1992

A working taxonomy of speech acts used by communication instructors in oral speech critiques

Christine M. Burger
San Jose State University

Follow this and additional works at: https://scholarworks.sjsu.edu/etd_theses

Recommended Citation

Burger, Christine M., "A working taxonomy of speech acts used by communication instructors in oral speech critiques" (1992). *Master's Theses*. 379.
DOI: <https://doi.org/10.31979/etd.af9j-b8v9>
https://scholarworks.sjsu.edu/etd_theses/379

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Master's Theses and Graduate Research at SJSU ScholarWorks. It has been accepted for inclusion in Master's Theses by an authorized administrator of SJSU ScholarWorks. For more information, please contact scholarworks@sjsu.edu.

INFORMATION TO USERS

This manuscript has been reproduced from the microfilm master. UMI films the text directly from the original or copy submitted. Thus, some thesis and dissertation copies are in typewriter face, while others may be from any type of computer printer.

The quality of this reproduction is dependent upon the quality of the copy submitted. Broken or indistinct print, colored or poor quality illustrations and photographs, print bleedthrough, substandard margins, and improper alignment can adversely affect reproduction.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send UMI a complete manuscript and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if unauthorized copyright material had to be removed, a note will indicate the deletion.

Oversize materials (e.g., maps, drawings, charts) are reproduced by sectioning the original, beginning at the upper left-hand corner and continuing from left to right in equal sections with small overlaps. Each original is also photographed in one exposure and is included in reduced form at the back of the book.

Photographs included in the original manuscript have been reproduced xerographically in this copy. Higher quality 6" x 9" black and white photographic prints are available for any photographs or illustrations appearing in this copy for an additional charge. Contact UMI directly to order.

U·M·I

University Microfilms International
A Bell & Howell Information Company
300 North Zeeb Road, Ann Arbor, MI 48106-1346 USA
313/761-4700 800/521-0600

Order Number 1350073

**A working taxonomy of speech acts used by communication
instructors in oral speech critiques**

Burger, Christine Marie, M.A.

San Jose State University, 1992

U·M·I
300 N. Zeeb Rd.
Ann Arbor, MI 48106

A WORKING TAXONOMY OF SPEECH ACTS USED BY
COMMUNICATION INSTRUCTORS IN ORAL SPEECH CRITIQUES

A Thesis

Presented to

The Faculty of the Communication Studies Department

San Jose State University

In Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements for the Degree

Master of Arts

By

Christine M. Burger

August, 1992

APPROVED FOR THE COMMUNICATION STUDIES DEPARTMENT

Dr. Jo Sprague

Dr. Shawn Spano

Dr. Judith Barnes

APPROVED FOR THE UNIVERSITY

M. Lou Lewandowski

ABSTRACT

A WORKING TAXONOMY OF SPEECH ACTS USED BY COMMUNICATION INSTRUCTORS IN ORAL SPEECH CRITIQUES

by Christine M. Burger

Past research on speech criticism in oral performance classes has focused on who should give criticism, when and how feedback should be offered, and what should be said. By adopting Speech Acts Theory as a basis for this research the emphasis changed to *what is being done* in teachers' critiques.

The purpose of this study was to generate a classification system that would categorize the speech acts used by public speaking teachers during an oral critique. Through a series of non-participant observations, 597 units of data were collected from five instructors during 45 student speeches.

Three of Searle's (1969) categories of illocutionary acts were utilized by instructors in this study; directives, assertives and expressives. Subcategories that were identified as most distinctive of speech criticism include: Simple Label, Indirect Judgment, Speech Feature, Rule Giving, Advise-Retrospective, Simple Command and Personal Feeling.

Multiple goals and Politeness Phenomena were advanced as possible reasons for instructors choice of indirect and direct speech acts used during oral critiques. Future research using this taxonomy can explore how teachers give students the information they need to improve while still *saving face*.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

First, I want to express my eternal gratitude to Genelle Austin-Lett, Jack Ford, Liz Harris, Elaine Lee and Gary Miller. These excellent instructors allowed me the privilege of observing their classes. Without your kindness and cooperation, I would not have collected such rich and exciting data. Thank You.

In the beginning, when it was necessary to plunge into language philosophy, I have Gary Ruud to thank for making it bearable. You made Wittgenstein, Austin and Searle proud.

Having knowledge, and having the ability to be a good teacher, are two different things. Judith Barnes is fortunate because she has both. She is truly one of the best professors I have ever had and I am fortunate to have had her on my committee. Thank You for your insight and encouragement.

It is a gift to be able to enlighten, challenge and encourage a student, while still offering guidance and direction. Shawn Spano has this gift. Thank You for all your input and help, especially regarding Speech Acts Theory.

Words can not express my deep appreciation and admiration for Jo Sprague. She has literally been everything to me: professor, intern advisor, thesis advisor, mentor, friend and confidant. I am grateful for her incredible commitment to this project. She offered her time, energy, knowledge and expertise in making it successful. As my professor and intern advisor, she has instructed, directed, and molded me into a proficient teacher. I will forever be indebted to her. Thank You, Jo!

Throughout my life I have attempted to do many things. My parents, Kevin and Gail Smith, have ALWAYS encouraged and supported me. The words *you can't*, were never in their vocabulary. If it weren't for them, I would not be the

person I am, nor would I be writing this thesis. I want to take this opportunity to thank them from the bottom of my heart, and to say "I love you both very much."

I am truly blessed because God has given me a second set of parents as well, Bill and Patricia Burger. I would like to thank them for doing everything in their power to make this thesis easier for me. They supplied me with a video and audio recorder, listened to me talk and talk and talk about this thesis, and offered their love and support. I love you both, and feel very lucky to be a part of your family.

Last, there is one person who has been by my side from the very first night of graduate school (when I was terrified of what I had gotten myself into), through the endless hours of writing, rewriting, unitizing, reunitizing, analyzing, reanalyzing, and then writing, rewriting again. His unconditional love and support have been incredible. He has offered me strength, encouragement, and hope. He even created, especially for me, the infamous strategy *Operation Thesis Completion*. It is he, my husband Craig Burger, to whom I dedicate this thesis.

I LOVE YOU SWEET PRINCE.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	iv
LIST OF FIGURES.....	viii
LIST OF TABLES.....	ix
Chapter	
I. THE PROBLEM.....	1
Introduction.....	1
Review of Literature on Speech Criticism.....	3
Review of Literature on Speech Acts Theory.....	10
Rationale for the Present Study.....	16
II. THE METHOD.....	19
Research Design.....	19
Sampling Method.....	20
Procedure.....	21
Analysis.....	24
III. THE RESULTS.....	27
Directives.....	27
Assertives.....	34
Expressives.....	39
Linked Acts.....	42

Miscellaneous and Uninterpretable.....	44
Summary.....	44
IV. DISCUSSION.....	46
Methodological Issues.....	46
Theoretical Issues.....	48
Implications for Future Research.....	55
Implications for Teachers.....	58
REFERENCES.....	60
APPENDIX	66
A. BREAKDOWN OF TAXONOMY ACCORDING TO CATEGORIES AND SUBCATEGORIES.....	66
B. TRANSCRIPTION OF TEACHER'S ORAL CRITIQUES CATEGORIZED ACCORDING TO TAXONOMY.....	68
Directives.....	68
Assertives.....	78
Expressives.....	100
Linked Acts.....	103
Miscellaneous & Uninterpretable.....	105
C. TWO SAMPLE CRITIQUES IN CONTEXT WITH SPEECH ACTS LABELED.....	106

LIST OF FIGURES

FIGURE	PAGE
1. Schematic of Directive Speech Acts Used by Teachers During Oral Critiques.....	33
2. Schematic of Assertive Speech Acts Used by Teachers During Oral Critiques.....	38
3. Schematic of Expressive Speech Acts Used by Teachers During Oral Critiques.....	41

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE	PAGE
1. Speech Acts Used in the Taxonomy of Teacher's Oral Critiques Compared to Searle's Major Categories.....	43
2. Ten Most Frequently Used Speech Act Categories in Oral Critiques of Student Speeches.....	49
3. Appendix A - Table 1A Breakdown of Taxonomy According to Categories and Subcategories.....	66

CHAPTER I

The Problem

Introduction

Communication instructors in oral performance classes are given the responsibility to critique speeches, and with that comes the responsibility to evaluate the students' success and to help them utilize their public speaking skills. Holtzman (1960) stated that every such teacher must ask the question, "What can I say (or write or do) that will result in this student's improving his [sic] communicative ability?" (p. 1)

Past efforts to answer these questions have focused on several aspects of criticism in the classroom. The most general lines of research validate feedback as a necessary part of learning. Berlo (1960) observed that "an awareness and utilization of feedback increases the communication effectiveness of the individual" (p. 115). Bilodeau and Bilodeau (1961) state, "There seems to be universal agreement among those who study the learning of skills that the most fundamental condition determining performance during learning is feedback" (p. 244). This begins to set the groundwork for more specific examinations of the ways in which instructors use oral critique in the classroom.

The earliest studies on speech criticism address issues such as who should give criticism, when and how should instructors give criticism and what should be said when criticism is offered. One line of research that is relevant to the present study identified the dimensions of content in the critiques by using four categories; content/delivery, positive/negative, atomistic/ holistic, and personal/impersonal (Sprague, 1971), and then applied these to various aspects of oral critique,

including the relationship between instructor-delivered oral criticism and student's self-concept (Book & Simmons, 1980; Schenone, 1981; Young, 1974).

Over this same period, communication theory has moved away from focusing on language as a referential system toward theories that treat language as action. According to Searle (1976), the theory of speech acts starts with the assumption that the minimal unit of human communication is not a grammatical unit such as the sentence or even a unit of expressive behavior, but rather the performance of certain kinds of acts, such as making statements, asking questions, giving orders, describing, explaining, apologizing, thanking, congratulating and so forth. Both Austin (1962) and Searle (1965) have noted that speaking is primarily using language for some purpose, which they defined as performing illocutionary acts. By adopting Speech Acts Theory as a basis for this research, the emphasis will change from *what is being said* in teachers' critiques to *what is being done*.

