ABSTRACT
        Since students consider instructor criticism to be
more helpful than peer criticism, this investigation focused on
student responses to instructor critique methods. A group of 309
students enrolled in twenty class sections of Fundamentals of Speech
Communication at Purdue University participated in the study.
Subjects were administered a revised version of the Personal Report
of Confidence as a Speaker. The final instrument contained two 8-item
subscales measuring speech anxiety and exhibitionism. On the basis of
student response to the 16-item instrument, subjects were divided
evenly into low, medium, and high levels of speech anxiety and
exhibitionism. A 32-item questionnaire was developed representing
eight classifications (content and delivery, positive and negative,
personal and impersonal, atomistic and holistic). For each statement,
the subject responded as to whether he would prefer to receive the
comment orally in front of the class, in private written form, or
whether he had no preference. The results indicated that oral
criticism in the classroom should probably be impersonal and
atomistic, and that female students prefer the private, written mode
more than do male students. (WR)

METHODS OF HANDLING CRITICISM IN THE COMMUNICATION

CLASSROOM: AN EMPIRICAL INVESTIGATION

OF STUDENT PREFERENCES

by

Stephen Young

Purdue University

Presented at the Annual Convention

of the

Central States Speech Association

Milwaukee, Wisconsin

April 4-6, 1974

Critical evaluation is recognized as an integral part

of any systematic approach used to educate people:

It is well established in educational theory that
learning cannot take place without criticism. A
person who wishes to learn a new task or to improve
upon his performance of an old one, will not progress
without some criticism. It may be self-criticism,
or it may be the criticism of an instructor. Without
it, no matter the source, there will be little learning.[1]

Criticism and evaluation is a critical part of teacher behavior

in the speech classroom. Very few research studies, however,

have tested the effectiveness of evaluation techniques. One of

the problems for the teacher is determining how to handle criticism

in the classroom

Most of the empirical research dealing with procedures

for criticizing classroom communication performances has been

concerned with rating scales and their development.[2] Rating

scales require the teacher to structure his responses to the

categories of the scale. Because of this restriction, Dedmon

feels that rating scales should be aids to evaluation, not

replacements for individual comments. He encourages the use of

a variety of methods of giving criticism including both oral

comments in class and private, written comments.[3] Two studies

of student perception and recall of classroom speech criticism

shed some light on this issue. Arnold found that while students

were not able to replicate rating blanks, they were able to

recall 41 percent of the written comments they received.[4] This closely paralleled Albright's finding that students recalled about 40 percent of oral comments received in class.[5] If student replication of rating blanks deviates significantly from ratings actually received from the instructor, it is doubtful whether rating blanks are helpful or have a significant influence on learning. If they are used at all, they should be used in conjunction with informal, constructive criticism. Informal, individually structured comments are probably the most helpful form of classroom criticism.

Several theoretical articles on classroom speech criticism advocate the use of peer criticism and self criticism by students.[6] In fact, research suggests that when students are trained in evaluation, their ratings correlate well with those of the instructor. While these approaches may be used to supplement instructor criticism, they should not be the only methods employed. Both Arnold and Albright found that students consider oral and written criticism by the instructor to be very helpful and significantly more helpful than oral and written criticism from fellow students.[7] While it may be possible to train students in evaluation and critical sensitivity, the instructor's role in providing helpful feedback to the student must not be de-emphasized.

If students in communication classrooms perceive individually structured comments from the instructor as the most helpful form of criticism, how should that criticism be handled? Some instructors critique a student's performance immediately following the presentation. Some present criticism after all

