off in the casket than doing the eulogy" (Miller, 2013). This fear is not surprising as this is consistent with

results of a survey conducted by Bruskin (1973) which examined Americans fears. R. H. Bruskin Associates surveyed 2,543 men and women in April of 1973.

Respondents were asked to pick items from a list representing situations in which they had some degree of fear. The rank order of fears reported is as follows: Speaking before a group, 40.6%; Heights, 32.0%; Insects and Bugs, 22.0%; Financial problems, 22.0; Deep water, 21.5%; Sickness, 18.8%; Death, 18.7%; Flying, 18.3%: Loneliness, 13.6%; Dogs, 11.2%; Driving or riding in a car, 8.8%; Darkness, 7.9%; Elevators, 7.6%; Escalators, 4.8%. (Speech Communication Association, 1973, p. 4)

Other surveys throughout time support that the number one fear among Americans is speaking in front of an audience (Dwyer & Davidson, 2012; Ledbetter, 2015; Motley, 1998; Richmond & McCroskey, 1995; Speech Communication Association, 1973).

As the fear of public speaking remains consistent, technology such as the internet has impacted the way people engage in public speaking. The traditional face-to-face public speaking channel may not be the only way to reach an audience. The internet has greatly changed the way people interact with others (Jones, 2008). For example, a person can use a webcam to record a presentation which can be viewed by others later.

With more colleges and universities using the internet as a learning tool, some researchers (Botella, Hofmann, & Moscovitch, 2004; Lind (2012); Tillfors et al., (2008)) encourage instructors to embrace the change. For the public speaking course to remain consistent and relevant, given the changing public landscape, students in the course need not only be trained in rudimentary oratory but also in digital oratory (Lind, 2012). Digital oratory is defined as thesis-driven, vocal, embodied public address that is housed within (online) new media platforms (e.g., YouTube (Lind, 2012)). Incorporating a digital assignment in the public

2

speaking course allows educators to increase students' collective reach, exponentially expanding their rhetorical polis (Lind, 2012).

Not all public speaking instructors have accepted the medium of technology as a tool for the basic speech course. For example, Hunt (2012) is a strong proponent of not teaching public speaking online and states the following:

First, the way I currently teach public speaking seems to work very well. Actually, from my understanding of the history of rhetoric it has worked well for thousands of years. The second reason concerns my vocational calling. My perception of effective teaching involves being with students in real physical space. In other words, I am called to the classroom, not the computer screen. My third reason – not unrelated to the first two – concerns the notion of embodiment. I am persuaded that embodied teaching, especially with a subject that centers on the use of the body and voice, is superior to disembodied teaching. My reason for not wanting to teach public speaking online would be identical to why I do not think sculpting or tennis should be taught online. (Hunt, 2012, p. 163)

Regardless of the format, a student takes a public speaking course, he or she may experience public speaking anxiety. The instructor's job is to help reduce a student's public speaking anxiety level. But, if the instructor does not know the level of a student's public anxiety, the course may not be helpful to the student (Gutgold & Grodziak, 2013). A one size all approach to teaching a public speaking course, no matter the format, can be a hindrance for a student.

Statement of the Problem

This study focused on examining students' public speaking anxiety levels as they enter online and traditional public speaking classroom environments. There is a lack of research

3

identifying students' public speaking anxiety levels entering the online and the traditional public speaking classrooms. There is a need for this research as colleges and universities increase the number of online public speaking sections offered each year to meet students' needs. There is little supporting research literature examining the relationship between the level of public speaking anxiety and the format in which the public speaking course is administered. There is also a lack of research that examines a student's gender, level of public speaking anxiety, and the format of the public speaking course.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to examine the public speaking anxiety levels of students enrolled in online and traditional public speaking courses. The Personal Report of Public Speaking Anxiety (PRPSA) instrument developed by James McCroskey was used to measure students' public speaking anxiety levels. The study also examined the relationship among a student's gender, public speaking anxiety level, and the format (online, traditional) in which the public speaking course was taken.

Research Questions

This study was guided by the following research questions:

1. What are the public speaking anxiety levels of students entering online public speaking courses?

2. What are the public speaking anxiety levels of students entering traditional, face-to-face public speaking courses.?

3. What is the relationship between public speaking anxiety levels of students in online public speaking courses by gender?

4. What is the relationship between public speaking anxiety levels of students in traditional, face-to-face public speaking courses by gender?

Significance of the Study

Many students may experience some level of speech anxiety regardless of their confidence level. When individuals take a public speaking course may depend on how comfortable they are speaking in front of an audience. Instructors of public speaking may need to adapt their teaching based upon the level of their students' speech anxiety. Simply being mindful of students' public speaking anxiety levels can provide instructors with a starting point of where to meet students in the learning process.

Emanuel (2005) argued that good communication skills fuel self-confidence and enable people to exert more control over their lives. This confidence can influence how students present themselves in a public forum. At some point in a student's lifetime, he or she might be given the task of performing some public presentation. For those who experience high levels of public speaking anxiety, giving a speech can be daunting.

Although most people in the public speaking profession acknowledge that the basic speech course enhances students' confidence in their speaking proficiency, some scholars, both inside and outside of the profession, challenge that the basic speech course as it is typically taught has very little value (McCroskey, 1967). On the contrary, Marcel (2015) found that students' speaking abilities do improve after taking a public speaking course. The researcher surveyed 1,610 business alumni and measured their confidence when giving a business presentation. The results revealed that alumni who had taken a public speaking course experienced higher levels of self-confidence than those who did not take it.

Furthermore, this study would add to the existing public speaking anxiety research literature. The study could help basic course directors inform public speaking instructors of how public speaking anxiety may differ with students who take the course via online or the traditional classroom. The results of this study may perhaps assist public speaking instructors in preparing course activities and assignments that can reduce public speaking anxiety in either format.

Assumptions of the Study

The following assumptions were made for the purpose of the study:

1. The participants of the study answered each question on the demographic questionnaire honestly.

2. The participants of the study answered each statement on the Personal Report of Public Speaking Anxiety honestly and consistently.

3. The Personal Report of Public Speaking Anxiety is a valid instrument to measure public speaking anxiety.

Limitations of the Study

This study contains the following limitations:

1. The Personal Report of Public Speaking Anxiety is a self-reported instrument.

2. The Personal Report of Public Speaking Anxiety provides only quantitative data.

3. The study cannot be generalized since the study was conducted at a single two-year public institution in the Southeast region of the United States.

4. A convenience sample was used for the study.

5. The sample was limited to students enrolled in either an online or traditional public speaking course. The sample did not include hybrid public speaking courses.

6. The data did not distinguish if the student was a domestic or international student.

7. The study included student participants who were enrolled in two online public speaking courses.

8. The study did not account for previous public speaking experience.

9. The study did not account for how comfortable student participants were with technology while enrolled in the online public speaking course.

10. The study was conducted at the beginning of one semester.

Definition of Terms

Andragogy: The art and science of teaching/leading adults (Knowles, 1980, p. 43).

Basic Course: The communication course either required or recommended for a significant number of undergraduates; that course which the department has, or would recommend as a requirement for all or most undergraduates (Morreale, et al., 1999)

Communication Apprehension: An individual's level of fear or anxiety with either real or anticipated communication with another person or persons (McCroskey, 1977).

Distance Education: Described as the process that connects learners with distributed learning resources and is characterized by a) separation of place and/or time between instructor and learner, among learners, and/or between learners and learning resources, and b) interaction between learner and instructor, among learners, and/or learners and learning resources conducted through one or more media (Galbraith, 2004).

Distance Learning: Refers specifically to the learning and to the learner (Galbraith, 2004).

Digital Oratory: Defined as thesis-driven, vocal, embodied public address that is housed within (online) new media platforms (Lind, 2012).

Generalized-Context Communication Apprehension: Apprehension viewed as a relatively enduring, personality-type orientation toward communication in each type of context (McCroskey, 1983).

Online Learning: An environment in which the student and teacher is physically separated by time and space. Technology is used as the medium of communication (Marland, 1989).

Pathological Communication Apprehension: Apprehension viewed when fear of unfamiliar situations induce anxiety (McCroskey, 1983).

Pedagogy: The art and science of teaching children (Knowles, 1980).

Person-Group Communication Apprehension: Apprehension viewed as a relatively enduring orientation toward communication with a given person or group of people (McCroskey, 1983).

Public Speaking: When an individual speaks to a group of people, assuming responsibility for speaking for a defined length of time (Coopman & Lull, 2013).

Public Speaking Anxiety: A situation specific social anxiety that arises from the real or anticipated enactment of an oral presentation (Bodie, 2010).

Situational Communication Apprehension: Apprehension viewed as a transitory orientation toward communication with a given person or group of people (McCroskey, 1983).

State Anxiety: Anxiety which operates from a situational orientation (McCroskey & Beatty, 1984).

Traditional Classroom: When the student and teacher is physically in the same room in real time. (Qi & Polianskaia, 2007).

Trait Anxiety: Anxiety which operates from a predispositional orientation (McCroskey & Beatty, 1984).

Trait-Like Communication Apprehension: Apprehension viewed as a relatively enduring, personality-type orientation toward a given mode of communication across a wide variety of contexts (McCroskey, 1983).

Uncertainty-Reduction Theory: This theory argues that the primary goal of individuals in initial interactions is to reduce uncertainty and increase the ability to predict the behavior of others (Berger & Calabrese, 1975).

Organization of the Study

Chapter I provides an introduction to this study. This chapter includes a statement of the problem, purpose of the study, description of the instrument used in the study, research questions, significance of the study, assumptions of the study, limitations of the study, and definition of terms used in this study. Chapter II includes a review of relevant literature to this study which includes: the history of the basic speech course, explanation of public speaking anxiety and communication apprehension, the effects of communication apprehension, the difference between state and trait anxiety, the role gender plays in public speaking anxiety, a brief overview of the Uncertainty Reduction Theory, adult education and andragogy, and online learning.

Chapter III presents the methods used for this study. It includes the research questions, the Personal Report of Public Speaking Anxiety instrument, population sample, data collection, and data analysis. Chapter IV provides the findings of the study and interpretation of the data. The demographic characteristics of the participants are described. Also, the statistical procedures

are presented. Chapter V summarizes the findings and conclusions of the study. Furthermore,

this chapter contains implications and recommendations for future practice and research.

CHAPTER II: LITERATURE REVIEW

Introduction

The National Communication Association (NCA) recognizes current national trends that support a broad general education for undergraduate students and supports the claims that communication skills are critical to the citizenry and workforce of the 21st century (Simonds, Buckrop, Redmond, & Quianthy, 2012). The basic course has provided students with training which has been shown to improve the success of students in their academic, professional, and social lives (Finn, Sawyer, & Schrodt, 2009). Chapter I addresses the statement of the problem, the purpose of the study, the research questions, the significance of the study, the assumptions of the study, the limitations of the study, and the definition of terms. Chapter II reviews the purpose of the study and the research questions. This chapter reviews the history of the basic course in the United States, defines what is public speaking anxiety, communication apprehension, and the effects of communication apprehension. The chapter also provides a distinction between state and trait anxiety, examines gender and public speaking anxiety, how the Uncertainty Reduction Theory and public speaking relates to one another, discuss adult education and andragogy, and online learning.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to examine the public speaking anxiety levels of students enrolled in online and traditional public speaking courses. The Personal Report of Public Speaking Anxiety (PRPSA) instrument developed by James McCroskey was used to measure students' public speaking anxiety levels. The study also examined the relationship among a student's gender, public speaking anxiety level, and the format (online, traditional) in which the public speaking course was taken.

Research Questions

This study was guided by the following research questions:

1. What are the public speaking anxiety levels of students entering online public speaking courses?

2. What are the public speaking anxiety levels of students entering traditional, face-to-face public speaking courses.?

3. What is the relationship between public speaking anxiety levels of students in online public speaking courses by gender?

4. What is the relationship between public speaking anxiety levels of students in traditional, face-to-face public speaking courses by gender?

The History of the Basic Course in the United States

The basic course is the largest single comprehensive instructional source of information about human communication in the world (Beebe, 2013). This course introduces students to content in the areas of public speaking, principles of oral communication, foundations of oral communication, interpersonal communication, and small group communication. Steven Beebe, former president of the NCA, compared the basic course to the front porch of a house (Beebe,

2013). The former president suggested this because students are first exposed to the academic field of communication when enrolled in the basic course.

However, the emergence of the basic course in higher education started with a dispute between a group of English and public speaking instructors. In 1914, 17 public speaking instructors removed themselves from a group called the National Council of Teachers of English. The public speaking instructors believed that English departments devalued the importance of public speaking instruction. With the goal of elevating the importance of public speaking in college curriculum, the group of 17 public speaking instructors formed the National Association of Academic Teachers of Public Speaking in 1914. The association changed its name to the National Association of Teachers of Speech in 1923. In 1946, the Speech Association of America became the identity of the association. The current name of the organization, the National Communication Association (NCA), was introduced in 1997.

As institutions started identifying public speaking and English in different departments, the examination of the basic course began to surface. In the 1950s, Donald Hargis became one of the first scholars to examine the basic course. In conjunction with the Committee on Problems in Undergraduate Study of the Speech Association, Hargis sought to find out the approaches to the course and identify the titles of the basic course. Four hundred and forty questionnaires were mailed to the heads of speech departments in 1954. Two hundred and twenty-nine department chairs responded to the questionnaire. After analyzing the results, the committee discovered that basic course was being taught at colleges and universities mainly as a public speaking course. Yet, the study revealed that the basic course went by 59 different titles such as speech, public speaking, fundamentals of oral communication, oral communication, communications, oral interpretation, and communication of technical information (Hargis, 1956).

Similarly, Morreale, Worley, and Hungenburg, (2010) examined how institutions across the United States labeled the basic course. In the study, 618 two-year and four-year speech departments were contacted using either an online or paper questionnaire. Two hundred and eight institutions responded to the questionnaire. The data showed that the basic course went by the following identifiers: public speaking, hybrid public speaking (includes group communication, interpersonal communication, and public speaking), interpersonal communication, group communication, and fundamentals of oral communication. There is an ongoing debate within the communication discipline on the basic course title description.

Based on the 1954 report by Committee on Problems in Undergraduate Study of the Speech Association of America, the basic course lacked clarity. In the 1960s, an organized effort to understand the activities of the course and its relationship in the general education curriculum began (Dedmon 1965; Dedmon & Frandsen, 1964). Dedmon (1965) argued that the basic course should be designed as an oral communication course. Dedmon suggested communication theory be the driving force behind speech activities. Particularly, Dedmon believed speech assignments needed to be geared towards students' communication to his or her group and within the group. The best approach to teaching a general education course is to combine traditional approaches to the course, which included public speaking, voice and diction, and communication skills, with communication theory (Dedmon, 1965).

Additionally, in the 1960s, it was common for colleges and universities to require students to take the basic course while enrolled at their institutions. Dedmon and Frandsen (1964) investigated to what extent the course was a course requirement for graduation. In January 1963, 925 questionnaires were mailed to heads of speech departments across the United States. Four hundred and six questionnaires were used for the analysis. The questionnaire asked

for three kinds of information: 1) general information about the school (location, whether or not it offered a major in speech), 2) information if the basic course was required, and 3) listings of textbooks and other materials required of students enrolled in the basic course. The analysis revealed that 51% of the institutions responded to the questionnaire required students to successfully complete the basic course before successfully graduating.

But, Dedmon was not the only scholar who advanced the basic course through scholarly pursuits throughout the 1960s. A group of eight Midwestern universities (Colorado, Oklahoma, Oklahoma State, Kansas, Kansas State, Iowa State, Missouri, and Nebraska) combined their efforts in 1962 to form a group called the Directors of the Basic Speech Course at Midwestern Universities, later called the Midwest Basic Course Directors (Munger et al., 2011). Each year since 1962, the group convenes to discuss the current trends and research activities in the basic course. The name of the conference currently goes by the Basic Course Directors' Conference. Dedmon and colleagues' efforts showed how the basic course needed to be maintained and built in relation to general education requirements.

Another trend revealed in the 1960s was the mindset to keep the number of students enrolled in the basic course low. This pattern of small class sizes in the basic course contrasted with the large sections other disciplines offered for their basic course (Gibson, Kline, & Gruner, 1974). By reducing the numbers of students in a public speaking course, basic course directors may have made this decision due to not wanting to overwhelm students with large audiences.

With the examination of the course and content being researched, the approach to designing the basic course became the focus of research in the 1970s and 1980s. James Gibson became the leader in studying the basic course during this era. Gibson found that the basic course emphasized items other than public speaking (Gibson, Gruner, Brooks, & Petrie, 1970; Gibson,

Kline, & Gruner, 1975; Gibson, Hanna, & Huddleston, 1985). Gibson et al., (1975) distributed 1,291 questionnaires to speech departments at four-year institutions. Five hundred and sixty-four of the questionnaires were used. The questionnaires asked information such as course objectives and content, instructional materials, instructional and testing procedures, curriculum, and organizational considerations, enrollment, and staffing (Gibson et al, 1975). When compared to the data obtained in 1970 by Gibson and colleagues, more institutions stressed other aspects of communication or used a hybrid approach though public speaking remained the top emphasis in the basic course.