Linda Laube Barnes (1990) derived an analysis of the comments teachers make on student's written compositions based on the Speech Acts Theory. Sprague (1991) suggests that there are similar "speech acts implicit in teachers' critiques of oral communication" (p. 15). The purpose of this study is to examine language used by speech teachers during an oral critique and to draw upon Speech Acts Theory to create a taxonomy of the speech acts implicit in classroom critiques of oral communication presentations.

The remainder of this chapter reviews two bodies of literature that contribute support and validation for this study: Speech Criticism and Speech Acts Theory.

Review of the Literature on Speech Criticism

One purpose for having public speaking courses is to help students develop public speaking skills in the area of content and delivery. Instructors are responsible to evaluate students and offer feedback as a means to promote improvement so that students have an opportunity to become successful speakers. In this study, the concepts "feedback" and "criticism" will mean the same thing. Book and Simmons (1980) stated that "feedback or criticism is a method used by teachers to inform students that aspects of their performance need to be altered or maintained" (p. 135). Book (1985) defined feedback as "deliberate comments with descriptive and evaluative information following a public address" (p. 120). Similarly, Robinson and Kerikas (1963) defined speech criticism as "a process of revealing the findings of diagnosis and evaluation to the student so that he [sic] may take the steps needed to improve his work" (p. 241). Cathcart (1966) believed that one cannot improve without understanding what needs to be improved upon. Rubin (1984) noted that feedback is an essential component of the instructional process which primarily takes the form of public speaking assessment in speech communication classes.

Based presumably on experience and observation, the earliest published work offered prescriptive advice for those who teach public speaking. Braden (1961) for example, emphasized the importance of immediate criticism following each speech. He also thought that the most effective way to phrase a critique was in a question format. Robinson and Kerikas (1963) believed that the only type of criticism given orally should be positive and constructive. They thought that the use of "don't" and negative comments should be avoided. Balcer and Seabury (1965) emphasized that instructors should avoid repeating the same critical comments for each speaker.

Scholars have continued to address issues of when, how and by whom criticism should be offered. The actual research literature is quite limited and, as the following review reveals, prescriptive advice still predominates. Concerning the timing of speech feedback, Dedmon (1967) stated that "students learn best when they have immediate and valid knowledge of success or failure" (p. 28). In its most extreme form such immediacy has been the feedback actually given during a speech (Amato & Ostermeier 1967; Nyquist & Wulff, 1982). The reasoning for this type of feedback has been the assumption that "verbal messages can enable individuals to adapt or modify their behavior instantaneously" (Nyquist & Wulff, 1982, p. 11). Book (1985) suggested that this type of feedback should be further examined in the public speaking situation. She notes that "the effect of the motivation of a speaker to improve specific aspects of his or her speaking ability and the effectiveness of this simultaneous feedback technique should be studied" (p. 23).

Researchers have also investigated the use of audio or video tape as a means of feedback. Quigley and Nyquist (1990) offer four learning opportunities that are created by video technology which can enhance the instructor's ability to provide feedback. Video provides student speakers the opportunity to: 1) adopt the role of observers; 2) identify or emphasize particular skills; 3) receive feedback about specific skills simultaneously with performing those skills; and 4) make comparisons (p. 3).

A study by Bradley (1970) compared two classes of public speaking. One did not videotape the speeches in the class; the other did. While there was no difference regarding the comprehension and retention of information and no variation among final grades given in the classes, the students who were videotaped had "a significantly more favorable attitude toward the Intellectual

Atmosphere and the Content Evaluation of the course" (p. 166). Studies have found that students do not improve simply by observing their videotaped performance (Nystrom & Leaf, 1939; Kenner, 1967). It was suggested that students require assistance from an instructor to identify positive and negative aspects of their speech. McCroskey and Lashbrook (1970) observed that "a student viewing his or her speech without feedback can work directly counter to the goals of the course" (p. 204). Porter and King (1972) reported that "when accompanied by an appropriate, positive critique by a qualified instructor, VTR feedback can improve oral interpretation performance" (p. 105).

Feedback is given not only by instructors; students are often asked to evaluate their peers' speeches. The rationale for this approach is that students who critique their classmates develop critical thinking and listening skills (Verderber, 1973). Peterson (1961) observed that "if the students are not allowed to offer their responses and criticisms to the speaker, the speaker is then denied the exposure to a variety of responses to his [sic] speech" (p. 105). Fujishin (1976) examined students' attitudes about giving oral criticism to other students and receiving oral criticism from other students in public speaking classes. He concluded that: 1) the majority of students felt qualified to give oral criticism regarding speaker delivery, speech content and speech organization; 2) oral student criticism should be given immediately after the speech; and 3) both positive and negative criticism can be encouraged from the students since the majority of students report that they like receiving both types of feedback (p. 39). He reasoned that students liked receiving negative criticism from their peers because students want to improve their speaking skills and that constructive suggestions help in directive improvement. A similar study done by Book and Simmons (1980) examined the helpfulness of feedback from students to their peers. They determined that

students are capable of giving feedback that is perceived as helpful and that the type of feedback is similar to that given by the instructor.

Most relevant to the present study has been research that examines what is being said in speech critiques and the related outcomes. One early study by Bostrom (1963) found that positive feedback affected more willingness to give speeches and higher self-ratings about one's speaking ability than did negative feedback. Bostrom suggested that "good speakers experience more positive changes than poor speakers" (p. 32). He goes on to say, "if our purpose is to build more positive speech attitudes, than criticism should be positive in nature" (p. 32).

Sprague (1971) created a category system of written criticism of student speeches, which was later extended to oral criticism by Schenone (1981). The category system was based on four dichotomies: content/delivery, atomistic/holistic, personal/impersonal, and positive/negative. *Content* refers to comments dealing with topic selection, reasoning, development of ideas, forms of supporting material, organization, attention factors, and audience adaptation. *Delivery* concerns comments dealing with voice quality, rate, volume, fluency, pauses or timing, eye contact, poise, posture, movement and gestures. *Atomistic* comments are those which deal with some element of the speech, directed towards content or delivery which can be isolated. Comments that deal with the total speech performance or which make a general statement about over-all content or delivery are considered *holistic*. *Personal* comments emphasize a teacher's affective response in criticism. They may refer to the personal life or attitudes of the student or instructor. *Impersonal* comments are more objective. They emphasize cognitive principles of good speaking. *Positive* comments praise, compliment, or note improvement. This category also includes the terms "OK," "acceptable," "fair," or others that indicate that a standard was met or an

undesirable element was absent. *Negative* comments are those which criticize, mention a weakness in the presentation, or make a suggestion for improvement. The results of Sprague's (1971) original descriptive study showed that criticism given by instructors to students frequently involved content (75%), atomistic (95%), and impersonal (99%) comments. Positive and negative comments were almost equally divided.

The development of Sprague's category system made it possible for future scholars to empirically describe the content of critiques. Vogel (1975) used this system to examine the relationship between teachers' written criticism and students' improvement on speech performance. He offered three types of predetermined feedback: 1) atomistic, impersonal, negative; 2) atomistic, impersonal, positive; and 3) atomistic, personal, positive. Although groups that received feedback significantly improved, this study did not reveal any significant difference between the three patterns of feedback. Other scholars have examined how certain content elements or patterns in critiques effect the outcome of how criticism is viewed. For instance, Young (1974) examined students' perceptions of the helpfulness of specific dimensions of evaluative feedback as conceptualized by Sprague (1971). Young found that "subjects perceived atomistic comments to be significantly more helpful than holistic comments" (p. 236). He discovered that "negative, impersonal, atomistic criticism was rated significantly more helpful than other types of criticism" (p. 239). Young suggests that students generally desire to have teacher evaluation and criticism remain on a business-like, impersonal level, free of personal feelings and attitudes. He notes that "a student's receptivity to criticism and, perhaps, his [sic] utilization of that criticism may be greatly affected by the degree to which the criticism meets his needs and preference" (p. 234).

Schenone (1981) selected two dimensions (positive-negative, content-delivery) of instructor delivered feedback given to students, established a method to code *oral* criticism, and then tested students' self-concept and attitude scores to determine whether there was an interaction between student self-concept, the proportions of instructor-delivered oral criticism received, and the attitude of the students toward receiving the oral criticism. The results indicated that "no interaction effects were significant but that the main effect of self-concept on the attitude of the students was significant" (p. 87). Students with higher self-concept had, on the whole, a more positive attitude towards feedback. She suggested that further analysis needs to explore the relationship between self-concept and the students attitude toward criticism to determine what variables interact with self-concept to influence the students attitude.

Edwards (1990) investigated self-concept by drawing from a different perspective, the symbolic interactionist view, which suggests that a person's sense of self is derived in communication as a result of the feedback received from others. She hypothesized that individuals who are more sensitive to feedback would develop different self-concepts than individuals who are less sensitive to feedback. Results from two investigations reveal that high sensitives are more likely to incorporate specific self-relevant feedback into their self-schema (self-schema refer to how individuals view themselves), than low sensitives.

In addition to self-concept, speech anxiety has been studied as a possible mediator of student's response to feedback. Proposing that feedback may have varying meanings for students who are anxious versus those who are not, Booth-Butterfield (1989) conducted two studies that examined the attributions students make based on feedback they receive. In the first study participants generated information, by answering open-ended questions, that reflected their perception of

feedback and its interpretation in response to a hypothetical performance. Anxiety was associated with negative comments for most categories, but with positive comments concerning content. Trait anxiety was also related to negative external attributions. In the second study all participants were given identical feedback. For both anxious and non-anxious students attributions indicated a self-serving effect where positive comments were attributed internally and negative comments externally. Overall, the study indicated that there are "more similarities than differences between anxious and non-anxious students in their attributions concerning feedback" (p. 129). Booth-Butterfield infers that trait CA will not unduly distort student perceptions and that instructor feedback stands a better chance of achieving its purpose and improving subsequent communication.