the student performances for a particular day have been completed.
Some instructors do not criticize student performances in front
on the class. Critiques are written and handed to the student
at the next class period, or, if the instructor has time, he
discusses the student's performance with him in a private
conference. Some of the above procedures result in a substantial
delay between the behavior to be modified and the criticism
intended to modify it. Several lines of evidence in learning
theory would suggest that both positive and negative reinforcement
must be immediate if it is to be effective in behavior
modification.[8] Hilgard and Marquis emphatically state, "At the
present time it seems unlikely that learning can take place at all
with delays of more than a few seconds."[9] With this fact in mind,
some researchers have experimented with techniques of immediate
reinforcement. Warren studied the timing and format of criticism
of volume. His research indicated that visual cues presented
during a speech produced the greatest increase in volume.[10]
Freyman used flashcards, which by previous agreement reflected
certain types of response, to criticize delivery during speeches.
This investigation revealed no significant difference among the
methods.[11] DeVito has described one approach whereby the student
wears a small receiving set while making a speech. During the
speech, the instructor provides immediate reinforcement and
direction. DeVito reports that after students adjust to this
novel approach, they come to appreciate the speaking situation
as a real learning experience.[12] Procedures for providing
reinforcement during a performance, however, must be used with

caution. Two experiments have shown that unfavorable immediate
feedback prompts a deterioration in eye contact, nervousness,
fluency, and bodily movement for the beginning speaker.[13]

If criticism _during_ the classroom performance must be
employed with caution, perhaps the most beneficial approach is
to provide reinforcement immediately after every performance.
Evidence from learning theory indicates that seeing someone
else being reinforced is effective teaching if the viewer has
the appropriate needs and the necessary prior conditioning to
the stimuli involved.[14] This would suggest that the best
approach might be to give oral criticism in front of the class
immediately following every performance. Such an approach has
the advantage of immediacy but it also has a potential disadvantage
in being public. Since communication is a very personal,
self-revealing behavior, students may be sensitive to public
criticism. Braden points out that certain aspects of criticism
should always be discussed with the student in private.[15] There
is some evidence from research that students may prefer private
treatment. Albright found that _written_ comments by the instructor
were evaluated as the most helpful form in his study.[16] In case
studies of reticent students, Phillips noted that they seemed
to be frightened by public criticism from their peers. In most
cases, when given an option, classes seemed to prefer to be
criticised in private by the instructor rather than publicly
by anyone.[17]

Research Questions

Since students consider instructor criticism to be more helpful than peer criticism, this investigation focused on student response to instructor critique methods. While previous research indicates a general student preference for written or private methods of reinforcement, this investigation was concerned with determining whether this holds true for all types of comments and all types of students.

Sprague developed and used an observational schema whereby critical comments can be described using the technique of content analysis.[18] Using her categories, every criticism can be classified according to four dichotomies: (1) content-delivery, (2) positive-negative, (3) personal-impersonal, and (4) atomistic-holistic.

Comments which deal with topic selection, reasoning, development of ideas, forms of supporting material, organization, attention factors, and audience adaptation are considered to be about the content of the speech. Holistic comments which do not specifically mention delivery are also coded as content comments. Comments dealing with voice quality, rate, volume, fluency, pauses or timing, eye contact, poise, posture, movement, and gestures are considered to be about the delivery of the speech.

Comments which praise, compliment, or note improvement are considered to be positive. Comments which use the terms o.k., acceptable, fair, or otherwise indicate that a standard was met or an undesirable element was absent are also considered to be positive. Negative comments are those which criticize,

mention a weakness in the presentation, or make a suggestion for improvement.

Personal comments emphasize a teacher's affective response in criticism. They may refer to the personal life or attitudes of the student or instructor. They may also deal with an individual student's improvement, especially as it is related to other speeches or speakers in the classroom. The personal approach reflects an empathetic, personal teacher-student relationship. On the other hand, impersonal comments are more coldly objective. They emphasize cognitive principles of good speaking rather than affective responses. Behaviorally oriented instructors who maintain an impersonal approach in criticism feel that their own affective responses, attitudes, and values are inappropriate. They attempt to maintain objectivity in the process.

Atomistic comments are those which deal with some isolable element of the speech, its content, or its delivery. Comments which deal with the total speech performance or which make a general statement about over-all content or delivery are considered to be holistic.

Sprague utilized the above dichotomous classifications because of four basic areas of controversy which she identified in the literature related to speech criticism. Theorists and instructors disagree about the relative emphasis that should be placed on these dimensions in classroom criticism.