To follow up the study conducted in 1975, Gibson, Gruner, Hanna, Smythe, and Haynes (1980) mailed questionnaires to 2,794 two-year and four-year institutions. The researchers decided to delete, add, and modify some questions used in the 1975 study. One finding of this study showed more graduate teaching assistants and junior faculty taught the basic course than senior faculty. The basic course being taught more by graduate teaching assistants and junior faculty was consistent with the study by Gibson et al., (1970). In this study, it was reported that over 57% of the basic course was by these graduate teaching assistants and junior faculty. Also, there was an uptick by institutions to focus back more on public speaking than other communication approaches in the basic course when compared to the results five years prior in 1975.

The ongoing audit of the basic course continued with the study conducted by Gibson et al., (1985). In this study, 2,087 two- and four- year institutions received questionnaires. Five hundred and twenty-three of the questionnaires were usable. Information asked on the survey included demographic information, orientations, instructional methods, and administrative concerns. Results showed that the public speaking orientation to the course was the most

16

commonly used approach to the basic course in the 1980s (Gibson, et al., 1985; Gray, 1989). At this point in time, there was a rise in the responsibilities of graduate teaching assistants and junior faculty teaching the basic course at 71% (Gibson et al., 1985). This was a 14% rise in when compared to the Gibson et al., 1970 study that revealed that the 57% of the basic course instructors were graduate teaching assistants and junior faculty. The shift from senior faculty teaching the basic course to graduate teaching assistants and junior faculty could be attributed to increase enrollment in the course at this point in time.

Efficiency in teaching the basic course became important in the 1980s. Economics encouraged the use of more graduate assistants and forced departments to look for ways to increase enrollments without sacrificing quality (Gray, 1989). So, a new technique to the basic course called the Fred S. Keller's Personalized System of Instruction (PSI) had been implemented to increase efficiency. This self-directed approach divided students into larger groups where learning would be guided through modules, while lecture was used to supplement what was learned from the modules. Fuss-Reineck and Seiler (1982) indicated that the Fred Keller's Personalized System of Instruction had little acceptance in speech communication. This potential significant change did not have much impact on the majority of basic courses in speech communication across the nation (Gray, 1989).

Although continuous self-reflection helped to legitimize the course in general education, the concentration of building a network of scholars became prominent in the 1980s. A proposal at the Midwest Basic Course Directors' conference led the charge for an academic journal. The Basic Communication Course Annual (BCAA) would be the name of the journal due in part to the efforts of Wallace (1989). In its 27th volume, the lone peer reviewed journal in the field leads the way in research on administering and teaching the basic course.

In correlation with the journal, the visibility of the basic course on college campuses sprouted up in the 1990s. The changing needs of the students may have helped influence the efficiency model of the basic course. As more curricula, outside of communication required students to complete communication assignments, training became important. Institutions started building communication centers. The National Association of Communication Centers provide training and assistance for students in the basic course. The communication centers also prepare students to present presentations for different courses, help with interviewing skills, and provides workshops for faculty on instructional communication skills for their classrooms (Valenzano, Wallace, & Morreale, 2014).

Equally as important, in 1994, the National Communication Association added a membership division dedicated to the basic course. Members of the National Communication Association voiced their opinions at a meeting in 1996 about the importance of the basic course and oral communication.

> There is substantial consensus on the importance of communication skills in the general education of students. Virtually every college or university mission's statement makes the development of communication skill a central educational goal. There is also widespread acknowledgment of the vital important of oral communication in the personal, professional and civic lives of graduates. For decades, the literature of our profession has addressed the essential role of communication in any liberal education and provided documentation of the effectiveness of basic communication courses. (National Communication Association, 1996, p. 1)

Up until the 1990s, most of the academic literature on the basic course focused on items such as communication apprehension and public speaking anxiety. The basic course needed to be revised as more research started to focus on communication competencies that would translate to the workplace success. Kramer and Hinton (1996) examined whether students' perceptions of their communication competencies in class, at work, and in social settings increased after taking a public speaking course. The results showed when students enrolled in a public speaking course

18

their perceptions of their communication competencies improved in several areas: public speaking, interpersonal communication, group communication, interviewing, listening, and self-confidence (Kramer & Hinton, 1996). This finding suggested that taking a public speaking course did impact students' perception of communication competencies (Ford & Wolvin, 1992; Stacks & Stone, 1984; Wolvin, 1998). Many basic communication courses help students transition to college and as preparatory for professional and corporate settings upon graduation (Morreale, Worley, & Hugenberg, 2010).

As the role of the basic course became an important figure in general education in the 1990s, the delivery of the course started to shift slightly. Morreale, Hanna, Berko, and Gibson (1999) added to the basic course literature by examining the impact of technology on the basic course. Morreale et. al., (1999) found technology including interactive (smart) classrooms, computer equipped practice labs, computer-based tutorial packages, CD-ROMs and the Internet for research activities, e-mail listservs, and home pages had been used for the basic course. In addition, Morreale et al., (1999) sent out surveys through the mail to 1,500 schools listed on the National Communication Association website. Two hundred and ninety-two schools replied to the questionnaire. Respondents were asked items in four categories: general approach/orientation to the basic course, pedagogy, enrollment description and dynamics, and administrative concerns. Though small, five percent of the schools who responded used televised lectures and videotapes to teach to students.

Based on the survey results in the 1990s and 2000s, the basic communication course continued to focus on public speaking (Morreale et al., 1999; Morreale, Hugenberg, & Worley, 2006; Morreale et al., 2010). Since this shift brought a significant change in the textbook selection so it could align with the focus of public speaking in the basic course. Many institutions

changed textbooks to keep up with the changing needs of students. Instead of using Alan

Monroe's *Principles and Types of Speeches* textbook, speech departments used Stephen Lucas's

The Art of Public Speaking (Morreale et al., 1999). Departments around the country decided to

seek a textbook that included the fluid nature of speeches, particularly since the basic course

started to implement technology.

The use of technology as a teaching tool became more apparent with the turn of the 21st

century. Hungenberg and Hungenberg (2007) suggested ways technology could be included in

the basic course. The researchers stated how the use of an electronic book (e-book), interactive

student activities online content examinations, student practice quizzes, email, chat rooms,

discussion boards, learning objects, and streaming videos could enhance student engagement.

However, the authors stated that the activities be used to facilitate student learning not a

substitute for it.

The emergence of technology in the basic course has helped keep the course relevant and

adaptable. Dance (2002) argued that:

> "In many ways, the undergraduate course in basic public speaking
> is the discipline's "bread and butter" course. The course introduces new students to the
> discipline, provides continuing teaching opportunities for both permanent and adjunct
> faculty and often supports graduate programs through its staffing by graduate assistants.
> This is an important course. (Dance, 2002, p. 355)

Morreale, Worley, and Hugenberg, (2010) supported the claims of Dance (2002):

> (The) basic course has continued to remain healthy over time…enrollment is stable or on
> the rise and the course is a recognized and viable part of general education, which
> contributes to students' development of communication competency across
> disciplines…the orientation of the basic course has remained unchanged in that the
> majority of institutions continue to teach public speaking. The assignments…in the
> course are…centered on public speaking…The basic course is changing and evolving in
> some ways, perhaps in response to globalization, diversity, and the emergence of
> communicative technologies…changes…likely to require innovative thinking that meets
> the student needs and budgetary restraints while maintaining academic integrity and
> respect for the core content of the communication discipline. The use of media and

technology is probably one of the most significant changes affecting the basic course over time. (Morreale et al., 2010, p. 425).

However, the basic course has encountered problems. Morrale, Myers, Backlund, and Simonds, (2016) conducted a study that replicated the eight prior studies of the basic course that dates to the 1970s. In the study, 188 two-year and four-year institutions speech departments participated. A 65-item survey was sent in electronic or mailed to communication department chairs that were listed on the National Communication Association website. The survey had been updated to include questions that were raised in regional and national communication conferences. The results revealed the basic course had 10 problems. The problems were financial support (45.7%), qualifications of instructors (42.9 %), evaluation of instructors (39.5%), training of instructors (35.3), assessment of student learning (25.7%), grade inflation (21.6%), consistency across sections (standardization) (18.6%), technology issues, (18.0), general administration of the course (0.6%), and classroom civility (0.6%). These problems remained consistent with the findings of Morreale et al., (2010). Each iteration of the basic course survey has uncovered new issues and identified new challenges to the basic course, which call for further examination by communication education scholars (Morreale et al., 2016)

Public Speaking Anxiety Defined

Public speaking anxiety has been labeled different terms such as speech fear, social speech fright, speech anxiety, audience anxiety, communication apprehension, performance anxiety, and most often labeled as stage fright (Daly, 1978; Daly & Buss, 1983). But, stage fright and public speaking anxiety differ. Stage fright is a response to either the participation in or the anticipation of a public performance, such as a public speech, an oral reading, singing before a group, or even performing in an athletic competition before an audience (McCroskey, 1976). Public speaking anxiety (PSA) is defined as a situation specific social anxiety that arises from

the real or anticipated enactment of an oral presentation (Bodie, 2010). It is a sub-type of communication-bound anxiety whereby individuals experience physiological arousal (e.g., increased heart rate), negative self-focused cognitions (e.g., ''I'm concerned I'll appear incompetent.''), and/or behavioral concomitants (e.g., trembling) in response to an expected or actual presentation (Bodie, 2010).

Communication Apprehension

In a special reports section published in the *Speech Monographs* in 1970, James McCroskey reported on the development of instruments that measured communication-bound anxiety. In 1968, McCroskey renamed the term communication-bound anxiety to communication apprehension (McCroskey, 2009). The Speech Association of America (known as the National Communication Association) recommended that communication apprehension be measured at different ages. The committee stated since many problems in speech communication pedagogy may result from students' inhibitions rather than their inability, it recommended the development of instruments to measure at various ages the extent of communication-bound anxiety (McCroskey, 1970).

To create these instruments to meet the needs of communication discipline, McCroskey first reviewed the three types of instruments that measured communication-bound anxiety. McCroskey discovered that observer ratings, devices for indexing physiological changes, and self-reporting scales had been used by researchers to measure communication-bound anxiety. The issue with the approaches had been that the items did not measure the same phenomenon.

After a process of elimination of the three instruments, McCroskey decided that the self-reporting scale would be the best approach to measuring communication apprehension in 1970. There were three reasons for why McCroskey chose to use the self-reporting scale. The first

reason was due to the low expense to administer. The second reason was that the instrument could tap anxiety responses across a variety of communication contexts at one time. The third reason is because Likert-type self-report scales, when properly developed, normally, are highly reliable (McCroskey, 1970).

With the decision made to use self-reporting scales, McCroskey developed four scales to measure communication apprehension. The Speech Association of America suggested the scales be age dependent. The scales developed included the Personal Report of Communication Apprehension for College Students, Personal Report of Communication Apprehension for Tenth Graders, the Personal Report of Communication Apprehension for Seventh Graders, and the Personal Report of Public Speaking Apprehension (later changed to the Personal Report of Public Speaking Anxiety). After the scales had been tested by other researchers and validated, McCroskey went on to define communication apprehension as an individual's level of fear or anxiety with either real or anticipated communication with another person or persons (McCroskey, 1977).

There are different types of communication apprehension that have been identified. According to McCroskey (1983), the types of communication apprehension included trait- like communication apprehension, generalized-context communication apprehension, person-group communication apprehension, situational communication apprehension, and pathological communication apprehension.

Trait-like communication apprehension can be viewed as a relatively enduring, personality-type orientation toward a given mode of communication across a wide variety of contexts. Generalized-context communication apprehension may be seen as a relatively enduring, personality-type orientation toward communication in a given type of context. Person-

group communication apprehension consists of relatively enduring orientation toward communication with a given person or group of people. Situational communication apprehension entails a transitory orientation toward communication with a given person or group of people. Pathological communication apprehension involves a fear of unfamiliar situations induce anxiety (McCroskey, 1983). These different types of communication apprehension may impact the communication interaction with others.

Early studies on communication apprehension by McCroskey and his colleagues revealed the impact it could have in individuals' in both the public and private spheres. Daly and McCroskey (1975) noted clear preferences on the part of people with high communication apprehension for occupations having low communication requirements and people with low communication apprehension for jobs with high communication requirements. Individuals with high communication apprehension experienced lower job satisfaction than those with low communication apprehension (Falcione, McCroskey, & Daly, 1977; McCroskey, 1976). McCroskey, Daly, and Sorensen (1976) indicated that people with high communication apprehension had lower grades in school when compared to students with low communication apprehension.

According to McCroskey (2009), some people did not believe there was something such as communication apprehension in their classrooms. McCroskey (1977) concluded students with high communication apprehension scored lower on the American College Test (ACT), had lower grade point averages, and recorded lower grades on objective tests and instructor-evaluated written projects when compared to low communication apprehension students. McCroskey and McVetta (1978) suggested students with high communication apprehension, compared to students with low communication apprehension, expressed greater preferences for seating

arrangements in the classroom inhibiting interaction and lesser preferences for arrangements facilitating interaction.

Beatty (1998) detailed the long-term effect of experiencing communication apprehension in public speaking situations is the development of a predisposition to avoid communication. Most people admit to having some degree of public speaking anxiety (Hickerson, 1998). The impact of communication apprehension can lead to missed opportunities in the workplace and impact a student's choice of employment (Daly & McCroskey, 1975; Daly & Shamo, 1976) and application for employment (Daly & Leth, 1976). According to Robinson (1997), the basic public speaking course is an ideal setting for treating communication apprehension.

According to Daly and McCroskey (1975), communication apprehension has been found to be a widespread phenomenon that negatively affects a large number of people. Robinson (1997) argued the basic course allows instructors to treat many apprehensive students at one time. Also, communication apprehension is a common problem for students in a basic course and taking a public speaking course may be the only opportunity for students to speaking in public in their college career (Robinson, 1997).

Public speaking anxiety may be a factor in why some students decide to take the public speaking course online. However, Clark and Jones (2001) used three questionnaires including the Personal Report of Communication Apprehension to examine communication apprehension in students enrolled in a traditional face-to-face public course or online course. The results revealed communication apprehension did not differ between students in the traditional public speaking course and the online course. It was highlighted that there is no evidence students elected to take an online public speaking course to avoid face-to-face contact (Clark & Jones, 2001).

Effects of Communication Apprehension

According to McCroskey and Richmond (1992), communication apprehension has both internal and external effects. Internal effects come from within the person. This type of effect is observable. Some people fall apart when experiencing high communication apprehension, while others maintain a cool and composed exterior (McCroskey & Richmond, 1992). People react differently when faced with anxiety. McCroskey (2009) indicated among the general population in the United States, it is estimated 20% of people suffer the effects of high communication anxiety.

External effects have no externally observable behavior that is a universally predictable effect of communication apprehension (McCroskey & Richmond, 1992). The reaction to the communication anxiety may yield unpredictable behaviors. The person may fight and face the anxiety. The person may flee and avoid the communication situation. The person may overcompensate and experience discomfort due to facing the communication experience without being fully preparing for the encounter. Approximately 70% of people in the United States experience communication anxiety when they have to give a public speech (McCroskey, 2009). The use of cognitive modification, systematic desensitization, and visualization/skills training strategies have been recommended to reduce communication apprehension by scholars (Ayers & Hopf, 1985; Finn, et al., 2009; Fremouw & Scott, 1979; McCroskey, 1972; McCroskey, et al., 1970).

State and Trait Anxiety

According to Spielberger (1966), state anxiety referred to an individual's level of anxiety in a specific situation at a particular point in time. Trait anxiety is defined as the "differences among people in the disposition or tendency to perceive a wide range of situations as threatening" (Spielberger, 1966, p. 13). Scholars had added to Spielberger's definitions.

McCroskey and Beatty (1984) defined state anxiety that operated from a situational orientation. Trait anxiety is defined as anxiety which operates from a predispositional orientation (McCroskey & Beatty, 1984). These two phenomena have been viewed separately.

State anxiety can be separated into two conditions: habituation and sensitization. Behnke and Sawyer (1998) argued that the public speaking experience can be broken down into four phases. The four phases are anticipation, confrontation, adaptation, and release. Speech state anxiety patterns for the classical milestones of anticipation, confrontation, adaptation, and release have been established by inspecting the line plot of State-Trait Anxiety Inventory (STAI) scores across the four stages of public speaking anxiety (Roberts, Finn, Harris, Sawyer, & Behnke, 2005). The difference in the four stages of public speaking anxiety is what led to the distinction in state anxiety of speakers who are sensitizers and habituators. Sensitizers are individuals who responsiveness increases by highly potent stimuli, while habituators anxiety decreases with time due to repeated or prolonged exposures to stimulus (Finn, Sawyer, & Schrodt, 2009).