Recently, there has been an increase in interpretive research within the communication studies field. Communication scholars have begun to incorporate ethnographic approaches as analytic tools. Preston and Todd-Mancillas (1985) used what they referred to as a grounded ethnographic method to observe students' perceptions of teacher's oral feedback on their speeches. Two female students were chosen from an available pool of twelve student volunteers and were asked to view instructor critiques, pertaining to their performance of a prior speech. Students were then asked to identify statements perceived as helpful in improving speechmaking and those which promoted good or bad feelings about their abilities. This study concluded that feedback that indicates a specific part of the speech needing improvement was most helpful. Positive feedback made students feel good about themselves but was not identified as helpful. Negative feedback was perceived as promoting bad feelings unless teacher was exhibiting positive immediacy behaviors (i.e., smiling, giving reassuring looks).

Research on speech criticism to date has generated various bodies of information regarding different aspects of criticism. The underlying assumption is that effective criticism will enable students to learn more and/or become better public speakers. If we as scholars succeed in finding the most effective way of giving criticism, then we will succeed in our efforts to help students. Scholars have attempted to answer many questions, such as, when should we give criticism? How should we give criticism? Who should give criticism? Last, scholars have begun to examine what is being said in teacher critiques. The research in the last three decades has failed to reach solid conclusions in answering the preceding questions. While it is important to find answers to these questions, one must first ask, "What are the intentions of the instructor?" How can we, as scholars, evaluate the success of speech criticism if it is not clear what the goals of the event are? For this reason, it is vital that scholars go beyond *what is being said* and examine *what is being done*. One way to evaluate the language used during instructor given speech critiques is to apply the Speech Acts theory, as it allows for the observation of what is being done during oral critiques given after student presentations.

Review of the Literature on Speech Acts Theory

Language philosophy has changed and evolved over the last century. Before ordinary language philosophy, many scholars who studied language simply categorized words according to definitions, then examined the sentence for meaning and structure. This is evident in the early writings of prominent language philosopher Ludwig Wittgenstein, as he was primarily concerned with the nature and limits of language itself. He however, repudiated this approach and began an investigation into the ordinary use of linguistic expression. Later, Wittgenstein

(1969) introduced the concept of language-game in the *Blue Book*. He defined language-games as "the primitive forms of language, wherein the ways of using signs are much simpler and easier to discern than those involved in everyday discourse" (p. 17). Wittgenstein created the term language-game to bring into prominence the fact that speaking a language is part of an activity, or of a form of life. The term "game" was used because language is governed by rules which are created by people.

Just as Wittgenstein's theory of language changed, so has the general philosophy of language. Rather than viewing language as a logical structure of propositions, language philosophers began to examine the way language was used. This emphasis on language as action is manifested in the distinguished writings of J. L. Austin (1962) and later extended by John Searle (1965). Austin generated the basic concepts that Searle subsequently developed into what is now referred to as the theory of speech acts. This theory shifts attention from what language is to what it does. Each utterance is complete as a single speech act if it carries out an intention that is distinct from what came before and after it. From a speech-act perspective, all linguistic artifacts, including those that count as literary, must be understood in relation to the socio-historical context of their production and reception. Austin explains that words are not only something we use to say things, but that we also use them to do things, and the difference between saying and doing is of such magnitude that we must understand the two functions in distinct ways. He termed the two functions: performative, the language with the primary function of doing something, and constative, language used primarily for saying something.

Austin has noted that there are three types of acts that may occur when a person says something. The first is a locutionary act in which the utterance amounts to

"saying something" or expressing a proposition. It is the utterance of a sentence with the intention of expressing a reference. Most speaking however, consists primarily of using language for some purpose; these utterances have been defined as performing illocutionary acts. According to Cronkhite (1984), an illocutionary speech act can be defined as a single utterance, which by definition is complete once it is uttered, regardless of the effects it may or may not have. An illocutionary act is the actual performance of the speaker's purpose for speaking (i.e., demand, promise, insult, suggest). Searle (1969) outlines five types of illocutionary acts. The first are called assertives. An assertive commits the speaker to advocate the truth of the proposition. An example of this act would be any proposition containing performative verbs such as state, affirm, conclude and believe. Directives attempt to get the listener to do something. They are requests, invitations, pleadings and so forth. Commissives commit the speaker to a future act such as promising, vowing and guaranteeing. Expressives are acts that communicate some aspect of the speaker's psychological state. Examples include thanking, congratulating, apologizing, and other similar acts. The last type of illocutionary act is called a declaration which is designed to create a proposition that, by its very existence, makes it so. Examples include appointing, marrying, resigning, and so forth.

Austin's final category consists of perlocutionary acts which are the consequences of what happens after utterance of an illocution. Searle (1980) stated that "perlocutionary acts have to do with those effects which our utterance have on hearers which go beyond the hearer's understanding of the utterance. Such acts as convincing, persuading, annoying, amusing, frightening are all cases of perlocutionary acts" (p. 39). Searle added a fourth type of act which comes before the three that Austin created. Utterance acts are the simple pronunciation

of words, singly or in combination. All acts, with the exception of the utterance act, are used with intent.

A single locutionary act can activate a number of illocutionary conventions. In order to know which convention the illocutionary act is conforming, one must know in which community it is being performed. Austin (1962) establishes Rule A.1: "There must exist an accepted conventional procedure having a certain conventional effect, that procedure includes the uttering of certain words by certain people in certain circumstances" (p. 14). What this means is that before there can be performative language, there must exist a social body that recognizes and accepts the conventional procedure in which the language functions. Austin (1971) explains "speech versus acts, saying versus doing, meaning versus performing, structure versus practice, locution versus illocution: every pair determines the conventional effects produced by an utterance governed by Rule A.1" (p. 64). For example, "The window's open" is a single locution that can activate a number of illocutionary conventions. It could warn you to be careful not to fall out, request you to close it, inform you of a state of affairs and so forth.

In contrast, a perlocutionary act deals with the effect that a locution has on the hearer. For example, the locution "Surprise!" can activate a number of perlocutionary acts. It could confuse, startle, annoy or amuse the hearer. Austin (1962) points out that while "illocutionary acts are conventional acts: perlocutionary acts are not conventional" (p. 121). For an act to have illocutionary force it must be understood within the conventional context, whereas, perlocutionary acts do not necessarily concede to this rule. This confirms that the meaning of a perlocutionary act is dependent upon the hearer rather than the conventional procedure. For example, if a speaker were to say "this coffee was really good" meaning he/she wanted another cup, and the hearer understood the

remark as a compliment rather than a request, the utterance lacked illocutionary force. If however, the hearer understood the utterance as a request, regardless to how he/she reacted to it, the utterance had illocutionary force. The perlocutionary act was not dependent upon the speaker's intention or upon the hearer's comprehension, rather it depended on the hearer's reaction to the meaning of the statement (e.g., happy to oblige, offended, reluctant, etc.).

Early language research employed Speech Acts Theory as a means to answer the question, "How many ways of using language are there?" (Searle, 1976, p. 1). Language philosophers attempted to universalize the ways in which language could be used, arguing that "there are a rather limited number of basic things we do with language" (Searle, 1976, p. 23). Scholars challenged this by noting that these generalizations were "relatively asocial biases of an intra-cultural account" (Rosaldo, 1982, p. 203).

Speech Acts Theory tried to identify a comprehensive list of linguistic acts. Beyond the research that recognized classifications within and across speech communities, other scholars attempted to examine nonstandard uses of language. For example, Grice (1975) analyzed nonstandard use of language and explored the patterns involved in sequencing communicative acts in such a manner as to allow a listener to infer the speaker's personal intentions. Grice argues that the speaker can pattern conventional signs in nonstandard patterns in order to lead the listener to infer the speaker's personal intent. However, he suggests that when we converse with others we are bound by the common purpose of exchanging information. In order to achieve that purpose we must cooperate with each other, thus he created the cooperative principle. It states, "Make your conversational contribution such as required, at the stage at which it occurs, by the accepted purpose or direction of the talk exchange in which you are engaged" (p. 45).

Within the Communication field, scholars differ in their opinion of Speech Acts Theory. Campbell (1973) observes that this philosophical movement had little impact on the study of communication in its early years. He suggests that the reason for this is the lack of distinction between illocutionary and perlocutionary acts and also that the issue of intentionality is unclear. Campbell argues that "Austin has ignored the sense in which language is a single, unified process; he has ignored, too, the dimensions of language that are rhetorical in the traditional sense of intending to persuade and the modern sense of stylistically adapting utterances and discourse to desired ends" (p. 296). He concludes by stating that the concepts of both illocutionary force and perlocutionary effects are empty.

Gaines (1979) addresses Campbell's primary concern by suggesting a remedy to the problem of perlocution as it pertains to rhetoric. In doing so, he makes a distinction between illocutionary and perlocutionary acts and offers a preliminary analysis of the types of perlocutionary acts and attempts to supply a tentative set of conditions under which perlocutionary acts may be said to be fully consummated. He concludes by suggesting that speech acts theory could be applied in the field of communication research.

Communication scholars have come to see more value in Speech Acts Theory. This is due in part to the change in how language is treated within the communication discipline. Instead of viewing language as simply the transmission of information, communication scholars are beginning to share the "understanding of human speech as a phenomenon that not only signifies or symbolizes but also reveals, constitutes, or embodies 'world' between persons" (Stewart cited in Sprague, 1992, p. 13). Recently, in a symposium titled "Speech Acts Theory in Mainstream Communication Research," Cushman and Kunitomo (1981) attempted

to integrate scholarship concerning speech acts across a broad variety of communication issues. In this symposium, Hopper, Sanders, Lyne and Cherwitz explored Speech Acts Theory and its relationship to the referential, sequential, and inferential uses of language in order to advance the understanding of rhetorical and communicative processes.