The Sprague content-analysis technique was employed in this study to categorize different kinds of criticism. The first question under consideration in this study was:

> What mode of criticism (i.e., a private, written method or a public, oral method) do students prefer for different types of comments?

The general student preference for written or private methods of reinforcement may not hold true for all types of students. An individual's self concept is one variable which may affect the way he reacts to critical evaluation. A student with a low self concept is likely to be sensitive to criticism, over-responsive to praise, hypercritical of himself, and pessimistic toward competition. On the other hand, a student with a high self concept is likely to be confident of his ability, to accept praise without embarrassment, and to look at criticism as being beneficial, i.e., a chance to acknowledge weaknesses and set out to change them.[19] The self is conceptualized as multidimensional with different self aspects affecting a person's behavior in different situations.[20] Since speech anxiety and exhibitionism are two aspects of self concept which contribute to speaker confidence and may be considered salient in the setting of classroom speech performance and criticism, the second general question under consideration in this investigation was:

> Do individual levels of speech anxiety or exhibitionism affect student mode preferences for different types of comments?

Recent findings indicate that sex variables influence classroom criticism and response. Female students have been found to be more receptive to criticism than male students.[21]

In addition, Sprague found that both student and instructor sex were significantly related to the types of criticism students actually received.[22] Because sex variables are related to research in this area, the third general question under consideration in this investigation was:

> Do student and instructor sex differences affect student mode preferences for different types of criticism?

Subjects

The 309 students who participated in this investigation were enrolled in twenty class sections of COM 114 (Fundamentals of Speech Communication) at Purdue University during the spring semester of 1972. Ten of the classes were taught by male instructors; ten by female instructors. Under male instructors, eighty students were male and seventy-six were female. There were ninety males and sixty-three females in the ten classes taught by female instructors.

Methodology

Subjects were administered a revised version of Gilkinson's Personal Report of Confidence as a Speaker (PRCS).[23] Since factor analytic research by Friedrich indicates that the PRCS is not unidimensional, the instrument was revised for use in this study.[24] Using the principal factor method with product moment correlations and varimax rotation, items were gradually deleted during four factor analyses. The final instrument comprised two eight-item subscales measuring speech anxiety and

exhibitionism. The final factor analysis of this instrument
produced an orthogonal solution of two eight-item factors,
indicating subscale independence.[25]

Persons who score high on the exhibitionism subscale
take pride in their speaking ability. They report that they
face the prospect of making a speech with complete confidence.
They also report feeling expansive and fluent while speaking;
ideas and words come to mind easily. On the other hand, persons
who score high on the anxiety subscale report that they feel
awkward when making a speech. Before the speech, they become
frightened and nervous. During the speech, they lose the thread
of their thinking, become confused, jumble the speech, and become
flustered when anything unexpected occurs. On the basis of
student response to this sixteen-item instrument, subjects in
this study were divided evenly into low, medium, and high levels
of speech anxiety and exhibitionism.

The four dichotomous classifications utilized in the
Sprague content analysis procedure provide eight basic labels
for different types of criticism. A collection of critical
comments was developed which reflected all of the dimensions
of criticism equally. Three graduate students in speech
education compiled sixty statements for possible inclusion in
a questionnaire. Using Sprague's four dichotomies, five graduate
students with experience in teaching speech coded each of these
statements. On the basis of interjudge agreement, 32 comments
were retained. Within this collection of critical comments,
each of the eight classifications (content and delivery,

positive and negative, personal and impersonal, atomistic and holistic) was represented sixteen times. It is possible for the eight classifications to be combined in sixteen different four-way combinations (For instance, one would be: content-negative-impersonal-atomistic). Each of these possible combinations was represented twice in the questionnaire.

In order to obtain response to a balanced sample of different types of criticism, student mode preferences were collected in a hypothetical setting. Subjects were asked to assume that they had just finished delivering a five-minute speech in their class. Since it is not likely that an instructor would give a student all of the comments on one speech, subjects were asked to respond to each comment individually. They were reminded that if their instructor considered the statement to be appropriate, he might make the comment orally in front of the class, or privately in written form. For each statement, the subject responded as to whether he would prefer to receive the comment orally in front of the class, in private, written form, or whether he had no preference.