With trait anxiety, four traits have been identified to demonstrate this area. The four traits include compulsive communication, self-perceived communication competence, shyness, and willingness to communicate. The shyness trait of trait anxiety been studied by scholars (McCroskey & Richmond, 1988; McCroskey & Richmond, 1992; Pilkonis, Heape, & Klein, 1980) According to McCroskey and Richmond (1992), there are five different degrees of shyness:

The Skill Deficient

People tend to do what they do well and avoid doing what they do poorly. Many people in our society have low communication skills. If these people are able to receive training which they perceive increases their skills, their shyness is likely to disappear.

The Social Introvert

Some people have a high need and desire to be with other people (social extroverts), while others prefer to be alone most of the time (social introverts). In circumstances where they have little motivation to communicate, they will appear shy. In other circumstances, when more motivation to communicate is present, it will appear they are not shy at all.

The Alienated

Alienated individuals typically behave in a shy manner. In another environment, they may not behave this way, but in the given environment they see little need to communicate because they perceive no benefits that they would obtain by communicate.

The Ethnically/Culturally Divergent

Each ethnic and cultural group has its own ways of behaving. Similarly, ethnic and cultural groups communicate in very different ways, sometimes even in different languages or dialects. In some groups, such as the general white North American culture, talk is highly valued. In others, much less value is placed on talking to others. Most people within any ethnic or 20 cultural groups quickly learn the communication norms of their group. The problem arises when one moves into an ethnically or culturally different group. The person, while possibly being a very effective communicator in her or his own group, is divergent from the other group members. Not only does the outsider have difficulty understanding what he or she should do to communicate effectively, the group members may have considerable difficulty figuring out how to adapt to the divergent person. Under such circumstances the ethnically or culturally divergent person is very likely to behave in a shy manner, but such shyness is restricted to circumstances in which the individual is with person of a different ethnic or cultural background.

This trait anxiety may appear in students enrolled in the basic course. Finn, Sawyer, and Behnke (2007) examined the extent to which trait anxiety and physiological reactivity predicted anxious arousal during a public speaking presentation. The results revealed trait anxiety and physiological reactivity are strong predictors of anxious arousal. However, Dupagne, Stacks, and Giroux (2007) found that there was not significant difference on reducing state or trait anxiety when video streaming was used in public speaking classes to record speeches.

Individuals with trait anxiety are not just anxious about communicating in the basic public speaking course, but also nervous about speaking in other public speaking situations (Booth-Butterfield & Booth-Butterfield, 2004). Richmond and McCroskey (1998) determined:

> As noted earlier, about 20 percent of the population falls in each extreme category. It is important to clarify the meaning we are assigning to the terms low and high communication apprehension. People in the so-called normal range of communication apprehension tend to respond very differently in various situations; one situation (a job interview) might prompt them to be highly anxious while another situation (answering a question in class) might result in no anxiety or tension at all. The "low" and the "high" communication apprehensive, however, tend to respond to virtually all oral communication situations in the same way. The low communication apprehensive will usually be willing to talk and not be scared to communicate. The high communication apprehensive will usually be unwilling to talk, remain quiet, and be scared speechless most of the time. In summary, trait-like communication apprehension is an enduring orientation about communication and usually doesn't change unless there is some form of intervention or behavior modification. (Richmond & McCroskey, 1998, p. 44)

Gender and Public Speaking Anxiety

Gender may play a role in the success in a public speaking situation. McCroskey, Simpson, and Richmond (1982) reported that women are more apprehensive within a communication context. The researchers argued to expect a lower proportion of women (compared to men) to seek training. Being apprehensive may represent a meaningful barrier to the economic and social advancement of women in the society (McCroskey, et al., 1982). This result has been supported by other scholars (Emanuel, 2005; McCroskey, 1984). Mejias,

Applbaum, Applabum, and Trotter (1991) discovered females are more prone to speaking anxiety than males. Behnke and Sawyer (2002) found female public speakers exhibited higher levels of speech anxiety on both state and narrowband trait public speaking measures.

Conversely, other studies have produced different results. Gaibani and Elmenfi, (2014) surveyed 108 students over the course of three academic semesters. Students were given a questionnaire addressing speech anxiety at the end of each semester. The results revealed no significant impact of gender on public speaking anxiety. Matsuda and Gobel (2004) and Tianjian (2010) produced the same results as Gaibani and Elmenfi (2014). In fact, Levitt (1980) reported male students experienced higher levels of public speaking anxiety when compared to female students.

Uncertainty Reduction Theory and Public Speaking

One of the most defensible and pragmatic theories in the communication discipline is the Uncertainty Reduction Theory (URT) introduced by Charles Berger and Richard Calabrese in 1975 (Witt & Benke, 2006). The Uncertainty Reduction Theory argues the primary goal of individuals in initial interactions is to reduce uncertainty and increase the ability to predict the behavior of others (Berger & Calabrese, 1975). The theory predicts when someone is placed in an unfamiliar situation, anxiety at its highest. For students in a public speaking course, the unfamiliarity of little to no prior public speaking experience may increase their anxiety levels.

Berger and Calabrese (1975) proposed the following seven axioms for the Uncertainty Reduction Theory. Axioms are statements or propositions of a relationship among variables assumed to be true (Blalock, 1969).

- Axiom One: Given the high level of uncertainty present at the onset of the entry phase, as the amount of verbal communication between strangers increases, the level

of uncertainty for each interactant in the relationship will decrease. As uncertainty is further reduced, the amount of verbal communication will increase.

- Axiom Two: As nonverbal affiliative expressiveness increases, uncertainty levels will decrease in an initial interaction situation. In addition, decreases in uncertainty level will cause increases in nonverbal affiliative expressiveness.

- Axiom Three: High levels of uncertainty cause increases in information seeking behavior. As uncertainty levels decline, information seeking behavior decreases.

- Axiom Four: High levels of uncertainty in a relationship cause decreases in the intimacy level of communication content. Low levels of uncertainty produce high levels of intimacy.

- Axiom Five: High levels of uncertainty produce high rates of reciprocity. Low levels of uncertainty produce low reciprocity rates.
  Axiom Six: Similarities between persons reduce uncertainty, while dissimilarities produce increases in uncertainty.

- Axiom Seven: Increases in uncertainty level produce decreases in liking; decreases in uncertainty level produce increases in liking.

Adult Education and Andragogy

Adult educators appear in a myriad of different settings and situations. The adult educator can be a consultant hired by a company to enhance its employees' listening skills. Perhaps, the educator is an assigned or informal mentor to a younger colleague in the workplace. Maybe, the person is a volunteer who teaches a course to local citizens at a community center on how to

better communicate in interpersonal relationships. Many individuals may be considered members of the adult education field without realizing it.

Adult education can be formal, nonformal, or informal. The practice of formal adult education can be found in educational institutions. People who are striving to obtain a degree or to be certified to practice in a particular occupation are examples of formal adult education. Non-formal adult education includes educating adults outside of educational institutions. Learning in churches, libraries, and museums are forms of non-formal adult education settings. In a like manner, adult education can be informal. Learning through experience or daily endeavors are examples of this type of education.

The adult education field is vast in nature. This broad, non-defined field of study has a glaring issue with its identity: Who is considered an adult? Arnett (1997) indicated the adult status is not merely biological but is socially constructed, formed from the criteria the members of a culture deem to be most important in signifying adult status. Meulemann (2003) defined adulthood as the obligation to stick to the self once found against changes of wishes and circumstances, of inner and outer forces. Particularly in the United States, being an adult depends on the situation. When a male turns the age of 18, he must register with the Selective Services. In all states, the drinking age is 21. The operator of a motor vehicle can obtain a driver's license at age 16. As seen in these examples, it may be complicated to determine who is considered an adult.

Even though defining who is considered an adult can be problematic, researchers have attempted to explain what is adult education. Darkenwald and Merriam (1982) claimed that adult education is a process whereby persons major social roles are characteristic of adult status undertake systematic and sustained learning activities for the purpose of bringing about changes

in knowledge, attitudes, values or skills. Cyril Houle (1996) defined adult education as a process involving planning by individuals or agencies by which adults "alone, in groups, or in institutional settings……. improve themselves or their society. Both definitions encompassed as the learner purposefully learning new things.

There is a clear distinction between andragogy and pedgogy. "Andra" translates as the word adult, which makes andragogy the art and science of teaching/leading adults (Knowles, 1980, p. 43), whereas "peda" or "paid" translates as child, which makes pedagogy the art and science of teaching children (Knowles, 1980). Andragogy is a partner that can help the speech communication discipline- at all levels- grow, prosper, and survive (Engleberg, 1984).

The work of Malcolm Knowles is integral to understanding adult learning in postsecondary education (Purcell, 2010). Malcolm Knowles is considered the father of adult education. Knowles (1984b) suggested four guiding principles of andragogy. The first principle is the adult learner needs to be involved in the planning and evaluation of the instruction. The second principle highlights embracing the learner's experience. Experience provides the basis for the learning activities. The third principle ties to making the subject relevant and timely to the learner's job or personal life. The fourth principle examines how the adult learner is problem-centered. Knowles also proposed the following assumptions about adult learners.

1) Self-Concept-It is a normal aspect of the process of maturation for a person to move from dependency toward increasing self-directedness, but at different rates for different people and in different dimensions of life (Knowles, 1970). For the public speaking student, he or she may need to progress at their own rate.

2) Experience- As people grow and develop they accumulate an increasing reservoir of experience that becomes an increasingly rich resource for learning-for themselves and

for others (Knowles, 1970). Students who decided to enter the public speaking course bring their own unique experience that can be shared with others in the course. Advice can possibly be shared amongst peers and help them become more competent public speakers.

3) Readiness to Learn- People become ready to learn something when they experience a need to learn it in order to cope more satisfyingly with real-life tasks or problems (Knowles, 1970). At times, individuals are not ready to take the public speaking course because of things such as fear or realize gaining experience speaking in front of others could improve their chance to attain a desire promotion in one's job.

4) Orientation to Learn- Learners see education as a process of developing increased competence to achieve their full potential in life (Knowles, 1970). There are different reasons for why students enter a public speaking course. It could be to improve one's public speaking skills, a friend is taking the course so the person decided to take the course, or fulfill an oral requirement for a degree. Cyril Houle's 1961 book, the Inquiring Mind, discussed three adult learner orientations: 1) Learning orientation- Learners participate for the sake of knowledge; they are continuous, lifelong learners (Houle, 1961). 2) Activity Orientation- Learners participate primarily for social reasons (Houle, 1961). 3) Goal Orientation- Education is used to fulfill a predetermined goal (Houle, 1961).

5) Motivation to learn- Internal motivation is key as a person matures (Taylor & Kroth, 2009). Confidence and self-esteem in speaking publicly could intrinsically motivate someone. Empowerment may be a driving force for someone to enroll in a public speaking course.

6) The need to know- Adults need to know the reason for learning something. (Taylor & Kroth, 2009). Skills-based learning is emphasized when public speaking instructors teach students how skills learned in class translate to job-related tasks.

Online Learning

Many colleges and universities now offer online public speaking courses and believe it is an entirely reasonable idea (Hunt, 2012). Students who enroll in an online class have unique qualities. Dabbagh (2007) argued that the following characteristics and skills are recognized as critical to the success of the online learner:

- Having a strong academic self-concept.

- Exhibiting fluency in the use of online learning technologies.

- Possessing interpersonal and communication skills.

- Understanding and valuing interaction and collaborative learning.

- Possessing an internal locus of control.

- Exhibiting self-directed learning skills.

- Exhibiting a need for affiliation.

Online courses have their benefits and can help explain why the basic course has expanded to the online format. Keramidas (2012) highlighted that online courses offered three essential advantages. The first advantage is online courses do not have the time and spatial constraints as traditional courses. The second advantage highlights that online courses are more cost-effective than traditional, face-to-face classes. The third advantage of online courses it attracts more students from around the world and increase revenue for the institution.

With technological advances making online courses easier to implement and the cost savings which make them so attractive to campus administrators, it is not surprising the number

of institutions that offering online courses and the amount of such courses offered have been growing (Tichavsky, Hunt, Driscoll, & Jicha, 2015). Teaching and learning have seen a shift in the 21st century. While face-to-face is the traditional method of learning, the emergence of online or distance learning has come to the forefront in education. The online formats include blended, hybrid, web-facilitated, and entirely online (Allen & Seaman, 2015).

Though the terms distance education and distance learning are used interchangeably, they do differ. Distance education can be described as the process connecting learners with distributed learning resources and is characterized by a) separation of place and/or time between instructor and learner, among learners, and/or between learners and learning resources, and b) interaction between learner and instructor, among learners, and/or learners and learning resources conducted through one or more media (Galbraith, 2004). Distance education may involve synchronous or asynchronous delivery methods (Allen, Bourhis, Burrell, & Mabry, 2002). Synchronous methods include using live chats, web conferencing, video conferencing, and instant messaging. Examples of asynchronous delivery methods consist of discussion boards, email, and narrated presentations. Regardless of the method used, separation in time and/or space between the instructor and learner exist.

In contrast, distance learning refers specifically to the learning and to the learner and the resources used in the learning process (Galbraith, 2004). These resources may include the instructor, experts in a certain area of study, the textbooks written on the subject matter, and workbooks. In most circumstances, the learning process has defined roles between the student and instructor. The instructor acts a guide in the learning process for the student. The student shows up in the online environment and learns. For the instructor to know if the student is active in the learning process, the student may need to establish an online presence.

Institutions of higher education have used various content delivery methods, including traditional face-to-face courses, hybrid or web-facilitated courses, and entirely online courses to address the needs of their students (Xin, 2015). The various delivery methods depend upon available resources at a given institution or company. Each delivery method has its advantages and disadvantages. An example of a disadvantage is the physical environment difference between an online course and the traditional face to face learning environment. In an online course, nonverbal communication may be void between the learner and the instructor. Messages communicated may be misinterpreted or not translated correctly by the learner. The environment for the distance learning experience is influenced by the impact of demographic, social, economic, and technological changes; variances in individual and societal lifestyles and expectations; and the existing cultural and social framework (Galbraith, 2004).

Learning outcomes achieved using distance learning

National and international trends have suggested a growing awareness on the part of institutions that the process of developing and delivering distance education is not just the dissemination of information using a variety of technology and innovation, but is, in fact, a student-oriented process (Galbraith, 2004). Student needs drive the curriculum for the online course. A lack of vision for the course learning outcomes may lead to a frustrated learner.

The learning outcomes in an online environment do not change from any other learning environment. All learning outcomes are dependent upon the course content. Learning outcomes can be measured through assessments such as assignments, midterms, and final exams. Student learning outcomes, leans heavily upon replication; that is, the continuing examination of the same phenomenon via the reanalysis of the same data with different methods and/or the analysis of additional data with the same or different methods (Sussman & Dutter, 2010). The course is

the driving force of the learning outcome. For example, in a public speaking course, learning outcomes may include focusing on the importance of solid content and organization in speeches or encouraging students to be mindful of the importance of audience analysis when giving a presentation. Whether a student is taking a course online or face to face, the learning outcomes usually do not change.

One learning outcome that can be achieved from distance learning is to describe items. Describing something to others is used throughout everyday life. Techniques such as reflective journal writing, group projects enabling team learning, portfolios demonstrating individual ability, and presentation and idea sharing are a few methods that an instructor can use to include this meet this type of learning outcome (Galbraith, 2004). These assessments may assist in the intellectual development of the student.

Creating is another learning outcome achieved using this method. The applicability of this learning outcome may be considered realistic. For instance, in an online physical science class, an instructor could require students to create a replica of a volcano. A course that entails that students interact with items may have many learning outcomes that are focused on creating.

Having critical thinking skills may be important in the contemporary technologically savvy workplace. Being able to analyze scenarios and make accurate decisions are skills that are required to move up into leadership positions. In a distance learning course, the learning outcome of effectively analyzing a situation is attainable. Case studies can provide learners with scenarios and allow for them to make independent decisions. Being able to analyze may be considered the most important learning outcome that is achieved in any learning environment.

Learning Tasks students are engaged in distance learning

The learning tasks students can engage in distance learning are numerous. Learning tasks depend on the course content. Tasks may include hands on activities or critically analyzing texts. The learning activities and modes of assessment will need to be responsive to the learning needs of individual learners, and the elements of a learning event--- the learning content, instructional methods, technologies and context—will need to complement each other (Galbraith, 2014). The tasks given by the instructor needs to be relevant and applicable.

Students can engage in learning tasks and then complete assessments. There are many reasons for instructors to create an assessment and the online environment lends itself to the creation of these. These can be used in class for pretests, formative assessments, exit ticket quizzes, traditional quizzes and tests, and more. Using online quizzes in classes may help students to become more familiar and comfortable with the process of completing assessments digitally. One reason for creating an assessment is to gather feedback and listen to the learners, analyze what they are telling you and iterate based on their feedback to ensure that one's teaching is as effective as possible.