Another significant development that has drawn attention to Speech Acts Theory is the increasing use of ethnographic research approaches by communication scholars as a means of studying communication in different cultural settings (Philipsen, 1976). The ethnography of speaking, according to Hymes (1962), is concerned "with the situations and uses, the patterns and functions, of speaking as a activity in its own right" (p. 16). He advocates an examination of speech acts, speech events, factors of speech (sender, receiver, message form, channel, code, topic, setting), and functions in speech events (expressive, directive, poetic, contact, referential, contextual). Hymes (1974) proposed that linguistic behavior of a speech community can be classified into speech events and can be naturalistically described according to the setting, the participants and the mode. In this research context the speech act can be utilized as one analytic tool to critically examine language used in specific communication settings. This work is part of language pragmatics in contrast to earlier efforts to establish linguistic universals.

Rationale for the Present Study

Although attempts have been made to analyze different aspects of speech criticism, scholars have yet to discover "what works." As the previous literature review reveals this may be due in part to the fact that research related to speech criticism has been based on researchers' perceptions of different problems related

to feedback. Often times data is collected by presenting students with hypothetical critiques and/or examining decontextualized fragments of language used in the classroom. Until recently, studies examining speech criticism have been conducted primarily from a positivistic perspective. The limits of this approach are noted by Staton-Spicer (1982) "preoperational/process/product studies have served to isolate certain variables as potentially important, the studies are not sufficient for our understanding of the teacher as a communicator" (p. 43).

The field of education has moved beyond positivistic methods for analyzing classroom discourse. Interpretive studies within the educational discipline have produced valuable information, some of which is more useful to instructional communication researchers than that which has been produced in their own field. Although instructional communication researcher's have begun to recognize this approach as valuable, few studies have actually been done. Staton-Spicer and Wulff (1984) advise instructional communication researchers that "classroom talk can be analyzed from a cultural perspective, or the classroom itself can be considered a communication system" (p. 384). Staton-Spicer (1982) identified two aspects of instructional communication that she encourages qualitative scholars to examine:

First, the instructional environment in all its complexity should be examined in depth to discover its effect on the communicative behavior of teachers and students. Questions concerning the appropriate uses of selected human communication strategies can be addressed only with respect to the setting.

Second, the intentions, thoughts, and feelings of teachers about their own communicative behavior and the events and behavior of others needs to be examined. Communicative behavior would not be looked at in isolation from the intentions of the communicators, but in conjunction with them. (p. 38).

If scholars attempt to qualitatively examine the classroom as a speech event, relationships and crucial variables, some which have never been recognized as important before, can possibly be generated. Sprague (1992) observed that instructional communication scholars rarely "look critically at the language of the classroom in terms of the meanings that are created through the nature of the discourse" (p. 13). Thus, by using the speech acts as an analytic tool one could closely examine different aspects of language used in the classroom.

This proposed study will examine language used during speech critiques and draw upon Speech Acts Theory to create a taxonomy of speech acts characteristic of the speech event known as instructor critiques of oral presentations. Just as communication theory has moved away from focusing on language as referential towards theories that treat language as action, so should research that examines speech criticism. By adopting Speech Acts Theory as a basis for research, the emphasis will change from what is being said in teachers' critiques to what is being done. This type of evaluation allows criticism to be viewed in context, while also considering the apparent intent of the instructor.

Ultimately, the broad question that this exploratory study asks is, "Does Speech Acts Theory offer a useful and effective way to understand classroom critiques?" In order to begin to answer this question one must first gather naturally occurring instructor critiques and examine what speech acts are being utilized. Therefore, the specific question in this study is "What illocutionary acts are performed by speech teachers during classroom critiques of oral communication presentations?" Once a taxonomy of classroom critique speech acts is formulated, scholars can begin to answer the broader question.

CHAPTER II

The Method

Research Design

The purpose of this study was to generate a classification system that would categorize the speech acts used by public speaking teachers during an oral critique. Through a series of non-participant observations, a sample of naturally occurring discourse was collected and a typological analysis was conducted.

A similar study by Linda Laube Barnes (1990) examined how teacher expectations manifest themselves when teachers comment on student papers. She derived an analysis of the comments teachers make on student's written compositions based on Speech Acts Theory. Sprague (1991) suggests that there are similar "speech acts implicit in teachers' critiques of oral communication" (p. 15).

As stated in the preceding chapter, this research is guided by a different set of assumptions than most earlier work on speech criticism. This study falls into the category of interpretive research and is based on assumptions taken from the naturalistic paradigm. According to Lincoln and Guba (1985), there are five key axioms that differentiate the naturalistic and positivistic perspectives. The *first axiom* deals with the nature of reality. While the positivistic paradigm views the nature of reality as single, tangible and fragmentable, the naturalist paradigm views realities as multiple, constructed and holistic. The *second axiom* examines the relationship of the knower to the known. Positivists view the knower and known as independent, a dualism, while naturalists view the knower and known as interactive, inseparable. The *third axiom* examines the possibility of generalization. The positivists perspective aims for inquiry that develops

generalizations that are free from both time and context. The naturalistic perspective views generalizations as "working hypotheses" that are bound by time and context. The *fourth axiom* refers to the possibility of causal links. Positivists concede that every action can be explained as a result of a real cause that precedes the effect temporarily, while the naturalists concede that all entities are in a state of mutual simultaneous shaping so that it is impossible to distinguish causes from effects. The *fifth axiom* examines the roles of values in inquiry. The positivist's approach views inquiry as value-free, while the naturalistic approach views inquiry as value-bound (p. 37). The purpose for reviewing the differences between these two paradigms is to provide clarity regarding the approach to inquiry taken in this study. The present research clearly falls within the interpretive perspective. For example, there is no attempt to separate the knower and the known. Rather, having knowledge of the event and experience as a speech teacher was useful in determining the goals of the instructor. Similarly, this investigation did not try to determine a causal relationship between criticism and specific outcomes, but took a less deterministic view and saw participants as actively carrying out their intentions.

Sampling Method

Naturally occurring samples of classroom oral criticism were collected from instructors, who taught lower division public speaking classes during the spring 1992 semester. The classes were selected from community colleges and universities in Santa Clara County. Selection was criterion-based which requires "only that the researcher create a recipe of the attributes essential to the selected unit and proceed to find or locate a unit that matches the recipe" (Goetz & LeCompte, 1984, p. 77). The criteria for selection of classes was based on the

instructor's practice of encoding oral criticism to each student immediately after the presentation of a speech and on the requirement that each student give a formal speech. Five instructors who met the criteria, two male and three female, agreed to participate. A minimum of one week's worth of class time per instructor was observed to produce 45 individual student critiques from the instructors. This amount of textual material is consistent with Barnes' (1990) study of speech acts in criticism of written work, which was based on the analysis of 34 instructor critiques.

Procedure

The study involved videotaping several lower division public speaking classes on days that students presented speeches. The tape ran throughout the entire class period, so that comments could be analyzed within context. Each class was familiar with being videotaped by their instructor on speech days. An audio tape recorder was also running as a backup device to guarantee accurate interpretation of wording.

After gathering sufficient samples of naturally occurring classroom talk, the oral critiques were transcribed. Due to the fact that instructors were not limited to simply critiquing speeches, it was necessary to decide what was considered instructor critique and what was not. For example, instructors often requested students to quiet down or answered questions that did not pertain to a speech that had been given. These types of classroom talk were clearly not speech critiques, therefore were not transcribed. It was essential to define oral criticism to simplify the transcription process. According to Schenone (1981) oral criticism is defined as "the information the teacher directed personally to the speaker about his/her performance" (p. 77). The speech critique is a unique communication event.

While it appears to be a one-on-one conversation, all members of the class participate because they are required to listen and learn from advice and comments given by the instructor to the student speaker. Often times when an instructor discusses different aspects of a speech, it appears that comments are directed to the class in general, rather than just to the student who spoke. Therefore, because of the difficulty of isolating the primary intended audience for each comment, the definition given by Schenone (1981) was broadened to include comments that appeared to be beneficial to the class as a whole, as well as personal comments directed to the student who spoke.

Once the body of discourse to be considered as oral speech critiques was identified, it was necessary to divide it into units for analysis. According to Lincoln and Guba (1985), unitization of data collected for naturalistic inquiry should be based upon two characteristics. They suggest that "first, it should be heuristic, that is, aimed at some understanding or some action that the inquirer needs to have or to take." Secondly, "it must be the smallest piece of information about something that can stand by itself, that is, it must be interpretable in the absence of any additional information other than a broad understanding of the context in which the inquiry is carried out" (p. 345).

The closest model for unitization in the context of oral criticism given in the classroom was developed by Schenone (1981). Her guidelines are:

1. Each distinctly separate idea is counted as one unit even if that unit consists of a few words or is several sentences in length. (e.g., Can we just put everything on one piece of tape and just have a stop? Time it. Time a piece of video to show maybe three times, then stop and then have it on hold. Then time another, maybe looking at the bullet for a period of time and then stop it. [one unit]).
2. A statement followed by further clarification or examples is coded as one unit. (e.g., I thought that potentially the sense beyond the specific concrete information. The sense of warmth and the community that you

were presenting in the speech came through from the very first words that you spoke. [one unit]).

3. A statement followed by a general question which answers the question is counted as one unit. (e.g., Fear appeal, what are they covering up? The inferences. [one unit]).
4. A series of words or statements which are not synonymous to each other are counted as one unit. (e.g., Good organization, three main points, and then tying back to the beginning. [one unit]).
5. A holistic statement which refers back to the previous statement is counted as one unit. (e.g., Very clear pattern of organization; causes, effects, controls. [one unit]).

These five recommendations served as general guidelines for this research.