Although the major limitation of this study was that subjects responded in a hypothetical situation, each of the subjects had experienced speechmaking in the classroom and had received criticism from his instructor. In addition, the instructions for the questionnaire were carefully designed to assist subjects in adapting to the hypothetical setting.

Data Analysis

Mode preference responses were tabulated in several different ways for analysis. A chi square test was computed for 20 different contingency tables. A follow-up probing procedure was not used to compare the numerous entries within each table. Instead, percentages were employed to describe and compare the many tables in which significant differences appeared.

Results

The chi square value for every table except one was significant beyond the .05 level of probability.

Table 1 reveals the percentage of mode preference responses appearing in each category when all types of criticism were taken into consideration. While 47 percent of the responses by the general population indicated no preference, 35 percent revealed a preference for the private, written form. Only 18 percent of the response appeared in the oral category. The response from students characterized by medium and high levels of speech anxiety revealed a greater preference for the written mode (38%) than did the response from students characterized by low levels of anxiety (28%). Students characterized by low levels of exhibitionism also expressed a greater preference for the private, written mode (40%) and a lower preference for the oral mode (12%) than did students characterized by medium and high levels of exhibitionism. The mode preference responses of male students under male instructors were very similar to the

general student population. Male students under female
instructors, however, expressed a greater preference for the
oral mode (30%) and a lower preference for the written mode (28%).
Female students under male instructors expressed a high preference
for the written mode (42%). This also held true for female
students under female instructors (38%); in fact, the students
in this category also expressed a lower preference for the oral
mode (11%). While the above differences between different types
of students must be acknowledged, one must also recognize that
a high percentage of response (42-52%) from all the groups
revealed no mode preference.

Table 2 is a summary of the percentage of mode preference
responses appearing in each category when responses to content
and delivery criticism were tabulated separately. The differences
between student groups in that table are similar to those which
appear in Table 1. The mode preferences expressed for content
and delivery criticism do not appear to be significantly different.

Table 3 reveals the percentage of mode preference
responses appearing in each category when responses to positive
and negative criticism were tabulated separately. When the
responses from all subjects were taken into consideration,
54 percent of the responses to positive criticism revealed no
preference while only 40 percent of the responses to negative
criticism indicated no preference. Responses to negative criticism
revealed a greater preference for the written mode (45%) than did
responses to positive criticism (24%). At the same time,
responses to negative criticism indicated a lesser preference

for the oral mode (15%) than did the responses to positive
criticism (21%). This indication of a written mode preference
for negative criticism and no mode preference for positive
criticism is reflected in all the different groups represented
in the table. Other differences in the table reflect similar
variations between student groups as appear in Table 1. It is
interesting to note the interaction of these effects. The
highest percentages of response indicating a written mode
preference for negative criticism came from students characterized
by a medium or high level of speech anxiety, students characterized
by low levels of exhibitionism, and female students. Also, the
public, oral mode preference indicated by male students under
female instructors does not appear to hold true for negative
criticism. Their response for negative criticism revealed a
greater preference for the written mode (37%) than for the oral
mode (23%).

Table 4 summarizes the percentage of mode preference
responses appearing in each category when responses to personal
and impersonal comments were tabulated separately. When the
responses from all students were taken into consideration,
51 percent of the response to impersonal criticism expressed no
mode preference while only 44 percent of the responses to personal
comments indicated no preference. Responses to personal criticism
revealed a greater preference for the written mode (39%) than did
responses to impersonal criticism (31%). All the different,
student groups represented in the table revealed similar
differences in mode preference for personal and impersonal

criticism. Other differences in the table reflect similar variations between student groups as appear in Table 1. The highest percentages of responses indicating a written mode preference for personal criticism came from students characterized by a medium or high level of speech anxiety, students characterized by low levels of exhibitionism, and female students. When responses were tabulated according to the personal and impersonal dimensions of criticism, the oral mode preference indicated by male students under female instructors did not hold true.