Characteristics and skills of learners that are necessary for effective use of distance learning

For learners to effectively use this technique, they may need to be able to navigate a computer with relative ease. If someone does not have much experience working with computers, it may be difficult for the learner to learn. The learner may become frustrated and fail or even quit the online course. This skill of navigating a computer is a requirement to be an effective distance learner (Yu & Yu, 2002).

Email skills may be needed to succeed in an online course. Communicating with the instructor through an email platform is the norm. Frustration can ensue when communication breakdowns occur. It may not only affect perceptions, but it can affect the learning of the student (Heiman, 2008). A learner needs to be able do things such send an email, send an email with an attachment, and know where to place the instructor's email address in the email message. The lack of knowledge in engaging in the communication process with the instructor may leave many questions asked by the student unanswered.

Lim and Hyunjoong (2003) sought to identify what learner characteristics and motivation types affected a group of undergraduate students' learning and application of learning for a course conducted online. Each learner brings a skill set that may play a role in learning. Learner characteristics are known to affect students' learning achievement both for traditional and online instruction (Lim & Hyunjoong, 2003). Some example learner characteristics identified by Lim and Hyunjoong (2003) include previous work experience, computer experience, previous online learning experience, and gender.

The characteristics needed to be a successful distance learner delves into personal attributes. Effective learners manage their time. Distance learning courses can be task-oriented. Good time management skills may be needed to be prosperous. The learners may need to be able to balance their coursework with their other responsibilities outside of school. Though family and job obligations may be important to the learner, but being able to juggle them with the online course may determine the success the student experiences in the course.

Distance learning can be a lonely experience. The learner needs to be self-reliant. There is not an instructor physically in front of the student reminding him or her to complete assignments. Learners may need to be able to seek out the answers to the questions on their own.

Time zone differences may be a challenge the learner may face. Other factors such as schedule differences between the learner and instructor may impact the experience.

Being a self-directed learner is important to be successful in an online course. Wang, Peng, Huang, Hou, and Wang (2008) argued as a mature individual, the distance learner shifted from bring a dependent type to an independent type. The person must take the initiative to seek out knowledge. It is his or her responsibility to ask questions when something is not understood. The intrinsic motivation to succeed may help a student test assumptions. These types of learners are goal-oriented and are active in the learning process. The ability to make decisions on what information is relevant makes this learner a strong one in distance learning.

Conditions necessary for effective use of distance learning

For distance learning to be effective, the technology must be functional. The Internet must be fully functional for the student and instructor to communicate with one another. It is crucial that student and teacher have reliable access to the Internet. The provider must consider the needs for learner support in relation to the distance learning models used and make provisions for delivery of, or access to, appropriate resources based on the design of learning activities, technology involved, and the needs of the learner (Galbraith, 2004).

The sense of not being alone is a necessary condition that needs to be met for distance learning to be effective. Learning occurs best in a supportive environment where highly qualified educators are personally involved in the process (Kupczynski, Green, & Gibson, 2012). When an individual feel like he or she is a part of a community, it may make the person of the class. As an instructor, requiring students to complete items such as posting a picture on the course homepage for everyone to view, can help bridge to gap of feeling isolated in the class. By requiring students to post a picture to the course homepage, it may make the student aware that he or she are not

alone in the course, but are a member of the online community. The instructor needs to choose the correct online platform in which to engage students. Blackboard and Canvas are online software systems that can be used or any other system determined by the higher education institution.

Instructor skills needed to expertly use distance learning

Instructors need to be good communicators. The teacher needs to disclose to the learner all information pertinent to the learning opportunity such as course prerequisites, modes of study, evaluation criteria, and technical needs (Galbraith, 2004). All instructors should establish clear expectations of the course. A lack of structure to the course could produce irritated students.

Also, instructors need to be able to narrow the scope of information provided to students. Online instructors must avoid a hit-and-run approach in which they merely post canned lectures and notes on their institution's course management system (Comer, Lenaghan, & Sengupta, 2015). Having too many resources can cause students to become flabbergasted. Choosing the correct materials to use in the course may enhance learning.

Summary

This chapter presents an overview of relevant literature for the study. The chapter first addresses the history of the basic course in the United States for a specific reason. To know where the basic course is headed and its impact on students, it was imperative to explain where the basic course has been in the past and what effect it had on students. With each passing year, the basic course faces new challenges that need to be addressed by public speaking course directors and instructors. Next, public speaking anxiety was defined. The distinction was needed because public speaking anxiety has been studied under different terms (Daly, 1978; Daly &

Buss, 1983). Once the distinction of public speaking was established, reviewing the literature on communication apprehension was needed since public speaking anxiety is a sub-type of communication apprehension (Bodie, 2010). The chapter proceeds to discuss the effects of communication apprehension, the difference between state and trait anxiety, and the role gender may have on public speaking anxiety. A brief overview of the Uncertainty Reduction Theory was addressed in this chapter. Also, this chapter addresses literature on adult education and andragogy, and online learning.

CHAPTER III: METHODS

Introduction

Presentations are a necessary part of both college and work responsibilities, and competence in public speaking is paramount to student success in and out of the classroom (Johnson & Szczupakiewicz, 1987). This chapter is divided into eight sections. The first section restates the purpose of the study. The second section provides the research questions. The third section describes the design of the study. The fourth section discusses the instrumentation used in this study. The fifth section defines the sample population. The sixth section examines the data collected. The seventh section offers an analysis of the data. The eighth and final section discusses the limitations of the study.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to examine the public speaking anxiety levels of students enrolled in online and traditional public speaking courses. The Personal Report of Public Speaking Anxiety (PRPSA) instrument developed by James McCroskey was used to measure students' public speaking anxiety levels. The study also examined the relationship among a student's gender, public speaking anxiety level, and the format (online, traditional) in which the public speaking course was taken.

Research Questions

This study was guided by the following research questions:

1. What are the public speaking anxiety levels of students entering online public speaking courses?

2. What are the public speaking anxiety levels of students entering traditional, face-to-face public speaking courses.?

3. What is the relationship between public speaking anxiety levels of students in online public speaking courses by gender?

4. What is the relationship between public speaking anxiety levels of students in traditional, face-to-face public speaking courses by gender?

Design of the Study

A one-way ANOVA and descriptive statistics guided the research design used in this study. The Personal Report of Public Speaking Anxiety by James McCroskey was used to measure public speaking anxiety levels. A demographic questionnaire was used to gather information about participants' age, gender, race, class rank, and the format in which the student was taking the public speaking course.

Instrumentation

One demographic questionnaire and instrument were used in this study. The researcher created the demographic questionnaire to collect information about participants. The questionnaire gathered the following information: age, gender, race, class rank, and the format in which the student was taking the public speaking course. For the purposes of this research study, participants had to be 18 years old or older and be enrolled in either an online or traditional, face-to-face public speaking course in the fall of 2017 at Pellissippi State Community College. The

Personal Report of Public Speaking Anxiety scale developed by James McCroskey was used to measure students public speaking anxiety levels.

Personal Report of Public Speaking Anxiety Instrument

The Personal Report of Public Speaking Anxiety (PRPSA) is a self-reporting instrument designed by McCroskey (1970) to measure public speaking anxiety. The PRPSA contains 34 statements asking respondents to rate themselves based on a 5-point Likert scale. The scale is: 1=Strongly Disagree, 2= Disagree, 3=Neutral, 4=Agree, and 5=Strongly Agree. Respondents are to indicate one response per statement. Example statements include: "I look forward to giving a speech"; "I have trouble falling asleep the night before a speech": "When I make a mistake while giving a speech, I find it hard to concentrate on the parts that follow": " I enjoy preparing for a speech." High public speaking anxiety is characterized as scoring above a 131. A score of 98 and below represents low public speaking anxiety. A score between 98 and 131 represents moderate public speaking anxiety with the mean being 114.6. The scores fall between 34 and 170. With over 30 instruments to measure communication apprehension, this instrument is an excellent measure for research which centers on public speaking anxiety (McCroskey, 1970). This instrument is highly reliable (alpha estimates >.90) (McCroskey, 1970).

To determine participants public speaking anxiety levels., a formula is used. The formula is: 72 - Total from Step 2 + Total from Step 1= The public speaking anxiety score. Step One includes adding the Likert scale responses on the Personal Report of Public Speaking Anxiety from items 1, 2, 3, 5, 9, 10, 13, 14, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 25, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, and 34. Step One was a singular score. For Step Two, the Likert scale responses from statements 4, 6, 7, 8, 11, 12, 15, 16, 17, 18, 24, and 26 were added up to compute the second score. To calculate the final

public speaking anxiety level, the score from Step 2 was subtracted from the 72 then added to the score from Step One.

Interestingly, the Personal Report of Public Speaking Anxiety (PRPSA) is based on Emery and Krumboltz's (1967) study on test anxiety. The scale was developed by substituting public speaking situations for test situations. McCroskey wanted the scale to be lowered from 34 statements to 20, however item and factor analyses (n=729) found that items were discriminating and all loaded on a single factor, so the final Personal Report of Public Speaking Anxiety scale included 34 statements. (McCroskey, 1970).

Sample

The sample was drawn from a convenience sample at a large sized community college in the Southeast region of the United States. The study was conducted in the fall of 2017. Participants received extra credit in either their online or traditional, face-to-face public speaking course. Approval from both the Auburn University and Pellissippi State Community College Institutional Review Boards was received before the researcher conducted the study.

Pellissippi State Community College in Knoxville, Tennessee was chosen for two reasons: its location in the United States and the diverse life experiences of the students. The college offers its students the opportunity to earn the following credentials:

- Associate's degrees and certificates that lead to employment in a variety of career fields

- Associate's degrees, courses, programs, pathways, and partnerships that prepare students for transfer to baccalaureate-level colleges and universities

- Industry recognized certifications that increase the skills of the local workforce, support the development of existing and new employers, and foster economic growth (Pellissippi, 2017).

The college has five campus branches within Knox and Blount counties in east Tennessee. The campus branches are Division Street, Hardin Valley, Magnolia, Strawberry Plains (all located in Knoxville, Tennessee in Knox County) and Blount County (located in Friendsville, Tennessee in Blount County). With the implementation of the Tennessee Promise and Tennessee Reconnect programs, the college has adapted to the needs of its students by offering classes at different times throughout the morning, afternoon, evening, and weekend classes and has expanded classes to the online and hybrid formats.

Data Collection

One instrument, the Personal Report of Public Speaking Anxiety, and a demographic questionnaire were administered to students enrolled in a large sized community college in the Southeast region of the United States. The participants for the study were enrolled in either an online or traditional public speaking course in the fall of 2017. The convenience sample included both full-time and part-time adult learners.

For Protection of Human Participants, the researcher went through a thorough process. Items reviewed include the Personal Report of Public Speaking Anxiety scale (Appendix A), demographic questionnaire (Appendix B), information letter (Appendix C), and research project design. The researcher received permission to use the Personal Report of Public Speaking Anxiety for research purposes as cited by McCroskey (2007).

First, the researcher had to obtain the approval of his dissertation chairperson, followed by the approval of the department chair of the College of Education at Auburn University. After receiving approval from these parties, the researcher had to receive a written site authorization document (Appendix D) approval from the Dean of the Liberal Arts at Pellissippi State

Community College in Knoxville, Tennessee. Students at Pellissippi State Community College served as participants for this study.

After receiving the necessary approvals, the Institutional Review Board (IRB) at Auburn University (Appendix E) reviewed and approved the study to ensure the protection of human participants. Next, the Pellissippi State Community College Institutional Review Board (Appendix F) reviewed the study for the protection of human participants after receiving approval from the Auburn University Institutional Review Board. Pellissippi State Community College's Institutional Review Board wanted approval from the researcher's parent institution, Auburn University, before making a decision about the study.

Once all items were approved by both Auburn University and Pellissippi State Community College Institutional Review Boards, the researcher contacted both full- and part-time faculty members of the Communication Studies Department at Pellissippi State Community College via email and asked if they were willing to assist in the study. For those individuals who replied to the researcher's email and gave consent to participate, the Personal Report of Public Speaking Anxiety instrument, demographic questionnaire, and information letter were sent electronically via email.

For the first two weeks of the fall 2017 semester, faculty members who participated in the study encouraged their students to complete the Personal Report of Public Speaking Anxiety instrument and demographic questionnaire electronically. Student participants were instructed by faculty members that participation in the study was voluntary. The information letter was sent to research participants, which acted as a Wavier of Documentation of Consent. The Personal Report of Public Speaking Anxiety instrument and demographic questionnaire was posted by participating faculty members on either the learning management system used by the community

college or sent to students' official Pellissippi State student email account. The data collection took place outside usual college hours and could be completed at any time within the two-week period. The reason the researcher chose the first two weeks of the semester was because he sought to gather students public speaking anxiety levels before students presented their first graded speech.

The survey was administered using the electronic program called Qualtrics. After all data was collected after the two-week period, all responses were gathered and stored on the Qualtrics program then transferred to the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) for computation purposes. No personal identifiers were collected to safeguard anonymity and confidentiality. Participants were reminded through the information letter completing the survey and questionnaire was voluntary. Student participants had the opportunity to earn extra credit for completing the demographic questionnaire and Personal Report of Public Speaking Anxiety (PRPSA) instrument. Student participants were also informed they could discontinue their participation in the study at any time without any negative consequences.

Data Analysis

For this study, the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) was used to analyze the data. The data consisted of the public speaking anxiety levels of students taking either an online or traditional, face-to-face public speaking course obtained from 332 student participants. The responses from the 34-statement Likert scale Personal Report of Public Speaking Anxiety (PRPSA) instrument combined with the demographic questionnaire were placed in Qualtrics then transferred to SPSS for analysis.

The first two research questions required the use of descriptive statistics. The independent variable was the public speaking class format with two nominal levels (online, traditional (face-to-face)). The dependent variable was the public speaking anxiety level scores.

To determine student participants public speaking anxiety levels., a formula was used as suggested by McCroskey (1972). It takes three steps to obtain the public speaking anxiety score. Step One includes adding the Likert scale responses on the Personal Report of Public Speaking Anxiety from items 1, 2, 3, 5, 9, 10, 13, 14, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 25, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, and 34. The Step One gives you one score. For Step Two, the Likert scale responses on the Personal Report of Public Speaking Anxiety from items 4, 6, 7, 8, 11, 12, 15, 16, 17, 18, 24, and 26 were added up to compute the second score. Step 3 includes by taking the score from Step 2 subtracting it from the 72 then adding the score from Step One. The formula is: 72 - Total from Step 2 + Total from Step 1= The final public speaking anxiety score. For reliability, Cronbach's Alpha revealed .91.

A One-way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) was used to measure the relationships between public speaking anxiety levels of student in both the online and traditional, face-to-face public speaking courses by gender. The One-way ANOVA addresses research questions three and four of the study.   The procedure was chosen because there is one independent variable with two nominal levels (gender, class format) and one dependent variable (public speaking anxiety level). There are several underlying assumptions tied to the One-Way ANOVA.

1. The observations are random and independent samples come from the populations. The random observations are commonly referred to as the assumption of independence (n.d.).

2. The distributions of the populations from which the samples are selected are normal. The distributions are commonly referred to as the assumption of normality (n.d.).

3. The variances of the distributions in the populations are equal. The variances of distributions in the population are commonly referred to as the assumption of homogeneity of variance (n.d.). Based on the assumption there is homogeneity of variance, Levene's test was used to verify this assumption for this study.

Limitations of the Study

There are limitations to this study. The Personal Report of Public Speaking Anxiety instrument and demographic questionnaire are self-reporting tools. By using self-reporting tools, it is assumed that the participants answered the items honestly. Specifically, with the Personal Report of Public Speaking Anxiety tool, participants may realize how certain items relate to one another and may answer these items similarly to receive a desired outcome on the instrument.

Also, fatigue may be factor. The instrument includes 34 statements. Participants may become fatigued after a certain number of items and then proceed to answer the remaining items with the same answer without thoroughly understanding and internalizing the statement before providing an answer.

Another limitation is a convenience sample was used. The data was collected at a large, public community college in the Southeast region of the United States. This information may not be representative of other community colleges in the United States and other types of higher education institutions (i.e., four-year schools, private, technical, trade)

The study does not account for whether the student is domestic or foreign. Students bring with them different backgrounds and experiences. Since the community college environment is diverse, the culture from which the students come from may impact their public speaking anxiety level.

Furthermore, this study only examines public speaking anxiety levels entering a public speaking course. A pretest and posttest were not used. Public speaking anxiety levels can change as the semester progresses.

Prior experience in public speaking situations was not considered when the survey was distributed to student participants. Exposure to public speaking prior to taking a public speaking class may impact student participants public speaking anxiety level scores.