However, Schenone's (1981) rules were general guidelines for unitizing data in a manner that was effective for evaluating content, and the present study is primarily concerned with the intention of the instructor. Unitization therefore, entailed delineating specific speech acts and identifying the illocutionary force behind them, rather than identifying minimal content units. When unitizing the data for the present study, it was necessary to first separate data by, what Schenone (1981) referred to as, "teacher ideas." Each unit of data, whether it was one sentence or five sentences, was examined. The question, "What is getting done?" or "What was the intent of the instructor?" was asked. If more than one intention appeared to be present it was broken down until each unit of data had only one intention. It was possible for one sentence to have several intentions, while at other times one intention was portrayed through several sentences. In order to comply to Lincoln and Guba's (1985) suggestions for unitization, some units needed additional information so that each unit could be easily understood by any reader familiar with the general context of the oral communication classroom. For example, "It's [citing sources] real important." An informal reliability check of the unitizing was conducted by having a faculty member, who was familiar with interpretive

research, review the results of unitization. The few areas of difference were resolved through discussion

Comments made by the instructors produced 597 units of data. Before beginning the primary analysis, each unit of data was copied onto individual pieces of paper. At this point additional steps were taken that were not directly related to creating a taxonomy, but rather to help answer the broader question as to whether or not Speech Acts Theory was a valuable method of examining speech criticism. Drawing on variables from previous research, each unit of data was coded to determine the sex of both the instructor and the student. Also using Sprague's (1971) coding system units were coded as positive or negative, and related to content or delivery. Another graduate student, trained in Sprague's (1971) coding system, verified classification. Agreement was attained in all but four cases. The differences in classification were resolved through discussion. Each unit was also color coded according to the instructor who made the comments. This facilitated later observations about whether different classifications of speech acts were characteristic of individual instructors or were utilized by all instructors.

Analysis

Next the units were analyzed to determine categories of comments that performed similar illocutionary acts (e.g. question, order, statement, explanation). Analysis began by inductively grouping like units together on the basis of the instructors intent behind the utterance and what appeared to be *getting done*. Glaser and Strauss (1967) created the Constant Comparative method of analysis. This strategy combines inductive category coding with a simultaneous comparison

of all social incidents observed. Goetz and LeCompte (1984) describe these steps in Constant Comparative analysis:

As social phenomena are recorded and classified, they also are compared across categories. Thus the discovery of relationships, or hypothesis generation, begins with the analysis of initial observations, undergoes continuous refinement throughout the data collection and analysis process, and continuously feeds back into the process of category coding. As events are constantly compared with previous events, new typological dimensions as well as new relationships may be discovered. (p. 182)

It is important to note that while constant comparative method may be guided by the conventional modes of content analysis there are several crucial differences. Lincoln and Guba (1985) state that differences between the naturalistic data processor and conventional content analysis includes " the timing of rule formulation, need for a priori guiding theory (and deduced categories), utility of generalizable findings, and rejection of constraint to the quantitative arena" (p. 338-39).

In the beginning there were 36 small clusters of data. Each cluster had something in common either contextually, grammatically or functionally. Once all similar units were compiled, Searle's (1969) taxonomy of speech acts was reviewed to see if there were any similarities among initial inductively derived groupings and his general categories. After adapting all possible subcategories created by Searle, additional subcategories were created and defined for clusters that appeared to be compatible with Searle's general categories. For instance, *Rule Explaining* was created because this group was clearly a subcategory of *Assertive*, yet none of Searle's descriptions applied. A distinct definition was required that specifically cater to the speech event that takes place in the classroom when instructors offer oral feedback regarding a public presentation. Having exhausted all possible chances of creating new subcategories, a taxonomy was created by

arranging the acts into groups and subgroups to reflect the hierarchical relationships among the speech acts that were implicit in classroom critiques of oral communication presentations.

Next, efforts were made to address the broader question, "Does Speech Acts Theory offer a useful and effective way to understand the classroom critique?" Units of data in each subcategory were tallied to determine the sex of both the instructor and student, whether units were positive or negative, and if they were related to content or delivery (see Appendix A for complete breakdown). This general information will be reported along with the results. Last, original transcripts of classroom talk were revisited to explore the possibility of general sequence patterns of speech acts used by instructors. Further discussion of this possibility will be explored in the last chapter.

CHAPTER III

The Results

Searle (1969) outlined five types of illocutionary acts. The data from this study fell within three of these groups; directives, assertives and expressives. While many categories were straightforward, it is the borderline cases that appear to be particularly characteristic of classroom instructor critiques. This chapter will review each of Searle's categories that are pertinent to this study along with a detailed description of categories and subcategories. Some categories have been identified in previous research and others were created to describe the public event that takes place when instructors evaluate student speeches in the classroom.

Directives

Directives attempt to get the listener to do something. Thirteen subcategories of Directives were identified in this study as displayed in Figure 1.

Questions according to Searle (1969) are always directives because they attempt to get the hearer to perform a speech act. There are two types of questions mentioned by Searle (1969), real questions and exam questions. Both of these types were found in this study. However, there was a third and a fourth category as well.

Real Questions are those that are used when the instructor wanted to know information that the student had, purely because he/she wanted to know the answer. Examples of real questions include:

Do you normally speak at a fairly rapid rate anyway?

Were you a little nervous to start?

Were there any connections between the past and what we're familiar with here?

There were 18 units of data that were real questions. All five instructors asked this type of question. Questions dealt with content and delivery and were both positive and negative.

Exam Questions were asked when the instructor wanted to know if the student knew the answer. Presumably the instructor often already knew the answer.

Examples of exam questions are as follows:

What was the specific purpose of the speech?

More worse, should be what?

What should you do when you see me signal that your time is up?

There were three units of data that were exam questions, used by two instructors: one male and one female. Each instance was negative, but the questions dealt with both content and delivery.

Pedagogical Questions did not seek information for the purpose of knowledge, or to test the knowledge of the student. Rather, they were used as an instructional tool or as means to clarify a principle that was misused. Examples of this type of question include:

Now, how is that [affirmative vs. counter argument] different from what you just told us? (Instructor was informing the student as to the importance of having different arguments for the affirmative and counter cases.)

Last question, where did your information come from? (Instructor wanted to make the point that citing sources during a presentation is very important.)

Only one visual aid? (Instructor was implying that more visual aids would have been useful.)

There were eight units of this type of statement. Four out of five instructors used pedagogical questioning: one male and three female. In each case data was coded as negative, but dealt with both content and delivery.

Rhetorical Questions were not truly seeking answers. It appeared that the instructor was almost thinking outloud or pondering a thought. The student could answer the question if he/she wanted to. However, there was a sense that it wasn't necessary. Examples of this type of question include:

You were very convincing at points and I was wondering, is she beginning to shift [her opinion] at all?

I wanted to know how convinced you were [from your voice].

I was just wondering if you were trying to overcome a fairly long rehearsal time [because you were speaking so fast].

There were four such units used by three out of five instructors: one male and two female. The data were coded both positive and negative, but in each instance dealt with delivery.

Requests were used when an instructor asked a student to do something or take a specific action. Requests are similar to commands; however, they allow for the possibility of refusal. A request can be granted or refused by the hearer.

Examples of requests include:

I would ask to slow down a bit.

Please remember to cite your sources.

Make that [preview] clearer to us, just to please an old man.

There were eight units of data that were requests. Four out of five instructors made requests: two male and two female. The speech acts in this category were negative, and dealt with both content and delivery.

Simple Suggestion was used by instructors to offer for consideration different options that would allow the speaker future success in regards to different aspects of their speech. Example of suggestions include:

One of the things I want to suggest is that you slow down your rate.

Another way we can slow down is with transitions.

Maybe increasing the energy and fluency [of delivery].

There were 18 statements that were suggestions. All five instructors made simple suggestions. All data in this category were coded negative, and pertained to both content and delivery.

Retrospective Suggestion was a speculation by the instructor of what might have been more effective. This category is indirect; often times the retrospective suggestion was implied, but not said directly. Examples of retrospective suggestions are as follows:

I might have suggested introducing the oil sooner.

I think perhaps if there had been more continuity [language] then it would have been easier for people to follow.

You might have played the tape first, then followed with the quote.

Ten units of data were classified in the retrospective suggestion category. Four out of five instructors used this type of directive: two male and two female. All were coded as negative and dealt with only content.

Advise-Simple was similar to suggest. However, rather than implying that something might be better, advise clearly states that another course of action would be superior. Examples of advise includes:

Remember the question/answer period is evaluation.

When you're going to use opinion, make sure that the analysis of it goes directly to the argument.

In your introduction be sure to let us know what you're going to talk about.

There were 15 units of data that were categorized as advise-simple. Four out of five instructors used this category: two male and two female. All units of data were coded as negative and referred to both content and delivery.

Advise-Retrospective was a speculation by the instructor that clearly stated that another course of action would have been superior regarding some aspect of the student's speech. Often times instructor implied that another course of action would have been better. Nevertheless, the intention of the instructor was clear. Examples of advise-retrospective include:

I really thought you were going to tie [conclusion] into your introduction.

You could have documented your map, it could have been a source.

I would have liked for you to have a more powerful beginning.

There were 19 units of data that were in the advise-retrospective category. Four out of five instructors used this category: one male and three female. All data was coded negative and dealt with both content and delivery.

Simple Commands were used when an instructor ordered a student to do something. Searle and Vanderveken (1985) state that a command requires that the

speaker be in a position of authority over the hearer, whereas a simple order is used when individuals have equal power. Examples of commands include:

Distribute your weight evenly.

Put it [hat] back on your head, or God help me, turn it around.

Look at us.

There were 34 units of data that were commands. All five instructors used commands during oral critiques. All but four of the units of data were coded negative. Commands were related to both content and delivery.

Command/Praise was a category that instructed the student to take a specific action, but at the same time informed the student that certain aspects of his/her performance were better than before. Examples of the command/praise category are as follows:

You still need to work on fluency, but it is more fluent than ever before.

Keep working on it [eye contact]: nonetheless it was significantly better.

There were two units of data that fell into this category. Both were given by female instructors and were coded as negative pertaining to delivery.

Command/Explanation was a category that instructed the student to take a specific action, then explained why that action was necessary or how that action related specifically to the prior speech. Examples of command/explanation category are as follows:

Get rid of your notecards, you lose your eye contact.

Go into detail, that will fill up some of that space.

Give conclusion strength and conviction, we all needed to know that you were there.

Figure 1. Schematic of directive speech acts used by teachers during oral critiques.

There were 11 units of data that were in the command/explanation category. Four out of five instructors used this type of directive: two male and two female. All units were coded as negative, and pertained to both content and delivery.