Table 5 reveals the percentage of mode preference responses appearing in each category when responses to atomistic and holistic comments were tabulated separately. When the responses from all subjects were taken into consideration, 50 percent of the responses to atomistic criticism revealed no preference while only 44 percent of the responses to holistic criticism indicated no preference. Responses to holistic comments revealed a greater preference for the written mode (38%) than did responses to atomistic comments (31%). All the different student groups represented in the table revealed similar differences in mode preference for atomistic and holistic criticism. Other differences in the table reflect similar differences between student groups as appear in Table 1. The highest percentages of responses indicating a written mode preference for holistic criticism came from students characterized by a medium or high level of speech anxiety, students characterized by low levels of exhibitionism, and female students. When responses were tabulated according to the atomistic and holistic dimensions

of criticism, the oral mode preference indicated by male students under female instructors did not hold true.

Discussion

Critical evaluation is an integral part of the learning process. Students probably perceive the communication classroom as a learning laboratory experience and they expect to receive critical feedback in that setting. Because of their expectations for that setting, they may not be sensitive to the methods of feedback which an instructor employs. A rationale can be developed which would suggest that the best approach would be to give oral criticism in front of the class immediately following every performance. Evidence from learning theory suggests that seeing someone else being reinforced can be an effective learning experience. Therefore, criticism can benefit more than one student in the classroom. Besides, a high percentage of the responses tabulated in this study revealed that many students do not often have a preference for a public, oral approach or a private, written approach in the classroom. This finding, however, does not justify the use of oral criticism in all classroom situations.

Before the instructor in the communication classroom decides to employ any method of critical evaluation, he must be sensitive to the type of student involved. Student mode preferences revealed in this study indicate that students who have a high level of anxiety or a low level of exhibitionism prefer the private, written method of criticism more than do

other students. - The results of this study also indicate that female students prefer the private, written mode more than do male students. These differences appear to be true for all different types of criticism.

The mode preferences revealed in this study indicated that only one group of students preferred the oral mode of criticism in the classroom. When all types of criticism were taken into consideration, male students under female instructors expressed more preference for the oral mode of criticism than did other groups of students. When their preference for the oral mode was compared to their, expressed preference for the written mode, however, the oral mode received a greater percentage of the response only when the criticism consisted of positive reinforcement. The male student probably prefers public recognition from a female instructor. That preference, however, only appears to be greater than the preference for a private, written method when the recognition includes acceptance or praise.

Before the instructor in the communication classroom decides to employ any method of critical evaluation, he must be sensitive to the type of criticism involved. Student mode preferences revealed in this study indicate a preference for private, written criticism if the comment is negative, personal, or holistic. This preference holds true for all student groups analyzed; but, it is especially strong among students characterized by low levels of exhibitionism, and female students.

The results of this study provide several practical implications for the instructor in the communication classroom.

A self-report measure of speech anxiety and/or exhibitionism (easily employed in the classroom) may help determine how critical evaluation should be handled with different students. If this information is not available (or at the beginning of a term before the instructor has any experience with students), the instructor can at least make some inferences based on student sex. If the instructor desires to employ oral criticism in the classroom to reinforce the student himself as well as other members of the class, he might particularly use male students as models, especially if they are characterized by low levels of anxiety and/or high levels of exhibitionism. It may be best to use female students as models only if they are characterized by low levels of speech anxiety and/or high levels of exhibitionism.

On the basis of this study, oral criticism in the classroom should probably be impersonal and atomistic. The results of this investigation also reflect the fact that all students prefer to receive negative reinforcement in a private form. Therefore, all oral criticism in the classroom should take the form of positive reinforcement. If this procedure is followed, the instructor probably does not have to be as concerned about student levels of self confidence or student sex differences. However, if a teacher desires to make any oral, negative evaluation in the classroom, it should at least be done with a highly confident student.

This study has revealed some important differences in student preferences which may affect student attitudes in the learning environment. These attitudes may affect a student's

receptivity to criticism and, perhaps, his utilization of that criticism. For all instructors who recognize the importance of student attitudes and preferences, this study provides implications for the refinement of instructor critique behavior.

Footnotes

[1] R. S. Cathcart, Post Communication, Critical Analysis and Evaluation (Indianapolis: Bobbs-Morrill, 1966), p. 398.