Summary

This chapter was divided into eight sections. The first section restated the purpose of the study. The second section provided the research questions. The third section described the design of the study. The fourth section discussed the instrumentation used in this study. The fifth section defined the sample population. The sixth section examined how the data collection. The seventh section offered an analysis of the data. The eighth section mentioned the limitations of the study.

CHAPTER IV: FINDINGS

Introduction

Chapter I provided an introduction to this study. This chapter included a statement of the problem, purpose of the study, description of the instrument used in the study, research questions, significance of the study, assumptions of the study, limitations of the study, and definition of terms used in this study. Chapter II included a review of relevant literature of this study which includes: the history of the basic speech course, explanation of public speaking anxiety and communication apprehension, the effects of communication apprehension, the difference between state and trait anxiety, the role gender plays in public speaking anxiety, a brief overview of the Uncertainty Reduction Theory, adult education and andragogy, and a description of the online learner, and a brief summary of distance learning.

Chapter III presented the methods used for this study. It included the research questions, the Personal Report of Public Speaking Anxiety instrument, population sample, data collection, and data analysis. This chapter will present the purpose of the study, the research questions, demographic results, information about the Personal Report of Public Speaking Anxiety (PRPSA), the data analysis for each research question for the study.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to examine the public speaking anxiety levels of students enrolled in online and traditional public speaking courses. The Personal Report of Public

Speaking Anxiety (PRPSA) instrument developed by James McCroskey was used to measure students' public speaking anxiety levels. The study also examined the relationship among a student's gender, public speaking anxiety level, and the format (online, traditional) in which the public speaking course was taken.

Research Questions

This study was guided by the following research questions:

1. What are the public speaking anxiety levels of students entering online public speaking courses?

2. What are the public speaking anxiety levels of students entering traditional, face-to-face public speaking courses.?

3. What is the relationship between public speaking anxiety levels of students in online public speaking courses by gender?

4. What is the relationship between public speaking anxiety levels of students in traditional, face-to-face public speaking courses by gender?

Demographic Results

A convenience sample of 332 student participants was included in this study. The participants were students enrolled in a large community college in the southeastern region of the United States during the fall semester of 2017. All the participants were undergraduates taking a public speaking course either online or in the traditional, face-to-face format. Participation in the study was voluntary. Each participant completed the Personal Report of Public Speaking Anxiety (PRPSA) instrument developed by James McCroskey and a demographic questionnaire. The response rate from the Personal Report of Public Speaking Anxiety was 97%. The biographical questionnaire provided information about age, race, gender, class rank, and the format in which

the participant was taking the public speaking class (i.e., online, traditional, face to face). The

Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) was used to analyze and compute the public

speaking anxiety levels of student taking public speaking online and in the traditional, face-to-

face format. Also, SPSS was used to examine the public speaking anxiety levels of students in

the public speaking class by format (i.e., online, traditional, face-to-face) and gender. A one-way

ANOVA was used to analyze research questions three and four.

Format of the Public Speaking Course

Most of the sample came from students who were enrolled in the traditional, face-to-face,

public speaking course (83%). Table 1 below shows the breakdown.

Table 1

Distribution by Class Format, Fall 2017

Format	n	Percent
Online	56	17.0%
Traditional, Face-to-Face	276	83.0%

  N=332

Race and Class Rank

The participants in this study were comprised of mostly Caucasians (81%) and held a

sophomore class rank (47%). Table 2 and Table 3 shows the breakdown by race and class rank.

Table 2

Distribution by Race, Fall 2017

Race	n	Percent
African-American	20	6.0%
Asian	11	3.0%
Caucasian	268	81.0%
Hispanic	18	5.0%
Mixed Race	13	4.0%
Pacific Islander	1	0.5%
Other	1	0.5%

  N=332

Table 3

Distribution by Class Rank, Fall 2017

Race	n	Percent
First-time Freshmen	91	27.0%
Freshmen	57	17.0%
Sophomore	157	47.0%
Junior	25	8.0%
Senior	2	1.0%

N=332

Gender

The participants in this study were comprised of 210 females and 122 males (*n*=332). The higher percentage of participants for this study were females at 63% with males composing 37 % of the population. Table 4 represents the distribution of participants by gender.

Table 4

Distribution by Gender, Fall 2017

Gender	n	Percent
Male	122	37%
Female	210	63%

N=332

Personal Report of Public Speaking Anxiety Instrument

The Personal Report of Public Speaking Anxiety (PRPSA) scale is a self-reporting instrument designed by McCroskey (1970) to measure public speaking anxiety. The PRPSA contains 34 statements asking respondents to rate themselves based on a 5-point Likert scale. High public speaking anxiety is characterized as scoring above a 131. A score of 98 and below represents low public speaking anxiety. A score between 98 and 131 represents moderate public speaking anxiety with the mean being 114.6. To determine the public speaking anxiety level for student participants, the formula as determined by the Personal Report of Public Speaking Anxiety instrument was used. It included three steps based on the Likert scale responses from

the statements on the Personal Report of Public Speaking Anxiety with:1= Strongly Disagree,

2=Disagree, 3=Neutral, 4=Agree, and 5=Strongly Agree.

A formula is used to determine student participants public speaking anxiety levels. The

formula is: 72 - Total from Step 2 + Total from Step 1= The public speaking anxiety score. Step

One includes adding the Likert scale responses on the Personal Report of Public Speaking

Anxiety from items 1, 2, 3, 5, 9, 10, 13, 14, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 25, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, and

34. The Step One was a singular score. For Step Two, the Likert scale responses from statements

4, 6, 7, 8, 11, 12, 15, 16, 17, 18, 24, and 26 were added up to compute a second score. To

calculate the final public speaking anxiety level, the score from Step 2 was subtracted from the

72 then added to the score from Step One. Table 5 below shows the mean and standard

deviation for each of the 34 items on the PRPSA instrument.

Table 5

Distribution of Mean and Standard Deviation for all 34 Items on PRPSA Instrument

Please indicate whether or not you believe each statement applies to you by marking whether you:	*n*	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
While preparing for giving a speech, I feel tense and nervous.	332	1	5	2.02	.939
I feel tense when I see the words "speech" and "public speech" on a course outline when studying.	332	1	5	2.48	1.162
My thoughts become confused and jumbled when I am giving a speech.	332	1	5	2.37	1.045
Right after giving a speech I feel that I have had a pleasant experience.	332	1	5	3.05	1.011

I get anxious when I think about a speech coming up.	332	1	5	1.93	.958
I have no fear of giving a speech.	332	1	5	3.92	1.081
Although I am nervous just before starting a speech, I soon settle down after starting and feel calm and comfortable.	332	1	5	2.89	1.116
I look forward to giving a speech.	332	1	5	3.79	1.064
When the instructor announces a speaking assignment in class, I can feel myself getting tense.	332	1	5	2.39	1.113
My hands tremble when I am giving a speech.	332	1	5	2.86	1.247
I feel relaxed while giving a speech.	332	1	5	3.84	.968
I enjoy preparing for a speech.	332	1	5	3.53	1.077
I am in constant fear of forgetting what I prepared to say.	332	1	5	2.35	1.170
I get anxious if someone asks me something about my topic that I don't know.	332	1	5	2.31	1.073
I face the prospect of giving a speech with confidence.	332	1	5	3.07	1.048
I feel that I am in complete possession of myself while giving a speech.	332	1	5	3.19	.988
My mind is clear when giving a speech.	332	1	5	3.47	1.005
I do not dread giving a speech.	332	1	5	3.68	1.128
I perspire just before starting a speech.	332	1	5	2.91	1.138
My heart beats very fast just as I start a speech.	332	1	5	1.95	.917

I experience considerable anxiety while sitting in the room just before my speech starts.	332	1	5	2.00	1.026
Certain parts of my body feel very tense and rigid while giving a speech.	332	1	5	2.37	1.128
Realizing that only a little time remains in a speech makes me very tense and anxious.	332	1	5	2.82	1.145
While giving a speech, I know I can control my feelings of tension and stress.	332	1	5	3.16	1.053
I breathe faster just before starting a speech.	332	1	5	2.45	1.055
I feel comfortable and relaxed in the hour or so just before giving a speech.	332	1	5	3.65	1.079
I do poorer on speeches because I am anxious.	332	1	5	2.40	1.127
I feel anxious when the teacher announces the date of a speaking assignment.	332	1	5	2.59	1.176
When I make a mistake while giving a speech, I find it hard to concentrate on the parts that follow.	332	1	5	2.35	1.124
During an important speech I experience a feeling of helplessness building up inside me.	332	1	5	2.81	1.193
I have trouble falling asleep the night before a speech.	332	1	5	3.03	1.296
My heart beats very fast while I present a speech.	332	1	5	2.10	1.049
I feel anxious while waiting to give my speech.	332	1	5	1.87	.920

While giving a speech, I get so nervous I forget facts I really know.	332	1	5	2.48	1.162

Public Speaking Anxiety Level for Online Public Speaking Students

The results of Question 1, "What are the public speaking anxiety levels of students entering online public speaking courses?" are presented in Table 6. The average public speaking anxiety level score of students entering the online public speaking course was a 76, which indicates that students had a low public speaking anxiety level according to the Personal Report of Public Speaking Anxiety (PRPSA) instrument.

Table 6

Public Speaking Anxiety Level Online Format

	n	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
PRPSA	56	40.00	131.00	75.72	24.29
Valid N (listwise)	56				

Public Speaking Anxiety Level for Traditional Public Speaking Students

The results of Question 2, "What are the public speaking anxiety levels of students entering traditional, face-to-face public speaking courses?" are presented in Table 7. The average public speaking anxiety level score of students entering the traditional, face-to-face class was an 85, which indicates students had a low public speaking anxiety level according to the Personal Report of Public Speaking Anxiety (PRPSA) instrument.

Table 7

Public Speaking Anxiety Level Traditional Format

	n	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
PRPSA	276	34.00	162.00	84.93	25.73
Valid N (listwise)					

Public Speaking Anxiety Level for Online Public Speaking Students by Gender

The results of Question 3, "What is the relationship between public speaking anxiety levels of students in online public speaking courses by gender?" A one-way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) was the statistical test used to determine this research question. The results determined that there was no significant difference between male and female students public speaking anxiety levels based on gender when taking an online public speaking course with a small effect size $F (1,55)= .501$, $p=.48$, $n^2=.009$. Levene's test showed that the $p=.62$.

Table 8

Between-Subjects Factors- Online Format

	n
Gender	
Male	15
Female	41
Format	
Online	56

Table 9

Levene's Test of Equality of Error Variances-Online Format

F	df1	df2	Sig.
.25	1	54	.61

Table 10

Tests of Between-Subjects Effects-Online Format

Source	Type III Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.	Partial Eta Squared	Noncent. Parameter	Observed Power
Correct Model	298.54[b]	1	209.54	.50	.48	.00	.50	.10
Intercept	247766.46	1	247766.46	416.00	.00	.88	416.00	1.00
Gender	298.54	1	298.54	.50	.48	.00	.50	.10
class_type	.00	0				.00	.00	
gender* class_type	.00	0				.00	.00	
Error	31566.36	54	595.59					
Total	347269.00	56						
Corrected Total	31864.90	55						

Public Speaking Anxiety Level for Traditional Public Speaking Students by Gender

The results of Question 4, "What is the relationship between public speaking anxiety levels of students in traditional, face-to-face public speaking courses by gender?" A One-way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) was the statistical test used to determine this research question. The results found there was a significant difference between male and female students public speaking anxiety levels when taking a traditional, face-to-face public speaking course with a medium effect size $F(1,275)= 23.88, p<0.001, n^2= .08$. Female students taking a traditional public speaking course had a lower public speaking anxiety level (79) than male students (94).

Table 11

Between-Subjects Factors-Traditional Format

	n
Gender	
Male	108
Female	168
Format	
Traditional Classroom	276

Table 12

Levene's Test of Equality of Error Variances-Traditional Format

F	Df1	Df2	Sig.
1.216	1	274	.271

Table 13

Tests of Between-Subjects Effects-Traditional Format

Source	Type II Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.	Partial Eta Squared	Noncent. Parameter	Observed Power
Corrected Model	14547.59[b]	1	14547.59	23.88	.000	.08	23.88	.99
Intercept	1863873.94	1	1863873.94	3059.68	.000	.92	3059.68	1.00
Gender	14547.59	1	14547.59	23.88	.000	.08	23.88	.99
Class_type	.000	0				.00	.00	
Gender Class_type	.000	0						
Error	1577775.31	274	609.17					
Total	2058898.00	276						
Corrected Total	172322.90	275						

Summary

This chapter presented the results of the study that examined the public anxiety levels of students enrolled in an online or a traditional, face-to-face public speaking courses. The study also examined the relationship between the public speaking anxiety levels of students enrolled in an online or traditional, face-to-face public speaking courses based upon gender. Three hundred and thirty-two students participated in the study. The data collected in this study included participant's score on the Personal Report of Public Speaking Anxiety and demographic information such as age, race, gender, class rank, and the format in which the student took the public speaking course (online, traditional, face-to-face).

Based on the analysis of the results, students enrolled in an online or a traditional, face-to-face public speaking course experienced low levels of public speaking anxiety. There was not a significant difference in public speaking anxiety levels in students taking an online public speaking course based on gender. There was a significant difference in public speaking anxiety levels in students taking a public speaking course in a traditional, face-to-face format. The results revealed that men experienced higher levels of public speaking anxiety when compared to women who were enrolled in the traditional public speaking course. The next chapter, Chapter V, will provide a summary and conclusions of the study along with implications and recommendations for further research.

CHAPTER V: SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, IMPLICATIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Introduction

Chapter I provided a statement of the problem, the purpose of the study, description of the instrument used in the study, research questions, significance of the study, assumptions of the study, limitations of the study, and definition of terms. Chapter II included a review of relevant literature of this study which included: the history of the basic speech course, explanation of public speaking anxiety and communication apprehension, the effects of communication apprehension, the difference between state and trait anxiety, the role gender plays in public speaking anxiety, a brief overview of the Uncertainty Reduction Theory, adult education and andragogy, and described online learning. Chapter III presented research questions, the Personal Report of Public Speaking Anxiety instrument, population sample, data collection, and data analysis. Chapter IV presented the purpose of the study, the research questions, demographic results, information about the Personal Report of Public Speaking Anxiety (PRPSA), the data analysis for each research question for the study. This final chapter provides the purpose of the study, a summary, conclusions, implications, and recommendations for the study.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to examine the public speaking anxiety levels of students enrolled in online and traditional public speaking courses. The Personal Report of Public Speaking Anxiety (PRPSA) instrument developed by James McCroskey was used to measure

students' public speaking anxiety levels. The study also examined the relationship among a student's gender, public speaking anxiety level, and the format (online, traditional) in which the public speaking course was taken.

Research Questions

This study was guided by the following research questions:

1. What are the public speaking anxiety levels of students entering online public speaking courses?

2. What are the public speaking anxiety levels of students entering traditional, face-to-face public speaking courses?

3. What is the relationship between public speaking anxiety levels of students in online public speaking courses by gender?

4. What is the relationship between public speaking anxiety levels of students in traditional, face-to-face public speaking courses by gender?

Summary

This study examined the public speaking anxiety levels of students enrolled in an online and traditional, face-to-face public speaking the course. This study also investigated the relationship between a student's gender and the format (online, traditional) in which the public speaking course was taken as it relates to his or her public speaking anxiety level. The sample population for this study was 332 students enrolled in a large-sized community college in the southeastern part of the United States during the fall 2017 of the academic calendar. Participants completed a demographic questionnaire and the Personal Report of Public Speaking Anxiety (PRPSA). Participation in the study was voluntary.

The demographic questionnaire distributed to participants gathered information about their age, race, gender, class rank, and the format in which they were taking the public speaking course (online, traditional). The total number of participants in the study was 332. Two hundred and seventy-six (83 %) participants were enrolled in a traditional, public speaking course, while fifty-six (17%) participants were enrolled in an online public speaking course. One-hundred and twenty-two (37%) of the participants were male students, while, 210 (63%) of the sample were female students.

The independent variables for this study were class format (online, traditional,) and gender (male, female). The dependent variable for this study was the public speaking anxiety level as determined by the Personal Report of Public Speaking Anxiety (PRPSA). A one-way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) was used to determine the relationship between class format (online, traditional face-to-face) and gender as it relates to the public speaking anxiety levels.

The results found students who enrolled in either an online or traditional public speaking course entered the classroom with low public speaking anxiety. There was no statistical significant difference between men and women and their public speaking anxiety levels who were enrolled in an online public speaking course. However, there was a statistical significant difference between men and women and their public speaking anxiety levels for those who were enrolled in a traditional public speaking course. Men experienced higher levels of public speaking anxiety than women when taking a traditional public speaking course.

Conclusions

After analyzing the data, the following conclusions were made:

1. Students in this study entering an online public speaking course experienced low levels of public speaking anxiety. According to the Personal Report of Public Speaking Anxiety

(PRPSA), participants who scored less than a 98 on the instrument experienced a low level of public speaking anxiety.