Warning referred to when an instructor offered advance notice of a potential problem and an outcome, if the student chose to ignore the warning. An example of a warning includes:

Because believe me, if you don't practice the next speech and the final speech, your ass is going to be grass.

There was only one unit that fit in this category. It was given by a female instructor, regarding delivery and was coded negative.

Assertives

Assertives commit a speaker to advocate the truth of a proposition. Most propositions with performative verbs fall into this category. Eight subcategories of Assertives were identified in this study as displayed in Figure 2.

State referred to when an instructor asserted something as true. The comment was a neutral report of a state of affairs, not implying any evaluation. Examples of statements include:

The guns were in blue [reference to visual aid].

OK, in your outline you say that you used an article by Barney Vagel.

We were talking about a tradition here.

There were 30 units of data that were in this category. All instructors used this type of assertive. Data was coded both positive and negative, regarding content and delivery.

Rule Giving referred to mini-lectures given by the instructor. The purpose was to teach or remind student and/or the class of different principles that were applicable to the basic speech course. Examples of rule giving include:

I'll give you some key terms [to note persuasion], "It is necessary, it is easy, and it is important." Those are value judgment words.

That [asking questions] kind of recovery is a listener-speaker event.

It may take a little time to feel comfortable and adept in using the notecards.

There were 25 units of data categorized as rule giving. All instructors used this category. Units were coded as both positive and negative, regarding content and delivery.

Rule Explaining was when the instructor offered an explanation that included the cause and effect relationship between certain principles and the outcome that could be expected in the context of the basic speech course. Examples of rule explaining are as follows:

When you maintain a good eye contact level with your audience, it helps us buy into your package.

[If you memorize] You forget one word of a phrase and everything else that follows it disappears.

Remember that you're going to lose one of the more important areas of nonverbal by simply shadowing it out [by wearing a hat].

There were 17 units of data in this category. All instructors used rule explaining. Units were coded as positive and negative, pertaining to both content and delivery.

Conjecture referred to when an instructor attempted to relay information back to the student in an effort to clarify his/her understanding of the student's feelings, thought process, or reasoning for different aspects of his/her speech. Comments made by an instructor were based on at least some slight evidence. In this communication setting it was more than guessing, but similar in nature. The Examples of conjectures are:

I felt that you weren't as smooth as you wanted to be.

You had a lot of information and you felt obligated to be so precise.

You had your hands locked up, you wanted to gesture, but your hands wouldn't let you go.

There were 24 units of data in this category. All five instructors used conjectures. Data was coded both positive and negative, and pertained to both content and delivery.

Judge referred to conclusions drawn by the instructor, regarding elements of the student's speech based on perception, opinion, and professional evaluation. There were two main categories of judge: *Direct* and *Indirect*. Within the category *Direct*, there were two subcategories: *Generic Label* and *Individualized Analysis*. Within the subcategory *Individualized Analysis*, there were two additional subcategories: *Speech Feature* and *Improvement*.

Simple Label referred to when an instructor drew a general conclusion regarding any aspect of a prior presentation. This type of judgment was not personalized and could have been said about any speech. Examples of simple judgments include:

Good job.

Clear pattern of organization.

Really nice summary.

There were 125 units of data that were in this category. All instructors made simple judgments. All but 19 of those statements were coded as positive. Simple Label pertained to both content and delivery.

Individualized analysis referred to judgments made by the instructor that identified personal aspects of a student's speech. There are two subgroups of this category. They are as follows:

Speech Feature referred to statements that were directed to specific issues of an individual's speech. The difference between simple label and speech feature was that speech features were personalized and could not be used interchangeably for other speeches. Examples of speech features include:

You played down the moral aspect of the abortion issue, although fear, I thought, was appropriate.

You had a good argument on the retirement age in terms of Reagan signing a bill to extend, well actually, to drop that whole concept.

You had a good-natured approach to a topic that dealt with lethal toxicity.

There were 35 units of data that fell into this category. All instructors offered judgments that analyzed speech features. Units coded in this category were both positive and negative and dealt with content and delivery.

Improvement was the type of judgment offered when instructors noted that a student had made progress by specifying certain aspects of the speech that were more effective than in the past. Example of improvement include:

You're getting better at it [documentation].

You definitely improved on those [fillers].

This time was better, you looked at your audience.

There were 18 units of data that were in this category. Four out of five instructors

Figure 2. Schematic of assertive speech acts used by teachers during oral critiques

offered judgments of improvement: one male and three female. All units were coded as positive, and dealt with both content and delivery.

Indirect Judgment referred to statements in which an instructor was clearly making a judgment without linguistically doing so. That is, although no specific evaluative term was used, anyone familiar with the context of a speech class could not mistake these as purely descriptive statements. Examples of indirect judgments include:

You stayed with the issue at hand.

Your ten minute speech ran fifteen minutes.

We noticed your feet cross over each other every time you made a point.

There were 77 units of data in this category. All five instructors made indirect judgments. Data was coded both positive and negative and pertained to both content and delivery.

Expressives

Expressives are acts that communicate some aspect of the speaker's psychological state. Four subcategories of Expressives were identified in this study as displayed in Figure 3.

Thank was a category of expressives which instructors used to express gratitude.

There were two distinct subgroups; *Closure* and *Sincere Thanks*.

Closure statements were used by instructors to simply alert the class that it was time to move on to the next speaker. Examples of closures include:

Thanks a lot.

Thanks, [student's name].

Alright, good.

There were 15 units of data in this category used by all instructors. The statements were coded positive/content.

Sincere Thanks referred to when an instructor was genuinely grateful towards a student for some dimension of his/her speech. Examples of sincere thanks include:

Thank you, thank you for getting up there and trying not to look at those cards, 'cause I know that it is a temptation; it works as a barrier.

Thank you very much for sharing your family.

Well, thank you for not going overtime.

There were nine units of data in this category. Four out of five instructors offered sincere thanks: one male and three female. All were coded as positive, and pertained to both content and delivery.

Personal Feeling referred to when an instructor offered internal reactions that expressed his/her feelings towards different aspects of student's speech. Examples of personal feelings include:

I loved the fact you used social concern and our pocketbook [as appeals].

I liked your use of humor.

It is a joy to watch you; the vocal variety, the nonverbal, the enthusiasm.

There were 29 units of data in this category. Four out of five instructors expressed personal feelings: one male and three female. All but two units of data were coded as positive and comments referred to both content and delivery.

Congratulate is similar to thank in that it is an expression of sincerity, however, Searle and Vanderveken (1985) state that congratulate is an expression of pleasure as well. This subcategory is an acknowledgment of an individual's success.

Figure 3. Schematic of expressive speech acts used by teachers during oral critiques.

Examples of congratulate include:

My hearty congratulations.

So, I commend you [on documentation].

So yes, way to go [student's name].

There were five units that were coded in this category. Four out of five instructors used congratulate: one male and two female. All three were coded as positive pertaining to both content and delivery.

Linked Acts

Each unit of data in this category could easily be identified as a linked act, meaning that there were at least two recognizable speech acts present. This category does not coincide with Searle's (1969) taxonomy only because the units were not broken down to their smallest element. Had this been done the intention of the instructor would have been lost. Each unit consists of one positive and one negative unit. Between these two units each Linked Act had some type of disqualifier such as "but." Examples of Linked Acts include:

There was a lot of energy and we want to get it under control.

You know your personality came through [during first speech] and it was nice, but you were very fidgety.

Your points were clear, but the prices threw you off.

There were 22 units of data in this category. All five instructors used Linked Acts. Each unit was coded as negative pertaining to both content and delivery.

Table 1

Speech Acts Used in the Taxonomy of Teacher's Oral Critiques Compared to Searle's Major Categories

<u>Categories</u>	<u>Frequencies</u>
Directives	151
Assertives	351
Expressives	58
Declaratives	0
Commissives	0
Linked Acts	22
Miscellaneous & Uninterpretable	15
	<hr/> 597

Miscellaneous and Uninterpretable

Finally, as with any large body of naturally occurring discourse there were statements made by instructors that were either uninterpretable or were not related to individual student critiques. Examples of this category include:

I'd still like to have more . . .

[Everyone was paying attention] Except her who was sleeping through the whole thing. By the way.

If you're a snail you'll hate the speech either way.

There were 15 statements in this category.

Summary

Searle (1969) offers five broad categories of speech acts. In this study three of these categories were utilized: Directives, Assertives and Expressives. See Table 1 for distribution of data among Searle's general categories. Two of Searle's categories were not found: Commissives and Declaratives. Commissives commit the speaker to a future act such as promising, vowing and guaranteeing.

Declaratives are designed to create a proposition that, by its very existence, make it so. Examples include appointing, marrying, resigning, and so forth. It is possible that future studies which examine this communication setting might find instructors who offer these types of illocutionary acts. Additional categories include Linked Acts which are simply a combination of speech acts that can not be broken apart without changing the intent of the instructor. Last, there was a Miscellaneous and Uninterpretable category where speech acts were integrated into this speech event but did not display a clear intent as part of the critique.

There were 151 total units of data coded as Directives distributed among 13 different subcategories. Ten of these subcategories included only comments coded

as negative. Eleven of the subcategories were used by all five instructors; the other two subcategories Command/Praise and Warning accounted for only three comments, used by two instructors. The largest subcategory was Simple Command which contained 34 units of coded data. The smallest subcategory was Warning with one unit of coded data.

Assertives were by far the largest category with 351 total units of data dispersed throughout eight subcategories. They were coded as positive and negative pertaining to both content and delivery. Seven out of eight subcategories were used by all instructors; the eighth subcategory *Improvement* was used by four out of five instructors. The largest subcategory was Simple Labels with 125 units of coded data. The smallest subcategory was Rule Explaining with 17 units of coded data.

There were 58 units of data coded as Expressives among four different subcategories. The majority of instructors used each of these subcategories. Three out of four subcategories were coded as strictly positive: Closure, Sincere Thank and Congratulate. Personal Feelings consisted of 27 positive comments and two negative comments. The largest subcategory was Personal Feelings with 29 units of coded data. The smallest category was Congratulate with five units of data.