[2] See L. L. Barker, R. J. Kibler, and E. C. Hunter, "An Empirical Study of Overlap Rating Effects," Speech Teacher, 17 (March, 1968), 160-166; S. L. Becker, "The Rating of Speeches: Scale Independence," Speech Monographs, 29 (March, 1962), 38-44; R. N. Bostrom, "Dogmatism, Rigidity, and Rating Behavior," Speech Teacher, 13 (November, 1964), 283-287; T. Clevenger, "Retest Reliability of Judgements of General Effectiveness in Public Speaking," Western Speech Journal, 26 (Fall, 1962), 216-222; W. A. Linkugel, "Student Evaluation of Assignments in a Course in Fundamentals of Speech," Speech Teacher, 7 (March, 1958), 154-156; G. R. Miller, "Agreement and the Grounds for It: Persistent Problems in Speech Rating," Speech Teacher, 13 (November, 1964), 257-261; E. R. Pfister, "A Study of the Influence of Certain Selected Factors on the Ratings of Speech Performances," (Abstract) Speech Monographs, 23 (June, 1956), 96-97.

[3] D. N. Dedmon, "Criticizing Student Speeches: Philosophy and Principles," Central States Speech Journal, 18 (November, 1967), 276-284.

[4] D. H. Arnold, "Perception, Recall, and Influence of Criticism on Students in Fundamentals of Speech," Unpublished masters thesis, Illinois State University at Normal, 1964, pp. 33-35.

[5] M. D. Albright, "The Response of Students in Fundamentals of Speech to Oral Criticism," Unpublished masters thesis, Northern Illinois University, 1967, p. 26.

[6]See H. G. Barnes, "Teaching the Fundamentals of Speech at the College Level," Speech Teacher, 3 (November, 1954), 239-251; C. W. Harris, "Some Issues in Evaluation," Speech Teacher, 12 (September, 1963), 191-199; H. Hildebrandt and W. Stevens, "Blue Book Criticisms at Michigan," Speech Teacher, 9 (January, 1960), 20-22; W. E. Hoogestraat, "Letters of Evaluation - An Exercise in Speech Criticism," Speech Teacher, 12 (January, 1963), 29; K. E. Montgomery, "How to Criticize Student Speeches," Speech Teacher, 6 (September, 1957), 200-204; J. D. Ragsdale, "Post-Hoc and Synchronic Criticism," Speech Teacher, 16 (March, 1967), 161-164.

[7]Arnold, p. 39; Albright, pp. 34-35.

[8]See L. E. Bourne, "Effects of Delay of Information Feedback and Task Complexity on the Identification of Concepts," Journal of Experimental Psychology, 54 (September, 1957), 201-207; B. R. Bugelski, The Psychology of Learning Applied to Teaching (Indianapolis: Bobbs-Merrill, 1966), pp. 259-263; J. Greenspoon and S. Foreman, "Effects of Delay of Knowledge of Results on Learning a Motor Task," Journal of Experimental Psychology, 51 (April, 1956), 226-228; I. J. Saltzman, "Delay of Reward and Human Verbal Learning," Journal of Experimental Psychology, 41 (June, 1951), 437-439.

[9]R. Hilgard and D. G. Marquis, Conditioning and Learning (New York: Appleton - Century - Crofts, 1961), p. 165.

[10]I. D. Warren, "The Effect of Three Forms of Criticism on Volume," Unpublished masters thesis, Northern Illinois University, 1966.

[11]L. Froyman, "A Survey to Discover Instructional Procedures in Use Following Student Speech Performances," Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Western Reserve University, 1954.

[12]J. A. DeVito, "The Teacher as Behavioral Engineer," Today's Speech, 16 (February, 1968), 2-5.

[13]See F.P. Amato and T. H. Ostermeier, "The Effect of Audience Feedback on the Beginning Public Speaker," Speech Teacher, 16 (January, 1967), 56-60; W. Combs, "The Effect of Audience Feedback on Encoding Behavior of Speakers," Unpublished masters thesis, Michigan State University, 1968.