      2.   Students in this study entering a traditional public speaking course experienced low levels of public speaking anxiety. According to the Personal Report of Public Speaking Anxiety (PRPSA), participants who scored less than a 98 on the instrument experienced a low level of public speaking anxiety. These two findings contradict previous studies that indicated that individuals have a major fear of public speaking situations (Dwyer & Davidson, 2012; Ledbetter, 2015; Motley, 1998; Richmond & McCroskey, 1995; Speech Communication Association, 1973)

      3.   Based on the results of this study, there is no statistically significant difference in public speaking anxiety for men and women who take an online public speaking course.

      4.   This study indicates that there was a statistically significant difference in public speaking anxiety between men and women who take a traditional public speaking course. It highlighted that men experience higher levels of public speaking anxiety than women. The finding that men experience higher levels of public speaking than women was similar to the finding of Levitt (1980).

Implications

The current study suggests students' who participated in this study public speaking anxiety levels are low when entering both an online or traditional public speaking classroom. It is important to note that extraneous factors may have influenced this study. The impact of technology may have played a role in the results of this study. Social media such as Facebook, Twitter, Instagram, and Snapchat, Technology, Entertainment and Design (TED) talks, and Youtube are media outlets watched regularly by students. Students may often mimic speaker

actions of what they see using these channels. In addition, students may post videos of themselves on outlets such as Facebook and Snapchat on a regular basis. Students may already be comfortable talking in front of a group of individuals through a camera on their phone or a webcam on their computer. Though students cannot see their audience all the time, they may aware of an audience will view their video and how they portray themselves will impact how the audience views them. With this being said, there are several implications for students, public speaking instructors, administrators of the basic course, and higher education professionals.

Implications for Students

Students may have been told by individuals that presenting a speech is something that they should fear. The problem with individuals telling students that public speaking is something that they should fear may place doubt and fear into their minds. Students may act and behave in way that indicates that they are afraid of presenting a speech. Individuals telling students that they should fear public speaking does more harm than good because students may try to avoid public speaking situations thereby potentially missing potential promotions within the workplace that require public presentations. Furthermore, this fear may silence students and not give them a voice to make change in the United States. Students who participated in study were found to not speech anxious. The results from this study can help change the mindset of students entering both online and traditional public speaking courses because it demonstrates to them that other students are not frightened to give a presentation.

The findings may have been impacted by two programs, Tennessee Promise and Pellissippi State's Reconnect Now. Tennessee is the first state to offer citizens who have not obtained an associate's degree to attend community or technical college by paying for students' tuition and mandatory fees. The sample could have been drawn from students who were

members of these programs and had previous public speaking experience, therefore explaining the low public speaking anxiety levels.

Implications for Public Speaking Instructors

As the basic course continues to be a front porch of the communication discipline, public speaking instructors need to provide students a positive first impression of the discipline as they teach the course. A negative experience in a public speaking course may have lasting negative ramifications on a student's ability to communicate. As Beatty (1998) argued, the long-term effect of experiencing communication apprehension in public speaking situations can lead to the development of a predisposition to avoid communication. Heightened communication apprehension can lead to missed opportunities in the workplace and impact a student's choice of employment and application for employment (Daly & Leth, 1976; Daly & McCroskey, 1975; Daly & Shamo, 1976).

Public speaking instructors should be careful to not assume students entering their public speaking classroom have high levels of public speaking anxiety. The current study suggests students may not be as anxious about public speaking. As more individuals who have previous public speaking experience enter the college classroom, public speaking instructors may need to adapt to the needs of these students. For instance, public speaking instructors may consider implementing an assignment where students present a speech to the campus community. By creating a speaking opportunity on campus, students with prior public speaking experience can gain more experience. For students with little to no public speaking experience, speaking in front of a campus community allows the students to give a public presentation in a controlled environment where mistakes can be made, and lessons can be learned.

Another implication for public speaking instructors is the need to make the course content relevant and applicable to students. If students cannot see the relevancy of the assignments, it may be viewed as a waste of time. The basic course is viewed as a course that helps students transition to college and as preparatory for professional and corporate settings upon graduation (Morreale, Worley, & Hungenberg, 2010). Public speaking instructors can implement assignments and activities that can relate back to students' personal and professional lives. For instance, during class, students could work on practicing mediation breathing techniques that could help calm them down. Also, assignments may be targeted to students' current or potential occupation. An example of this type of assignment could be a presentation where a student researches and informs the audience about their current or future career.

Particularly since this study focused on public speaking anxiety in community college students, public speaking instructors are encouraged to implement andragogical principles in their courses. Some community college students do not transfer to a four-year institution. As more students enter the college and the public speaking classroom later in life, they are seeking transferrable skills that can translate immediately to the workplace. Based on Malcolm Knowles (1970) assumptions of adult learners, public speaking instructors may need to shift their teaching style from child-centered, where the instructor provides all the information to the student, to adult-centered, where the student and instructor are learning alongside each other. A shift like this would take time. Writers of public speaking textbooks would need to change the focus from concepts such as ways to choose a topic to workplace communication concepts such as how to present in a group setting or how to conduct oneself in an interview. Some of the concepts, such as how to choose a topic, may be outdated in today's 21st century. In most instances, one's topic will be provided due to the occasion.

In the online environment, public speaking instructors should redesign the class curriculum so it is geared toward students. As Galbraith (2014) indicated, the learning activities and modes of assessment will need to be responsive to the learning needs of individual learners, and the elements of a learning event such as the learning content, instructional methods, technologies and context, will need to complement each other. Online public speaking instructors can implement activities that students are already engaging in as part of the class. Some public speaking instructors require students to present a demonstration speech. So, for instance, allowing a student who is part of a community band to submit an online speech demonstrating how to play a violin helps complement the learning needs of the individual learner. The adjustment of curriculum, such as allowing a student the freedom to use existing activities in his or her life, helps to make the content applicable and relevant to the student.

Though the academic literature (Behnke & Sawyer, 2002; Emanuel, 2005; McCroskey et al., 1982; McCroskey, 1984; Mejias et al., 1991) highlights that women experience higher levels of public speaking anxiety than men, this study found the opposite. From this study, it revealed that men experienced higher levels of public speaking anxiety than women. The high public speaking anxiety levels of men compared to women in this study may be attributed to more speech anxious males than females. Public speaking instructors should be mindful to not place different groups of people in a category based on what research has shown previously is crucial. As public speaking instructors, the willingness to be open to different speaking styles may help decrease any implicit biases that may occur when student give presentations. Students bring into the classroom different life experience that impacts their speech performance. With each presentation, students gather valuable experience that influences how they perform in future presentations.

Implications for Basic Course Directors

Basic course directors should push for ongoing training to all instructors of public speaking, particularly graduate teaching assistants. As Morreale et al., (2016) indicated, a major problem with the basic course is the qualifications of the instructors This ongoing training can be presented in the format of attending the annual Basic Course Directors conference. Higher education institutions may send a representative or a group from their school to attend the conference. If money is an issue, instead of attending the conference, basic course directors and public speaking instructors can keep up to date on current research by reading articles from the Basic Course Annual, lone peer reviewed academic journal dedicated to the basic course.

The communication discipline is constantly changing with the different technological advances. If instructors of the basic course are not properly trained, the lack of awareness of current trends in the basic course can have a direct impact on students' learning. For example, if a student has not used a technology tool such as how to create and use a PowerPoint presentation, this student may not be able to be successful in many public speaking situations because most individuals expect students to use this tool when giving presentations in classes other than the basic course and in the workplace.

However, ongoing training needs to be purposeful and depends on students' learning needs. To determine if the ongoing training is effective, basic course directors can visit the classrooms of each instructor. Instructors should always be working to improve one's teaching effectiveness. The basic course director can view what activities and assignments public speaking instructors are using in their classrooms. If a basic course director believes that the activities and assignments are not meeting the needs of students, he or she can provide a list of

suggestions using academic journal articles from the Basic Course Annual or tips picked up from

attending the Basic Course Directors conference.

It is suggested that basic course directors require public speaking instructors to administer

the Personal Report of Public Speaking Anxiety (PRPSA) instrument to students at the beginning

and the end of each semester. By administering the PRPSA instrument, the results may show

whether or not public speaking instructors teaching techniques are having an impact on

decreasing students public speaking anxiety levels. Instructors of public speaking should be

aware of their students public speaking anxiety levels entering the basic course. By obtaining the

PRPSA scores of students, public speaking instructors will provide a starting point in where to

meet students needs as it relates to their public speaking anxiety level. As McCroskey and

Richmond (1992) mentioned, there are different degrees of shyness, and all may have an impact

on how students perform when giving speeches. By being aware of students public speaking

anxiety levels and knowledgeable about communication theories such as the Uncertainty

Reduction theory, instructors of public speaking can implement the use of cognitive

modification, systematic desensitization, and visualization/skills training to reduce

communication apprehension and uncertainty (Ayers & Hopf, 1985; Finn et al., 2009; Fremouw

& Scott, 1979; McCroskey 1972; McCroskey et al., 1970). The importance of providing tools to

students on ways to help alleviate public speaking anxiety can help them in future presentations.

Also, by requiring public speaking instructors to administer the PRPSA instrument to students,

the scores on the PRPSA can help public speaking instructors determine when to implement

specific strategies such as cognitive modification, systematic desensitization, and

visualization/skills training. If a public speaking instructor is faced with a speech anxious class,

he or she may need to spend more class time getting students comfortable with one another. For

example, a public speaking instructor could use icebreakers or group activities to help ease uncertainty students have towards one another and future presentations in the class.

In addition, the student PRPSA scores can help public speaking instructors anticipate issues that may arise in the class. For example, if a public speaking class is filled with highly anxious students, the instructor may need to spend a considerable amount of time at the beginning of the semester using a strategy like cognitive modification to help decrease the students' anxiety levels. However, if a public speaking instructor has a class with student with average and low public speaking anxiety, the instructor can reinforce the positive traits in the students and focus on other aspects of the basic course such as research, listening skills, and physical and vocal aspects of a presentation.

Implications for Higher Education Administrators

The implications of this study also impact higher education administrators. Ultimately, higher education administrators want to produce graduates who can communicate effectively once they enter the workforce. The ability to communicate helps keep companies and organizations functional. If college graduates are not communicating effectively once they enter the workforce, the instruction of the basic course may need to be reevaluated. The basic course is viewed as a course that helps students transition to college and as preparatory for professional and corporate settings upon graduation (Morreale, Worley, & Hungenberg, 2010). Students in this study had low public speaking anxiety. If students enter professional and corporate settings with low public speaking anxiety, they may be more prepared to take on leadership roles within the workplace.

The results of this study also impact higher education administrators who work directly with students in the college environment such as individuals who work in student support

services. The findings from this study indicated that students had low public speaking anxiety entering the online and traditional classroom. The study helps indicate to students that they can be successful. Higher education administrators who work with student organizations such as residence life, student government, and honor societies may have students who can lead a meeting or make presentations. Students who have low public speaking anxiety may make a positive change on the college campuses by giving presentations. The presentation can come in the form of advocating injustices student see on campus. The presentation can also appear in the form of advocating for a change in policy such as better-quality cafeteria food or internet access on the campus.

The higher education professional can help strengthen students' leadership and public speaking skills bu continuously placing students in situations where they must give presentations. The leadership and public speaking skills may translate to students being well-groomed and polished once they enter the workforce. Public speaking is the language of leadership and helps one become a more confident both personally and professionally.

Recommendations

1. It is recommended that this study be replicated at another community college in another region of the United States. The study was conducted at a large community college in the southeastern part of the United States. If this study was replicated at another large-sized community college in another region of the United States, the results may be different.

2. It is recommended to replicate this study with a larger sample size.

3. It is recommended that this study be replicated at a four-year institution in the United States. Students at four-institutions may have different life experiences than students at two-year institutions.

4. It is recommended that the public speaking anxiety levels of students be examined by age, race, and class rank.

5. It is recommended that the public speaking anxiety levels of students in all formats: online, hybrid, and traditional classroom setting be examined.

6. It is recommended to conduct a longitudinal study and see if students in this sample public speaking anxiety levels change each semester as they go throughout their college or professional careers.

7. It is recommended that a qualitative approach, such as interviews, be used to examine students' public speaking anxiety levels.

References

Allen, M., Bourhis, J., Burrell, N., & Mabry, E. (2002). Comparing student satisfaction with distance education to traditional classrooms in higher education: A metaanalysis. *American Journal of Distance Education, 16(2),* 83-93.

Allen, I. E., & Seaman, J. (2015). Changing course: Ten years of tracking online education in the United States. Sloan Consortium. PO Box 1238, Newburyport, MA.

Arnett, J. J. (1997). Young people's conceptions of the transition to adulthood. *Youth & Society, 29(1),* 3-23.

Ayres, J., & Hopf, T. S. (1985). Visualization: A means of reducing speech anxiety. *Communication Education, 34(4),* 318-323.

Beebe, S. A. (2013). Our "front porch.". *Spectra, 49(2),* 3-4.

Beatty, M. J. (1988). Situational and predispositional correlates of public speaking anxiety. *Communication Education, 37(1),* 28-39.

Behnke, R. R., & Sawyer, C. R. (2000). Anticipatory anxiety patterns for male and female public speakers. *Communication Education, 49(2),* 187-195.

Behnke, R. R., & Sawyer, C. R. (1998). Conceptualizing speech anxiety as a dynamic trait. *Southern Journal of Communication, 63(2),* 160-168.

Behnke, R. R., & Sawyer, C. R. (2001). Patterns of psychological state anxiety in public speaking as a function of anxiety sensitivity. *Communication Quarterly, 49(1)*, 84-94.

Behnke, R. R., & Sawyer, C. R. (2004). Public speaking anxiety as a function of sensitization and habituation processes. *Communication Education, 53,* 164-173.

Blalock, Jr., H. M. (1969). Theory construction: From verbal to mathematical formulations. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall

Bodie, G. D. (2010). A racing heart, rattling knees, and ruminative thoughts: Defining, explaining, and treating public speaking anxiety. *Communication Education, 59*, 70-105. doi:10.1080/03634520903443849

Booth-Butterfield, M., & Booth-Butterfield, S. (2004). *Communication apprehension and avoidance in the classroom: A text and course outline (2nd ed.).* Littleton, MA: Tapestry

Botella, C., Hofmann, S. G., & Moscovitch, D. A. (2004). A self-applied, internet-based intervention for fear of public speaking. *Journal of Clinical Psychology, 60,* 821-830. doi:10.1002/jclp.20040

Britt, D. M. (2015). How to better engage online students with online strategies. College Student Journal, 49, 399-404. Retrieved from http://eds.b.ebscohost.com.spot.lib.auburn.edu/ehost/detail/detail?sid=8b592eb7-3f07-428b-b863-e82413a3817a%40sessionmgr120&vid=0&hid=108&bdata=JnNpdGU9ZWhvc3QtbGl2ZQ%3d%3d#db=ehh&AN=109506012

Carrillo, E., Moya-Albiol, L., González-Bono, E., Salvador, A., Ricarte, J., & Gómez-Amor, J. (2001). Gender differences in cardiovascular and electrodermal responses to public speaking task: the role of anxiety and mood states. *International Journal of Psychophysiology, 42(3),* 253-264.

Cattell, R. B., & Scheier, I. H. (1958). The nature of anxiety: A review of thirteen multivariate analyses comprising 814 variables. *Psychological Reports, 4,* 351-388.

Comer, D. R., Lenaghan, J. A., & Sengupta, K. (2015). Factors that affect students' capacity to

        fulfill the role of online learner. *Journal of Education for Business, 90(3),* 145-155.

Coopman, S. J., & Lull, J. (2013). *Public speaking: The evolving art.* Stamford, CT: Cengage

        Learning.

Dabbagh, N. (2007). The online learner: Characteristics and pedagogical implications.

        Contemporary Issues in Technology and Teacher Education, 7(3), 217- 226.

Daly, J. A. (1978). The assessment of social-communicative anxiety via self-reports: A

        comparison of measures. *Communication Monographs, 45,* 204-218.

Daly, J. A., & Buss, A. (1983). Audience anxiety. *Communication, 12,* 27-35.

Daly, J. A., & Leth, S. (1976, April). Communication apprehension and the personnel selection

        decision. *In Annual Convention of the International Communication Association,*

        Portland.

Daly, J.A., & McCroskey, J.C. Occupational desirability and choice as a function of

        communication apprehension. *Journal of Counseling Psychology. 22,* 309-313.

Daly, J. A., & Shamo, W. G. (1976). Writing apprehension and occupational choice. *Journal of*

        Occupational and Organizational Psychology, 49(1), 55-56.

Darkenwald, G. G., & Merriam, S. B. (1982). *Adult education: Foundations of practice*. New

        York: Harper & Row.