Linked Acts was a category that consisted of units of data that appeared to contain more than one speech act, but functioned as a single speech act because of *what was getting done*. Further implications of this category will be explored in the next chapter.

CHAPTER IV

Discussion

Methodological Issues

There were several decisions made during the course of this study that were difficult and possibly limiting. Most pertained to methodological issues which will now be examined. The first difficult question was "What should be classified as criticism?" The moment one enters the classroom there are many things taking place: students ask questions, instructors assign homework, previous topics from previous class days are discussed, students crack jokes, instructors respond, and so forth. There is a unique interpersonal relationship between instructor and student. When instructors offer feedback on speeches, often times they include personal stories, jokes and reference to previous episodes in the classroom. Within the category Miscellaneous and Uninterpretable there are several examples of this type of interaction. Although this study did not include these acts as speech critiques, there is definitely something *being done*.

The second area of difficulty was unitizing the data. Most of the time it was fairly clear where one unit started and another ended. However, *Linked Acts* were difficult because if they were broken apart the intent seemed to change. What was *getting done* was unique, whether instructors were *saving face* which will be addressed later in this chapter, or whether instructors were maintaining multiple goals. These linked acts appeared to incorporate more than one goal at a time. For instance, "I thought it was cute use of economic problems and creating more classroom space, but what were your sources on that?" It appears the instructor was letting the student know that part of the speech was good conceptually, but at the same time she was letting the student know that rather than just basing the

argument on opinion there needed to be sources to back her up. In this study it was decided that the units categorized as linked acts would be left together rather than broken into the smallest possible units.

The third area of difficulty regarding methodological decisions was the actual creation of new categories and subcategories. For instance, although *Rule Giving* was not a subcategory according to Searle's (1969) taxonomy, it was clearly a subcategory of *Assertive*. Rather than attempting to force this type of speech act into one by Searle's subcategories, a new subcategory was created to address the intent of the instructor and was placed under Searle's broad category *Assertive*. Within the speech community it would be clear as to the intention of the instructor. However, for someone who was unfamiliar with the speech event, these units of data could appear to be simple statements. These types of decisions were based upon my knowledge of the speech event and my experience as a speech teacher.

The last area of difficulty was deciding which subcategory each one of the 597 units of data fit into. Although it is likely that people will question the placement of individual units of data, it is the categories themselves that must stand scrutiny (see Appendix B for full display of data classified by speech acts). Lincoln and Guba (1985) state that "the knower and the known are interactive, inseparable." What this means is that as a researcher it was not necessary to take each unit at face value because the context of what was said in the classroom was known. It was possible therefore, to use the knowledge of the contextual framework as a tool to categorize units. Those who simply read this study are forced to take each unit of data at face value. This methodological aspect of interpretive studies can be both positive and negative. Although it is beneficial for the researcher as units are

categorized, it is also negative because it is impossible to explain within the study why every individual decision was made.

The speech event that takes place in oral communication classrooms throughout high schools, junior colleges and universities is similar and there is a strong possibility that speech acts in the present study would be identified, along with possible new categories. However, the purpose of this study was not to generalize, but rather to create a working taxonomy that can be utilized by scholars for further research related to speech criticism.

Theoretical Issues

The previous chapter answered the specific question asked in this study by creating a taxonomy of illocutionary acts that are performed by speech teachers during oral critiques. The next step is to address the broader question, "Does Speech Acts Theory offer a useful way to understand classroom critiques?" One way to begin to answer this question would be to examine the most frequently used illocutionary acts and to explore the implications of *what's getting done* (see Table 2).

The communication setting in the basic speech course is unique. Oral critiques are given by instructors in a public setting to students. Although student speakers are primarily the ones who are supposed to benefit from critiques, the class as a whole has an opportunity to learn as well. Students can adjust their future presentations based on what they learn from a fellow classmate's success or error. There are very few speech events that primarily consist of judgments and commands such as the classroom critique. Instructors are challenged because of the many goals that exist when offering feedback. They want to help the speaker improve. This is done by informing the student of the positive and negative

Table 2

Ten Most Frequently Used Speech Act Subcategories In Oral Critiques of
Student Speeches

<u>Subcategories</u>	<u>Frequencies</u>
Simple Label	125
Indirect Judgment	77
Speech Feature	35
Simple Command	34
State	30
Personal Feeling	29
Rule Giving	25
Conjecture	24
Advise-Retrospective	19
Simple Suggest	18

aspects of his/her performance, and by telling the student what to keep doing, what to stop doing, and what to start doing. Instructors also want to help the class learn as a whole. Often times different aspects of a prior speech can lead to discussion that will benefit both the speaker and the class. However, it is not quite that simple because instructors are also trying to sustain an interpersonal relationship with the student, as well as have them maintain motivation and positive feelings toward the course in general. There are also time constraints in the classroom which force instructors to offer limited amounts of oral feedback. Therefore, instructors have to decide what to say publicly and what to save for written feedback.

A review of the breakdown of the total number of speech acts reveals, *Simple Labels* are used the most. In responding to written work, Sommers (cited in Sprague, 1991) notes that "most teachers' comments are not text-specific and could be interchanged, rubber-stamped, from text to text" (p.194). Similarly, simple labels do not offer guidance or direction to an individual's speech, nor do they personalize feedback given. Clark (1984) observes that "by labeling, the teacher does some important diagnostic work and leaves the solution of the problem to the student" (p. 169). One might wonder, why use simple labels at all? Or at least, why use them during an oral critique? Instructors may utilize the simple label because it is a simple way to quickly offer general feedback to students. Although this type of feedback may not be the most helpful, if it relates to positive aspects of the speech it probably doesn't hurt. Of the 125 generic labels, only 19 of them were coded as negative.

It is almost effortless to offer positive feedback, but it is somewhat difficult to give negative feedback that will be valuable and will not hinder the teacher/student relationship. Therefore, when offering feedback it is necessary to approach

student critiques in a manner that accomplishes each goal or at least the ones that are most important to the instructor. Communication competence in the classroom involves being able to do more than one thing at a time or being able to simultaneously address multiple goals.

One way to investigate how instructors maintain multiple goals while still offering helpful feedback would be to explore Brown and Levinson's (1978) discussion of politeness phenomena. This approach provides explanation for the use of certain functions and for the specific message forms in which these functions are likely to be found. It also examines the speaker's implicit knowledge regarding use of a particular form.

According to Brown and Levinson (1978), the use of language for certain functions intrinsically threatens the public self-image, called *face*, which consists of two related aspects: *negative face*, defined as the desire of every competent member of society that his/her actions be unimpeded by others; and *positive face*, defined as the desire of every member of a society that he/she wants to be desirable to at least some other persons. Depending upon the degree to which face is threatened, language users choose certain message forms in the expression of a function or simply avoid the function altogether. This theory could be used to explain why instructors choose directives, assertives and expressives as they do. For instance, why are almost all directives negative? Why are all expressives positive? It may be that the use of language during speech critiques is delivered in a manner that possibly *saves face* for the students being critiqued.

It appears that instructors seem to have three main approaches that address negative feedback, while still maintaining multiple goals or saving face. The *first* addresses the positive aspects of the speech in a very strong and personal manner. Often times *Personal Feelings* are offered regarding the positive characteristics of

the speech. This compensates for the discussion of negative aspects. The *second* approach utilizes *Linked Acts* by saying something positive, then following with a comment that addresses an area that needs improvement. This type of sequencing never allows oral criticism to become "too negative" because it is always accompanied by positive feedback. The *third* approach simply never says "that's wrong." Rather, it implies it by using indirect judgments.

Indirect Judgment was the second largest subcategory of speech acts used. Although this type of judgment offers instructors a way to maintain multiple goals, there is research that suggests some students may not interpret the meaning of indirect language the way instructors intend. Scholars have examined indirect and direct language in the classroom primarily in classes K-12. Delpit (1988) observed that children from working-class and middle-class backgrounds interpret indirect and direct language very differently. For example, Snow (cited in Delpit, 1988) reported that working-class mothers use more directives towards their children than do middle- and upper-class parents. This can affect how children interpret language used in the classroom. If a child who is familiar with primarily directive statements enters a classroom where instructors use indirect language as a means for direction, they can often times be viewed as "problem children" because they can not differentiate indirect and direct directives. Barnes (1984) reviewed literature that examines bilingual/bicultural children. Similar to the different classes, these children also had difficulty understanding and interpreting indirect and direct language. Barnes (1984) states:

One striking observation is that the teacher, who usually represents the mainstream, brings to the class a set of expectations about language use, behavior codes and appropriate learning strategies. Yet, these do not always neatly mesh with the rules and practices of the communities in which the non-mainstream children live. (p. 10)

While these observations were directed toward K-12, it is possible that students at the college level also experience difficulty in interpreting indirect language.

In addition to culture, gender may play a role in the choice of indirect and direct language and the method in which instructors choose to address multiple goals. Tannen (1990) notes that women tend to be more indirect than men. She states:

The explanation for a woman's indirectness could just as well be her seeking connection. If you get your way as a result of having demanded it, the payoff is satisfying in terms of status: You're one-up because others are doing as you told them. But if you get your way because others happened to want the same thing, or because they offered freely, the payoff is rapport. (p. 225)

Tannen (1990) suggests that "for most women, the language of conversation is primarily a language of rapport: a way of establishing connections and negotiating relationships" (p. 77). She goes on to say that "for most men, talk is primarily a means to preserve independence and negotiate and maintain status in a hierarchical social order" (p. 77). This could begin to explain why Tannen observed that men use more direct language and women use primarily indirect language. It may be possible that men and women also operate within different conventional procedures. Austin (1962) establishes the need for conventional effect. Before language can have illocutionary force there must exist a social body that recognizes and accepts shared conventions. Throughout past decades instructors dealt primarily with a homogeneous student body that recognized one specific conventional procedure. However, today's classroom consists of students from many different cultural backgrounds. There is also more of an awareness of how different genders may have different uses and interpretations of language. Therefore, one can not assume all students share the same conventions.