[14]Bugolski, pp. 259-263.

[15]W. W. Braden, Speech Methods and Resources (New York: Harper, 1961), p. 405.

[16]Albright, p. 34.

[17]G. M. Phillips, "Reticence Revisited," Pennsylvania Speech Annual, 23 (September, 1966), 40-57.

[18]J. A. Sprague, "An Investigation of the Written Critique Behavior of College Communication Instructors," Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Purdue University, 1971.

[19]W. D. Brooks, Speech Communication (Dubuque, Iowa: William C. Brown, 1971), pp. 68-70.

[20]K. J. Gergon, "Self Theory and the Process of Self Observation," Journal of Nervous and Mental Disease, 148 (April, 1969), 440.

[21]See Albright, p. 62; S. L. Young, "Student Perceptions of Helpfulness in Classroom Speech Criticism," Unpublished masters thesis, Purdue University, 1972, p. 59.

[22]Sprague, pp. 45-46.

[23]H. Gilkinson, "Social Fears as Reported by Students in College Speech Classes," Speech Monographs, 9 (March, 1942), 141-160.

[24]G. W. Friedrich, "An Empirical Explication of a Concept of Self-Reported Speech Anxiety," Speech Monographs, 37 (March, 1970), 67-72.

[25]Product moment correlations were computed between total scores on the subscales, the sixteen-item instrument, and the total PRCS inventory. Scores on the sixteen-item instrument correlated .89 with scores on the 104-item PRCS. At the same time, the correlation coefficient between subscale scores was .56. While the total sixteen-item instrument has high concurrent validity with the PRCS, it provides a cleaner measurement of speaker confidence because the dimensions being measured are more clearly defined.

Table 1
Mode Preference Response
All Types of Criticism

Subjects	Oral Preference	Written Preference	No Preference
** All Subjects (n=309)	18.1%	34.6%	47.3%
** High Anxiety Group (n=103)	16.0	38.2	45.8
Medium Anxiety Group (n=103)	18.3	37.6	44.1
Low Anxiety Group (n=103)	19.9	28.1	52.0
** High Exhibitionism Group (n=103)	18.2	33.0	48.8
Medium Exhibitionism Group (n=103)	23.6	31.2	45.2
Low Exhibitionism Group (n=103)	12.4	39.7	47.9
** Male Students Male Instructors (n=80)	16.6	32.0	51.4
Male Students Female Instructors (n=90)	30.0	28.5	45.5
Female Students Male Instructors (n=76)	16.3	42.0	41.7
Female Students Female Instructors (n=63)	10.9	37.9	51.2

Each subject responded to 32 comments.

Each table entry reflects the percentage of total responses which indicated the respective preference.

**Table chi square value significant at $p < .01$

Table 2
Mode Preference Response
Content and Delivery Criticism

SUBJECTS	Oral Preference		Written Preference		No Preference	
	CON	DEL	CON	DEL	CON	DEL
All Subjects	17.2%	19.0%	35.6%	33.6%	47.2%	47.4%
** High Anxiety Group	15.4	16.6	39.4	37.0	45.2	46.4
Medium Anxiety Group	17.4	19.3	38.7	36.5	43.9	44.2
Low Anxiety Group	18.7	21.1	28.8	27.3	52.5	51.6
** High Exhibitionism Group	17.2	19.2	34.0	32.0	48.8	48.8
Medium Exhibitionism Group	21.9	25.4	32.5	30.0	45.6	44.6
Low Exhibitionism Group	12.4	12.4	40.5	38.8	47.1	48.8
** Male Students Male Instructors	15.0	18.3	33.3	30.6	51.7	51.1
Male Students Female Instructors	25.3	26.6	28.8	28.2	45.9	45.2
Female Students Male Instructors	15.6	16.8	43.0	41.0	41.4	42.2
Female Students Female Instructors	10.1	11.6	39.6	36.2	50.3	52.2

Each subject responded to 16 comments of each type.

Each table entry reflects the percentage of responses for that
type of criticism which indicated the respective preference.