Del Valle, R., & Duffy, T. (2009). Online learning: Learner characteristics and their approaches

        to managing learning. Instructional Science, 37, 129-149. doi:10.1007/s11251-007-9039-

        0

Heiman, T. (2008). The effects of e-mail messages in a distance learning university on perceived

    academic and social support, academic satisfaction, and coping. *Quarterly Review of*

    Distance Education, *9*(3), 237-248.

Houle, C. O. (1961). *The inquiring mind.* Madison, WI: University of Wisconsin Press.

Hunt, I. I. I., & Arthur, W. (2012). Why I am not going to teach public speaking online.

    Explorations in Media Ecology, 11(2), 163-176.

Daly, J. A., & McCroskey, J. C. (1975). Occupational desirability and choice as a function of

    communication apprehension. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 22,* 309-313.

Dance, F. X. (2002). Speech and thought: A renewal. *Communication Education, 51(4),* 355-59.

Dedmon, D. N., & Frandsen, K. D. (1964). The 'required' first course in speech: A survey.

    Speech Teacher, 13(1), 32-37.

Dupagne, M., Stacks, D. W., & Giroux, V. M. (2007). Effects of video streaming technology on

    public speaking students' communication apprehension and competence. *Journal of*

    Educational Technology Systems, 35(4), 479-490.

Dwyer, K. K., & Davidson, M. M. (2012). Is public speaking really more feared than death?.

    Communication Research Reports, 29(2), 99-107. doi:10.1080/08824096.2012.667772

Emmanuel, R. (2005). A Rationale for the Basic Course: Fundamentals of Oral Communication

    vs. Public Speaking. *Community College Journal of Research and Practice, 29(2).* 153-

    162

Emery R. J. & Krumboltz, D. J, (1967). Standard versus individualized hierarchies in

    desensitization to reduce test anxiety. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 14*. 204-209.

Engleberg, I. N. (1984). Andragogy in community college communication courses.

    Communication Education, 33(1), 13-17.

Falcione, R. L., McCroskey, J. C., & Daly, J. A. (1977). Job satisfaction as a function of

    employees' communication apprehension, self-esteem, and perceptions of their

    immediate supervisors. *Communication Yearbook, 1,* 363-375.

Fayer, L. (2014). A multi-case study of student perceptions of online course design elements and

    success. International Journal for The Scholarship Of Teaching & Learning, 8, 1-27.

    Retrieved from

    http://eds.b.ebscohost.com.spot.lib.auburn.edu/ehost/detail/detail?sid=4d5ee829-6450-

    4dc6-a305-

    153407aa970e%40sessionmgr115&vid=0&hid=108&bdata=JnNpdGU9ZWhvc3QtbGl2

    ZQ%3d%3d#AN=94992027&db=ehh

Finn, A. N., Sawyer, C. R., & Behnke, R. R. (2009). A model of anxious arousal for public

    speaking. *Communication Education, 58(3),* 417-432.

Finn, A. N., Sawyer, C. R., & Schrodt, P. (2009). Examining the effect of exposure

    therapy on public speaking state anxiety. *Communication Education, 58(1),* 92-

    109.

Ford, W.S.Z., & Wolvin, AD. (1992). Evaluation of a basic course in speech education. In L.W.

    Hugenberg (Ed.), *Basic Communication Course Annual, 4*. Boston, MA: American Press.

Fremouw, W. J., & Scott, M. D. (1979). Cognitive restructuring: An alternative method for the

    treatment of communication apprehension. *Communication Education, 28(2),* 129-133.

Fuss-Reineck, M., & Seiler, W. J. (1982). Developing the personalized system of instruction for

    the speech communication classroom. convention of the Central States Speech

    Association, Milwaukee, WI.

Gaibani, A., & Elmenfi, F. (2014). The role of gender in influencing public speaking anxiety. *British Journal of English Linguistics, 2(3),* 7-13.

Galbraith, M. W. (2004). *Adult learning methods: A guide for effective. instruction, 3rd ed.* Malabar, Florida: Krieger Publishing Company.

Gibson, J. W., Gruner, C. R., Brooks, W. D., & Petrie, C. R. (1970). The first course in speech: A survey of U.S. colleges and universities. *The Speech Teacher, 19(1),* 13-20.

Gibson, J. W., Gruner, C. R., Brooks, W. D., & Petrie, C. R. (1971). The first course in speech: A survey of U.S. colleges and universities. *Speech Teacher*, *20(1),* 13-15.

Gibson, J., Gruner, C., Hanna, M., Smythe, M. J., & Hayes, M. (1980). The basic course in speech at U.S. colleges and universities: III. *Communication Education, 29*, 1–29. doi:10.1080/03634528009378387

Gibson, J. W., Hanna, M. S., Huddleston, B. M. (1985). The basic speech course at U.S. colleges and universities: IV. *Communication Education, 34(4),* 281-91.

Gibson, J. W., Kline, J. A., & Gruner, C. R. (1975). A re-examination of the first course in speech at U.S. colleges and universities. *Bulletin of The Association of Departments & Administrators in Speech Communication, 11,* 15-21.

Gibson, J. W., & And, O. (1980). The basic course in speech at U.S. Colleges and Universities: III. *Communication Education, 29(1),* 1-9.

Gray, P. L. (1989). The basic course in speech communication: An historical perspective. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Speech Communication Association, San Francisco, CA, November 20, 1989

Gutgold, N. D., & Grodziak, E. M. (2013). Making smart use of smart phones to improve public

 speaking. *Journal of Technology Integration in the Classroom, 5(1),* 13-16.

Hargis, D. (1956). The first course in speech. *The Speech Teacher, 5,* 26–33.

 doi:10.1080/03634525609376775

Houle, C. (1961). *The inquiring mind.* Madison, WI: University of Wisconsin Press.

Houle, C. O. (1996). *The design of education. second edition. Jossey-Bass higher and adult*

 education series. Wiley.

Howard, S. (1993). Accreditation of prior learning: Andragogy in action or a 'cut price'

 approach to education?. *Journal of Advanced Nursing, 18*, 1817-1824.

 doi:10.1046/j.1365-2648.1993.18111817.x

Hickerson, J. C. (1998). *A biofeedback/cognitive-behavioral treatment model for women with*

 public speaking anxiety (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). University of Texas at

 Arlington, Arlington, Texas.

Hunt III, A. W. (2012). Why I am not going to teach public speaking online. *Explorations in*

 Media Ecology, 11, 163-176. doi:10.1386/eme.11.2.163_1

Hugenberg, B., & Hugenberg, L. (2007). The basic communication course online: Challenges

 and practical suggestions for success. Conference Papers -- National Communication

 Association, 1-32.

Johnson, J., & Szczupakiewicz, N. (1987). The public speaking course: Is it preparing students

 with work-related public speaking skills? *Communication Education, 36*, 131-137.

Jones, S. (2008). *Internet goes to college: How students are living in the future with today's*

 technology. Washington, DC: Diane Publishing.

Keramidas, C. G. (2012). Are undergraduate students ready for online learning? A comparison of

      online and face-to-face sections of a course. *Rural Special Education Quarterly, 31(4),*

      25-32.

Knowles, M. (1980). *The modern practice of adult education: From pedagogy to andragogy.*

      Englewoods Cliff, NJ: Cambridge Adult Education.

Knowles, M. S. (1970). *The modern practice of adult education (Vol. 41).* New York: New York

      Association Press.

Knowles, M. (1984a). *The adult learner: A neglected species (3rd ed.).* Houston, TX: Gulf

      Publishing.

Knowles, M. (1984b). *Andragogy in action.* San Francisco, CA:: Jossey-Bass

Kramer, M. W., & Hinton, J. S. (1996). The differential impact of a basic public speaking course

      on perceived communication competencies in class, work, and social contexts. *Basic*

      communication course annual, 8(1), 1-20.

Kupczynski, L., Green, M. E., & Gibson, A. M. (2012). A study of faculty technology use in

      online learning: Is there a disconnect?. *Journal of Technology Integration in The*

      Classroom, 4, 19-27. Retrieved from

      http://eds.b.ebscohost.com.spot.lib.auburn.edu/ehost/detail/detail?sid=054f5af0-0dfd-

      4924-8d65-

      2f8b5b95905f%40sessionmgr112&vid=0&hid=108&bdata=JnNpdGU9ZWhvc3QtbGl2Z

      Q%3d%3d#db=ehh&AN=98040315

Ledbetter, S., (2015, October 13). America's top fears. Retrieved from

      http://www.chapman.edu/wilkinson/research-centers/babbie-center/survey-american-

      fears.aspx

Levitt, E. E. (1980). *The psychology of anxiety*. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates

Lim, D. H., & Hyunjoong, K. (2003). Motivation and learner characteristics affecting online

    learning and learning application. *Journal of Educational Technology Systems, 31*, 423-

    439. Retrieved from

    http://eds.a.ebscohost.com.spot.lib.auburn.edu/ehost/pdfviewer/pdfviewer?sid=154546a2

    -1b29-4b2d-9571-91840cd091f7%40sessionmgr4001&vid=1&hid=4108

Lind, S. J. (2012). Teaching digital oratory: Public speaking 2.0. *Communication Teacher, 26(3),*

    163-169.

Marland, P. (1989). An approach to research on distance learning. *British Journal of Educational*

    Technology, 20(3), 173-82.

Matsuda, S., & Gobel, P. (2004). Anxiety and predictors of performance in the foreign language

    classroom. *System, 32(1),* 21-36.

McCroskey, J. C. (1977). Classroom consequences of communication apprehension.

    Communication Education, 26, 27-33.

McCroskey J.C. (2009). Communication apprehension: What we have learned in the last four

    decades. *Human Communication 12(2),* 179-187.

McCroskey, J. C. (2007). *Communication research measures*. Retrieved from

    http://www.jamescmccroskey.com/measures/

McCroskey, J. C. (1970). Measures of communication-bound anxiety. *Speech Monographs, 37*,

    269-277.

McCroskey, J. C. (1977). Oral communication apprehension: A summary of recent theory and

    research. *Human Communication Research, 4*, 78-96. doi:10.1111/j.1468-

    2958.1977.tb00599.x

McCroskey, J. C. (1983). The communication apprehension perspective. *Communication, 12(1),* 1-25.

McCroskey, J. C. (1984). *The communication apprehension perspective. In J. A. Daly, & J. C. McCroskey (Eds.), Avoiding communication: Shyness, reticence, and communication apprehension.* Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publication

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

McCroskey, J. C. (1976). The problems of communication apprehension in the classroom. The *Florida Speech Communication Journal, 4,* 1-12.

McCroskey, J. C., & Beatty, M. J. (1984). Communication apprehension and accumulated communication state anxiety experiences: A research note. *Communication Monographs, 51*, 79-84. doi:10.1080/03637758409390185

McCroskey, J. C., Daly, J.A., & Sorenson, G.A. (1976). Personality correlates of communication apprehension. *Human Communication Research, 2(4),* 376-380.

McCroskey, J. C., & McVetta, R. W. (1978). Classroom seating arrangements: Instructional communication theory versus student preferences. *Communication Education, 27(2),* 99-111.

McCroskey, J. C., Ralph, D. C., & Barrick, J. E. (1970). The effect of systematic desensitization on speech anxiety. *The Speech Teacher, 19(1),* 32-36.

McCroskey, J. C. & Richmond, V. P. (1988). *Communication apprehension and small group communication. In R. S. Cathcart, & L. A. Samovar (Eds.), Small group communication (4th ed.).* Dubuque, IA: William C. Brown.

McCroskey, J. C., & Richmond, V. P. (1992). Communication apprehension and small group communication. *Small group communication: A reader*, 361-374.

McCroskey, J. C., Simpson, T. J., & Richmond, V. P. (1982). Biological sex and communication apprehension. *Communication Quarterly, 30(2)*, 129-133.

Mejías, H., Applbaum, R. L., Applbaum, S. J., & Trotter, R. T. (1991). Oral communication apprehension and Hispanics: An exploration of oral communication apprehension among Mexican American students in Texas. *Language anxiety: From theory and research to classroom implications,* 87-97.

Merriam, S. B., & Brockett, R. G. (2011). *The profession and practice of adult education: An introduction.* San Francisco, CA: John Wiley & Sons.

Miller, J. [Jay Miller]. (2013, January 13). *Fear of public speaking: Seinfeld on stage fright* [Video file]. Retrieved from https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=sDZCOTD_7ok

Morreale, S. P., Hanna, M. S., Berko, R. M., & Gibson, J. W. (1999). The basic communication course at US colleges and universities: VI. *Basic Communication Course Annual, 11*, 1-36.

Morreale, S., Hugenberg, L, & Worley, D. (2006). The basic communication course at U.S. colleges and universities in the 21st Century: Study VII. *Communication Education, 55*, 415–437. doi:10.1080/03634520600879162

Morreale, S. P., Myers, S. A., Backlund, P. M., & Simonds, C. J. (2016). Study IX of the basic communication course at two-and four-year US Colleges and Universities: A re-examination of our discipline's "front porch". *Communication Education, 65(3),* 338-355.

Morreale, S., Worley, D., & Hugenberg, B (2010). The basic communication course at U.S.

    colleges and universities in the 21st Century: Study VIII.— The 40th Anniversary.

    Communication Education, 59, 405–430. doi:10.1080/03634521003637124

Motley, M.T. (1988). Taking the terror out of talk: Thinking in terms of communication rather

    than performance helps us calm our biggest fear. *Psychology Today*, *22*(1), 46–49.

Meulemann, H. (2003). Biographical self-definitions from adolescence to adulthood and beyond.

    New Directions for Child & Adolescent Development, 2003(100), 51-62.

Munger, D., Linkugel, W., Blubaugh, J., Seiler, W., Wallace, S., Williams, G., & Robinson, W.

    (2011). History of the basic course conference from 1962 to present. Retrieved from

    https://www.facebook.com/notes/basic-course-directors/conference-history-from-1962-

    to-present/310119796747

National Communication Association. (1996). Policy platform statement on the role of

    communication courses in general education. Washington, DC: Author. Retrieved from

    http://www.natcom.org/index.asp?bid=526

(n.d.). *Understanding the One-Way ANOVA* [PDF file]. Retrieved from

    http://oak.ucc.nau.edu/rh232/courses/EPS525/Handouts/Understanding%20the%20One-

    way%20ANOVA.pdf

Pearson, J. C., DeWitt, L., Child, J. T., Kahl Jr, D. H., & Dandamudi, V. (2007). Facing the fear:

    An analysis of speech-anxiety content in public-speaking textbooks. *Communication*

    Research Reports, 24(2), 159-168.

Pellissippi State Community College. (2017). *About PSCC*. Retrieved from

    http://www.pstcc.edu/about/mission.php

Pilkonis, P. A., Heape, C. & Klein, R. H. (1980). Treating shyness and other relationship

difficulties in psychiatric outpatients. *Communication Education, 29*, 250-255.

Purcell, J. M. (2010). Learning-and grade-orientations of community college students: Implications for instruction. *Community College Journal of Research and Practice, 34(6),* 497-511.

Qi, Z., & Polianskaia, G. (2007). A comparison of traditional lecture and computer-mediated instruction in developmental mathematics. *Research & Teaching in Developmental Education, 24(1),* 63-82.

Rattine-Flaherty, E. (2014). Participatory sketching as a tool to address student's public speaking anxiety. *Communication Teacher, 28*, 26-31. doi:10.1080/17404622.2013.839048

Richmond, V.P., & McCroskey, J.C. (1995). Communication: Apprehension, avoidance, and effectiveness (4th ed.). Scottsdale, AZ: Gorsuch Scarisbrick.

Richmond, V. P. & McCroskey, J. C. (1998). *Communication: Apprehension, avoidance, and effectiveness (5th ed.).* Boston, MA: Allyn and Bacon.

Roberts, J. B., Finn, A. N., Harris, K. B., Sawyer, C. R., & Behnke, R. R. (2005). Public speaking state anxiety as a function of trait anxiety and reactivity mechanisms. *Southern Journal of Communication, 70(2),* 161-167.

Robinson, T. E. (1997). Communication apprehension and the basic public speaking course: A national survey of in-class treatment techniques. *Communication Education, 46(3),* 188-197.

Sawyer, C. R., & Behnke, R. R. (1999). State anxiety patterns for public speaking and the behavior inhibition system. *Communication Reports, 12*, 33-41.

Siew Foen, N., & Confessore, G. J. (2010). Understanding the relationship of perceived distance learning environments and the enhancement of learner autonomy. *International Journal*

of Learning, 17, 255-263. Retrieved from

http://eds.a.ebscohost.com.spot.lib.auburn.edu/ehost/detail/detail?sid=7fdb3490-2e17-

43c9-97c6-

b35c6cd9b4be%40sessionmgr4005&vid=0&hid=4108&bdata=JnNpdGU9ZWhvc3QtbGl

2ZQ%3d%3d#AN=52791937&db=ehh

Simonds, C. J., Buckrop, J., Redmond, M., & Quianthy, D. H. (2012). Revised resolution on the

role of communication in general education adopted by the NCA Legislative Assembly

November 17, 2012.

Stack, S. (2015). Learning outcomes in an online vs traditional course. *International Journal for*

The Scholarship of Teaching & Learning, 9, 1-18. Retrieved from

http://eds.b.ebscohost.com.spot.lib.auburn.edu/ehost/detail/detail?sid=4403b86e-324c-

49c4-8a19-

eff11e42669e%40sessionmgr113&vid=0&hid=108&bdata=JnNpdGU9ZWhvc3QtbGl2Z

Q%3d%3d#AN=100880996&db=ehh

Stacks, D.W., & Stone, J.D. (1984). An examination of the effect of basic speech courses, self-

concept, and self-disclosure on communication apprehension. *Communication Education,*

33, 317-332.

Speech Communication Association. (1973). Fears. Spectra, *9(6),* 4.

Spielberger, G. D. (1966). *Theory and research on anxiety. In G. D. Spielberger (Ed.), Anxiety*

and behavior. New York, NY: Academic Press.

Spielberger, C. D. (1966). *Anxiety and behavior.* New York, NY: Academic Press.

Sussman, S., & Dutter, L. (2010). Comparing student learning outcomes in face-to-face and

online course delivery. *Online Journal of Distance Learning Administration, 13,* 6-11.

Retrieved from

https://scholar.google.com/scholar?hl=en&q=Comparing+Student+Learning+Outcomes+

in+Face-To-Face+and+Online+Course+Delivery&btnG=&as_sdt=1%2C1&as_sdtp=

Tainsh, R. (2016). Thoughtfully designed online courses as effective adult learning tools.

Journal of Adult Education, 45(1), 7-10

Taylor, B., & Kroth, M. (2009). Andragogy's transition into the future: Meta-analysis of

andragogy and its search for a measurable instrument. *Journal of Adult Education, 38(1)*,

1-10.

Tichavsky, L. P., Hunt, A. N., Driscoll, A., & Jicha, K. (2015). "It's just nice having a real

teacher": Student perceptions of online versus face-to-face instruction. *International*

Journal for The Scholarship of Teaching & Learning, 9, 1-8. Retrieved from

http://eds.b.ebscohost.com.spot.lib.auburn.edu/ehost/detail/detail?sid=03e9c5b8-1e1a-

4709-b32c-

1b489ee22848%40sessionmgr198&vid=0&hid=108&bdata=JnNpdGU9ZWhvc3QtbGl2

ZQ%3d%3d#AN=108759462&db=ehh

Tillfors, M., Carlbring, P., Furmark, T., Lewenhaupt, S., Spak, M., Eriksson, A., & Andersson,

G. (2008). Treating university students with social phobia and public speaking fears:

internet delivered self-help with or without live group exposure sessions. *Depression and*

Anxiety, 25(8), 708-717.

Tianjian, W. (2010). Speaking anxiety: More of a function of personality than language

achievement. *Chinese Journal of Applied Linguistics (Foreign Language Teaching &*

Research Press), 33(5). 95-108.

Valenzano, J. M., Wallace, S. P., & Morreale, S. P. (2014). Consistency and change: The

    (r)evolution of the basic communication course. *Communication Education, 63,* 355-365.

    doi:10.1080/03634523.2014.911928

Wallace, S. P. (1989, February). A proposal for a national basic course journal. Paper presented

    at the Midwest Basic Course Directors' Conference, Wichita, KS.

Wang, Y., Peng, H., Huang, R., Hou, Y., & Wang, J. (2008). Characteristics of distance learners:

    Research on relationships of learning motivation, learning strategy, self-efficacy,

    attribution and learning results. *Open Learning, 23,* 17-28. Retrieved from

    http://eds.a.ebscohost.com.spot.lib.auburn.edu/ehost/detail/detail?sid=31a67d0d-cab9-

    419e-bdec-

    3b3d8c941b57%40sessionmgr4004&vid=0&hid=4108&bdata=JnNpdGU9ZWhvc3QtbG

    l2ZQ%3d%3d#AN=EJ786133&db=eric

Witt, P. L., & Behnke, R. R. (2006). Anticipatory speech anxiety as a function of public speaking

    assignment type. *Communication Education, 55(2),* 167-177.

    doi:10.1080/03634520600566074

Wolvin, A. D. (1998). The basic course and the future of the workplace. *Basic Communication*

    Course Annual, 10(1), 1-5.

Xin, H. (2015). Adaptability and replicability of web-facilitated, hybrid, and online learning in

    an undergraduate exercise psychology course. *Turkish Online Journal of Educational*

    Technology, 14, 19-30. Retrieved from

    http://eds.b.ebscohost.com.spot.lib.auburn.edu/ehost/detail/detail?sid=adc96220-caf8-

    42ca-a43a-

0fbebbb7485a%40sessionmgr115&vid=0&hid=108&bdata=JnNpdGU9ZWhvc3QtbGl2Z

Q%3d%3d#AN=100258485&db=ehh

Yu, F. Y. & Yu, H. J. J. (2002). Incorporating emails into learning process: Its impact on student

academic achievement and attitudes. *Computers and Education, 38,* 117-126.

APPENDIX A: PERSONAL REPORT OF PUBLIC SPEAKING ANXIETY

Personal Report of Public Speaking Anxiety (PRPSA)

This was the first scale we developed in our work on communication apprehension. It is highly reliable (alpha estimates >.90) but it focuses strictly on public speaking anxiety. Hence, we moved on to develop the PRCA and ultimately the PRCA-24. This is an excellent measure for research which centers on public speaking anxiety, but is an inadequate measure of the broader communication apprehension construct.

Directions: Below are 34 statements that people sometimes make about themselves. Please indicate whether or not you believe each statement applies to you by marking whether you:
Strongly Disagree = 1; Disagree = 2; Neutral = 3; Agree = 4; Strongly Agree = 5.

_____1. While preparing for giving a speech, I feel tense and nervous.

_____2. I feel tense when I see the words "speech" and "public speech" on a course outline when studying.

_____3. My thoughts become confused and jumbled when I am giving a speech.

_____4. Right after giving a speech I feel that I have had a pleasant experience.

_____5. I get anxious when I think about a speech coming up.

_____6. I have no fear of giving a speech.

_____7. Although I am nervous just before starting a speech, I soon settle down after starting and feel calm and comfortable.

_____8. I look forward to giving a speech.

_____9. When the instructor announces a speaking assignment in class, I can feel myself getting tense.

_____10. My hands tremble when I am giving a speech.

_____11. I feel relaxed while giving a speech.

_____12. I enjoy preparing for a speech.

_____13. I am in constant fear of forgetting what I prepared to say.

_____14. I get anxious if someone asks me something about my topic that I don't know.

_____15. I face the prospect of giving a speech with confidence.

_____16. I feel that I am in complete possession of myself while giving a speech.

_____17. My mind is clear when giving a speech.

_____18. I do not dread giving a speech.

_____19. I perspire just before starting a speech.

_____20. My heart beats very fast just as I start a speech.

_____21. I experience considerable anxiety while sitting in the room just before my speech starts.

97

_____22. Certain parts of my body feel very tense and rigid while giving a speech.
_____23. Realizing that only a little time remains in a speech makes me very tense and anxious.
_____24. While giving a speech, I know I can control my feelings of tension and stress.
_____25. I breathe faster just before starting a speech.
_____26. I feel comfortable and relaxed in the hour or so just before giving a speech.
_____27. I do poorer on speeches because I am anxious.
_____28. I feel anxious when the teacher announces the date of a speaking assignment.
_____29. When I make a mistake while giving a speech, I find it hard to concentrate on the parts that follow.
_____30. During an important speech I experience a feeling of helplessness building up inside me.
_____31. I have trouble falling asleep the night before a speech.
_____32.My heart beats very fast while I present a speech.
_____33. I feel anxious while waiting to give my speech.
_____34. While giving a speech, I get so nervous I forget facts I really know.

Scoring: To determine your score on the PRPSA, complete the following steps:

Step 1. Add scores for items 1, 2, 3, 5, 9, 10, 13, 14, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 25, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, and 34
Step 2. Add the scores for items 4, 6, 7, 8, 11, 12, 15, 16, 17, 18, 24, and 26
Step 3. Complete the following formula:
PRPSA = 72 - Total from Step 2 + Total from Step 1

Your score should be between 34 and 170. If your score is below 34 or above 170, you have made a mistake in computing the score.
High = > 131
Low = < 98
Moderate = 98-131
Mean = 114.6; SD = 17.2

Source:

McCroskey, J. C. (1970) . Measures of communication-bound anxiety. *Speech Monographs, 37*, 269-277.

APPENDIX B: DEMOGRAPHIC QUESTIONNAIRE

What is your age?

- ○ 18-20
- ○ 21-23
- ○ 24-26
- ○ 27 or older

What is your race?

- ○ Caucasian
- ○ African-American
- ○ Asian
- ○ Hispanic
- ○ Mixed Raced
- ○ Pacific-Islander
- ○ Other (Please specify)

What is your gender?

- ○ Male
- ○ Female

What is your rank in school?

- ○ First time Freshman
- ○ Freshman
- ○ Sophomore
- ○ Junior
- ○ Senior

In what format are you taking this public speaking course this semester?

- ○ Online
- ○ Traditional, face to face classroom

APPENDIX C: INFORMATION LETTER

INFORMATION LETTER

For a Research Study entitled
"Online vs. Traditional Classroom: An Examination of Public Speaking Anxiety in Community College Students"

You are invited to participate in a research study to investigate students' public speaking anxiety levels in online and traditional, face-to-face public speaking courses at a community college. The study is being conducted by Shaquille Marsh, an Adult Education Doctoral Candidate and a public speaking instructor at Pellissippi State Community College under the direction of Dr. Maria M. Witte, Professor, in the Auburn University Department of Educational Foundations, Leadership, and Technology. You are invited to participate because you are enrolled in either an online or traditional, face-to-face public speaking course for the fall semester of 2017. The sample includes both male and female individuals who are 18 years of age and older.

What will be involved if you participate? Your participation is completely voluntary. If you decide to participate in this research study, you will be asked to complete the instrument and questionnaire. The instrument and questionnaire will be administered in electronic form and will take 10 minutes to complete.

Are there any risks or discomforts? You should not encounter any reasonable risks if you decide to participate in this research study because there are no known risks or discomforts.

Are there any benefits to yourself or others? There is no benefit.

Will you receive compensation for participating? There is no compensation for participating in the study.

Are there any costs? If you decide to participate, you will not have to pay anything.

You may withdraw at any time by closing your browser window. Once you have submitted your data, I will not be able to withdraw it since it will be recorded anonymously. If you withdraw from the study, you forfeit your participation in the study. Your decision to stop participating in the study will not jeopardize your future relations with Auburn University, the Department of Educational Foundations, Leadership, and Technology, Pellissippi State Community College, or with your public speaking instructor.

Any data obtained in connection with this study will remain anonymous. I will protect your privacy and the data you provide by maintaining anonymized response practices. Information collected through your participation may be used to fulfill an educational requirement, published in a professional journal, and/or presented at a professional meeting.

If you have questions about this study, please contact Shaquille Marsh at som0001@tigermail.auburn.edu or Dr. Maria M. Witte at wittemm@auburn.edu. A copy of this document is yours to keep.

If you have questions about your rights as a research participant, you may contact the Auburn University Office of Research Compliance or the Institutional Review Board by phone (334) 844-5966 or e-mail at IRBadmin@auburn.edu or IRBChair@auburn.edu.

HAVING READ THE INFORMATION PROVIDED, YOU MUST DECIDE IF

YOU WANT TO PARTICIPATE IN THIS RESEARCH PROJECT. IF YOU DECIDE TO PARTICIPATE, THE DATA YOU PROVIDE WILL SERVE AS YOUR AGREEMENT TO DO SO. YOU MAY PRINT A COPY OF THIS LETTER TO KEEP. "THE AUBURN UNIVERSITY INSTITUTIONAL REVIEW BOARD HAS APPROVED THIS DOCUMENT FOR USE FROM AUGUST 07, 2017 TO AUGUST 06, 2020. PROTOCOL #17-300 EX 1708"

__Shaquille Marsh__   July 9, 2017
 Investigator's Name   Date

Shaquille Marsh_____
Print Name

Dr. Maria M. Witte_____
Co-Investigator

APPENDIX D: SITE AUTHORIZATION

PELLISSIPPI STATE
COMMUNITY COLLEGE

June 27, 2017

Institutional Review Board

c/o Office of Research Compliance

115 Ramsay Hall

Auburn University, AL 36849

Dear IRB Members,

After reviewing the proposed study, "Online vs. Traditional Classroom: An Examination of Public Speaking Anxiety in Community College Students", presented by Mr. Shaquille Marsh an AU graduate student, I have granted authorization for students to be *recruited* from the following course(s) (*before, during or after* class): All SPCH 2100: Public Speaking sections offered in either an online and traditional, face-to-face format during the Fall 2017 semester.

The purpose of the study is to determine the public speaking anxiety levels of students entering online and traditional, face-to-face public speaking courses in community college students. In addition, an examination of public speaking levels by format (online, traditional, face-to-face) and gender will be researched. Mr. Shaquille Marsh will conduct the following activities in the above listed course(s): contact, recruit, and collect data. It is understood that this project will end no later than Friday, September 22.

To ensure that the students are protected, Mr. Shaquille Marsh has agreed to provide to me a copy of any Auburn University IRB-approved, stamped consent document before he *recruits* participants in the above-listed courses. To eliminate any risk of coercion, I/the instructor will leave the classroom during Mr. Shaquille Marsh's presentation and allow students to complete information associated with the study outside the classroom. *Mr. Shaquille Marsh has agreed to provide a copy of his study results, in aggregate, to our department.*

If the IRB has any concerns about the permission being granted by this letter, please contact me at the phone number listed above.

Sincerely,

PELLISSIPPI STATE COMMUNITY COLLEGE

10915 HARDIN VALLEY ROAD • P.O. BOX 22990 • KNOXVILLE, TENNESSEE 37933-0990

A TBR INSTITUTION

865.694.6475

www.pstcc.edu

AN AA/EEO COLLEGE

105

APPENDIX E: AUBURN INSTITUTIONAL REVIEW BOARD APPROVAL

Dear Shaquille,

Your protocol entitled " Online vs. Traditional Classroom: An Examination of Public Speaking anxiety in Community College students" has been approved by the IRB as "Exempt" under federal regulation 45 CFR 46.101(b)(2).

Official notice:
This e-mail serves as official notice that your protocol has been approved. A formal approval letter will not be sent unless you notify us that you need one.   By accepting this approval, you also accept your responsibilities associated with this approval. Details of your responsibilities are attached. Please print and retain.

Electronic Information Letter:
A copy of your approved protocol is attached. However you still need *to add the following IRB approval information to your information letter(s):*   "**The Auburn University Institutional Review Board has approved this document for use from August 07, 2017 to August 06, 2020. Protocol #17-300 EX 1708**"

You must use the updated document(s) to consent participants. *Please forward the actual electronic letter(s) with a live link so that we may print a final copy for our files*.

Expiration – Approval for three year period:
Your protocol will expire on **August 06, 2020.** About three weeks before that time you will need to submit a renewal request.

When you have completed all research activities, have no plans to collect additional data and have destroyed all identifiable information as approved by the IRB, please notify this office via e-mail. A final report is no longer required for Exempt protocols.

If you have any questions, please let us know.
Best wishes for success with your research!

IRB Admin
Office of Research Compliance
115 Ramsay Hall
Auburn University, AL 36849
334-844-5966

APPENDIX F: PELLISSIPPI INSTITUTIONAL REVIEW BOARD APPROVAL

PELLISSIPPI STATE
COMMUNITY COLLEGE

INSTITUTIONAL EFFECTIVENESS, ASSESSMENT AND PLANNING

August 23, 2017

Shaquille Marsh
10915 Hardin Valley Road
Knoxville, TN 37933

Dear Mr. Marsh,

The Institutional Review Board at Pellissippi State Community College has received your application for permission to conduct your dissertation study, *Online vs. Traditional Classroom: An Examination of Public Speaking Anxiety in Community College Students.* The Board believes the design of your study meets the Federal requirements for protection of human participants. Your application has received approval as required by PSCC Policy 08:02:01 Conducting Research at Pellissippi State.

Any significant changes in the research project must be reviewed by the IRB at Pellissippi State. Please submit any changes in writing. The College looks forward to seeing the results of the study.

Sincerely,

Nancy A. Ramsey, Chair
Institutional Review Board
Letter modified March 19, 2014

PELLISSIPPI STATE COMMUNITY COLLEGE
10915 HARDIN VALLEY ROAD • P.O. BOX 22990 • KNOXVILLE, TENNESSEE 37933-0990

865.694.6526
www.pstcc.edu

A TBR INSTITUTION

AN AA/EEO COLLEGE

109