**Table chi square value significant at p < .01

Table 3
Mode Preference Response
Positive and Negative Criticism

SUBJECTS	Oral Preference		Written Preference		No Preference	
	POS	NEG	POS	NEG	POS	NEG
** All Subjects	21.3%	14.9%	24.4%	44.9%	54.3%	40.2
** High Anxiety Group	20.3	11.6	28.4	48.1	51.3	40.3
Medium Anxiety Group	21.8	14.9	26.2	49.0	52.0	36.1
Low Anxiety Group	21.7	18.1	18.6	37.5	59.7	44.4
** High Exhibitionism Group	22.0	14.4	23.1	42.9	54.9	42.7
Medium Exhibitionism Group	27.2	20.0	21.8	40.6	51.0	39.4
Low Exhibitionism Group	14.6	10.1	28.3	51.0	57.1	38.9
** Male Students Male Instructors	19.4	13.9	22.6	41.3	58.0	44.8
Male Students Female Instructors	28.5	23.4	20.1	36.9	51.4	39.7
Female Students Male Instructors	19.9	12.6	28.9	55.2	51.2	32.2
Female Students Female Instructors	15.1	6.6	27.6	48.2	57.3	45.2

Each subject responded to 16 comments of each type.

Each table entry reflects the percentage of responses for that type of criticism which indicated the respective preference.

**Table chi square value significant at $p < .01$

Table 4
Mode Preference Response
Personal and Impersonal Criticism

SUBJECTS	Oral Preference		Written Preference		No Preference	
	PER	IMP	PER	IMP	PER	IMP
* All Subjects	17.9%	18.3%	38.5%	30.8%	43.6%	50.9%
** High Anxiety Group	16.0	16.0	42.5	33.9	41.5	50.1
Medium Anxiety Group	17.4	19.4	41.4	33.9	41.2	46.7
Low Anxiety Group	20.4	19.4	31.4	24.7	48.2	55.9
** High Exhibitionism Group	17.5	19.0	36.2	29.8	46.3	51.2
Medium Exhibitionism Group	24.0	23.2	34.3	28.2	41.7	48.6
Low Exhibitionism Group	12.2	12.5	44.8	34.5	43.0	53.0
** Male Students / Male Instructors	16.3	17.0	35.6	28.3	48.1	54.7
Male Students / Female Instructors	27.2	24.7	30.9	26.1	41.9	49.2
Female Students / Male Instructors	14.2	18.2	47.5	36.5	38.3	45.3
Female Students / Female Instructors	11.2	10.5	41.9	33.9	46.9	55.6

Each subject responded to 16 comments of each type.

Each table entry reflects the percentage of responses for that
type of criticism which indicated the respective preference.

* Table chi square value significant at p<.05.

** Table chi square value significant at p<.01

Table 5

Mode Preference Response
Atomistic and Holistic Criticism

SUBJECTS	Oral Preference		Written Preference		no Preference	
	ATM	HOL	ATM	HOL	ATM	HOL
* All Subjects	18.8%	17.3%	30.9%	38.4%	50.3%	44.3%
** High Anxiety Group	16.7	15.3	34.3	42.1	49.0	42.6
Medium Anxiety Group	19.2	17.5	33.8	41.4	47.0	41.1
Low Anxiety Group	20.6	19.2	24.4	31.7	55.0	49.1
** High Exhibitionism Group	18.9	17.6	30.1	35.9	51.0	46.5
Medium Exhibitionism Group	24.3	23.0	27.5	35.0	48.2	42.0
Low Exhibitionism Group	13.3	11.4	35.0	44.4	51.7	44.2
** Male Students Male Instructors	17.0	16.3	28.4	35.5	54.6	48.2
Male Students Female Instructors	26.3	25.6	26.0	31.0	47.7	43.4
Female Students Male Instructors	17.4	15.0	37.2	46.9	45.4	38.1
Female Students Female Instructors	12.1	9.6	33.2	42.6	54.7	47.8

Each subject responded to 16 comments of each type.

Each table entry reflects the percentage of responses for that type of criticism which indicated the respective preference.

* Table chi square value significant at $p < .05$

** Table chi square value significant at $p < .01$