In the same vein, another indirect speech act that appears to be one of the most frequently used subcategories is *Advise-Retrospective*. This subcategory informs a student that another type of action would've, could've or might've been superior to what the student originally did during his/her speech. An example of this speech act includes "You could've documented the map, it could have been a source." The instructor's intent is vague. It is possible that these statements lack illocutionary force because there are so many different interpretations a student could have. Even with a clear understanding of the context in which the statement was said, it would be difficult to be sure why the instructor commented in this manner. Was it to justify a poor grade? Was it to offer advice for future speeches? Was it meant to raise the class's level of awareness regarding different options? Or was it simply a fleeting thought? Along with *Advise-Retrospective*, *Retrospective Suggestion* creates a high level of uncertainty. These types of categories can cause confusion rather than clarification. In the absence of rationale for offering "would've, could've, should've" statements, students could easily misinterpret their meaning. Variations of language constructions such as those previously mentioned may be used to accomplish different goals. However, the effect these constructions have on different genders, classes and cultures is important to consider.

This review of some of the most frequently used speech acts suggests that Speech Acts Theory offers a useful and effective way to understand and evaluate classroom critiques. One reason that this approach is useful is because it does not treat communication as determined by laws. Rather, it explores the purposeful ways language is used during oral critiques by examining the goals of the instructor. It also serves as an explanatory model that is suited for the complexity

of how teachers strive to achieve multiple goals in the classroom. Furthermore, this taxonomy has generated new areas where future research can be useful.

Implications for Future Research

Now that a taxonomy of speech acts used by instructors during oral critiques has been created, it would be beneficial to put it to the test. First as research proceeds, the methodological issues raised can be addressed. Scholars can include different aspects of classroom talk excluded from the present definition of "speech critiques" to see if such talk is actually part of what is getting done. The unitizing and categorization decisions made here can be further refined and could be subjected to traditional social science tests of validity and interrater reliability. The category Linked Acts particularly requires further investigation to explore the controversial idea that two acts can constitute one unreducible intent.

Studies similar to the present investigation should be enacted in other oral communication classrooms with different groups of instructors so that the category system can be tested and additional categories can possibly be created. Future studies should also conduct similar research in different settings (e.g., high schools, training seminars, Toastmasters, etc.) to determine if what is *getting done* is similar to that in the oral communication classroom. It would also be advantageous to examine the speech acts used in written feedback to compare and contrast illocutionary acts found in oral criticism.

Having identified the speech acts used in speech critiques, the next step would be to explore the degree to which these illocutionary acts have illocutionary force. This can be accomplished by interviewing instructors as to what they meant by certain statements and by interviewing students as to their interpretation of comments made by their instructors. Secondly, the perlocutionary effect upon

students who hear these statements needs to be examined. By interviewing students and asking how they felt regarding different speech acts, perlocutionary effects can be determined. Illocutionary force and perlocutionary effect can also be explored by investigating how students in the audience interpret oral feedback compared to the students being critiqued. There are several areas mentioned in previous discussion where illocutionary force and perlocutionary effect can be explored to provide further clarification regarding the interpretation of speech acts.

Since a large portion of speech acts are Simple Labels, it may be useful to determine what's getting done according to the instructor and to examine the interpretation of these statements from the students. Although it is likely that these types of speech acts have illocutionary force, they may not benefit the student as much as other types of comments (i.e., Speech Features). It is possible that instructors utilize Simple Labels due to time constraints or as a means to balance multiple goals.

Earlier speculation has raised interesting questions regarding how instructors maintain multiple goals. Further investigation should explore different ways in which instructors competently deal with these goals. One analytic tool which can be used to investigate this area is Brown and Levinson's (1978) discussion of politeness phenomena. Although direct language provides clarity, often times there are more tactful ways of addressing criticism. Indirect language can be difficult to interpret at times, but offers a way for instructors to save face for students. It is important for scholars to address the issues of class and culture as barriers for students who lack knowledge of the mainstream use of indirect language. Future research should explore these possible obstacles and the repercussions that follow. Indirect retrospective speech acts also need to be

addressed. Researchers should examine the instructors' intentions and students' interpretations of this vague category of speech acts.

Nonverbal communication can be used by instructors to assist in successfully delivering criticism. Preston and Todd-Mancillas (1985) observed that negative feedback was perceived as promoting bad feelings unless an instructor was exhibiting positive immediacy behaviors (i.e., smiling, giving reassuring looks, etc.). Bavelas (1990) states that "the verbal and nonverbal aspects of a message are highly interwoven and, to a substantial extent, interchangeable" (p. 127). She goes on to say that "the message is delivered as a unified whole and not in separate 'channels' that might vie with each other. The speaker skillfully uses all of the possibilities available in a given situation." Future research should examine the relationship between achieving multiple goals and the use of verbal and nonverbal communication together.

Given the fact that oral feedback was collected from only five instructors in this study, no significant patterns could be discerned regarding issues of gender. However, gender has been a prominent variable in previous research conducted on speech criticism. Tannen (1990) maintains that different aspects of language-use are partially gender-based. Since the use of indirect and direct language plays an intricate role in the classroom, future research addressing the use and interpretation of language and how it is utilized in the classroom may be benefited if both gender and culture are considered.

Finally, besides these interpretive studies, scholars can use methodological aspects of the positivistic approach to test the causal relationship between different speech acts and other classroom variables. The category system, if tested and refined, can offer another way to operationalize classroom critiques. The empirical description of speech acts used by teachers could be treated either as

independent or dependent variables in future research. Ultimately, the taxonomy of speech acts used during oral critiques could be beneficial in establishing useful ways to actually help students improve as public speakers.

Implications for Teachers

As mentioned previously, there are three ways teachers in the present study appeared to approach negative feedback while still maintaining multiple goals. Instructors are given a complex and challenging task as they try to balance these goals. This taxonomy can be used as a tool for instructors to review their performance as evaluators. By doing so teachers' level of awareness can be raised as to what kind of criticism they predominantly offer. When critiques are deconstructed, analyzed and classified, then put back into context, it allows instructors an opportunity to evaluate what speech acts they use most and which ones they don't use at all. Although there wasn't a distinct pattern utilized by individual instructors, each one who participated in this study seemed to have his or her own style. That is, instructors were partial to specific speech acts. For instance 62% of the subcategory *Personal Feeling* was offered by one instructor. See Appendix C for examples of speech critiques that show individual instructor's style. The types of oral criticism offered in the classroom may reflect the amount of experience an instructor has and their philosophy of offering criticism in the classroom.

This taxonomy can also be beneficial for advisors who are responsible for teacher-training in communication studies' classrooms. By examining speech acts used during oral critiques along with discussion of *what's getting done*, new instructors will have a stronger understanding what they are doing. It is also

important that they understand the relationship between the choice of speech acts used and maintaining multiple goals.

REFERENCES

References

- Amato, P. P., & Ostermeier, T. H. (1967). The effect of audience feedback on the beginning public speaker. *The Speech Teacher*, 16, 56-60.
- Austin, J. L. (1962). *How to do things with words*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Austin, J. L. (1971). "Performative-constative." In J. R. Searle (Ed.), *The Philosophy of Language* (p. 13-22). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Balcer, C., & Seabury, H. (1965). *Teaching speech in today's secondary schools*. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston.
- Barnes, L. L. (1984). *Communicative competence in the composition classroom: Discourse analysis*. Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of South Carolina.
- Barnes, L. L. (1990). Teachers' written comments. In S. Gabriel, & I. Smithson (Eds.), *Gender in the Classroom Power and Pedagogy* (pp. 140-59). Urbana: University of Illinois Press.
- Bavelas, J. B., Black, A., Chovel, N., & Mullett, J. (1990). *Equivocal communication*. CA: Sage Publications, Inc.
- Berlo, D. K. (1960). *The process of communication: An introduction to theory and practice*. San Francisco, CA: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston.
- Bilodeau, E. A., & Bilodeau, I. M. (1961). Motor skills learning. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 22, 243-80.
- Book, C. (1985). Providing feedback: The research of effective oral and written feedback strategies. *Central States Speech Journal*, 36, 14-23.
- Book, C., & Simmons, K. W. (1980). Dimensions and perceived helpfulness of student speech criticism. *Communication Education*, 29, 134-45.
- Booth-Butterfield, M. (1989). The interpretation of classroom performance feedback: An attributional approach. *Communication Education*, 38, 119-31.

- Bostrom, R. N. (1963). Classroom criticism of speech attitudes. *Central States Speech Journal*, 19, 27-32.
- Bradley, B. E. (1970). An experimental study of the effectiveness of the video-recorder in teaching a basic speech course. *Speech Teacher*, 19, 160-72.
- Braden, W. W. (1961). Teaching through criticism. In W. W. Braden (Ed.), *Speech methods and resources: A textbook for the teacher of speech* (pp. 53-164). New York: Harper & Row.
- Brown, P. & Levinson, S. (1984). Universals in language usage: Politeness phenomena. In H. Goody (Ed.), *Questions and politeness* (pp. 56-290). Cambridge, MA: Cambridge University Press.
- Campbell, P. N. (1973). A rhetorical view of locutionary, illocutionary, and perlocutionary acts. *Quarterly Journal of Speech*, 59, 284-96.
- Cathcart, R. (1966). *Post communication: Criticism and evaluation*. New York: Bobbs-Merrill.
- Clark, B. L. (Fall, 1984). Responding to students: Ughs, awks, and ahas. *College Teaching*, 32, 169-172.
- Cronkhite, G. (1984). Perception and meaning. In C. C. Arnold & J. W. Bowers (Eds.), *Handbook of rhetorical and communication theory* (pp. 51-229). Boston MA: Allyn and Bacon.
- Cushman, D. P., & Kunimoto, E. N. (1981). A symposium on "Speech Act Theory in mainstream communication research," an introduction. *Communication Quarterly*, 3, 196-236.
- Dedmon, D. N. (1967). Criticizing students speeches: A dialectical approach. *Speech Teacher*, 10, 59-62.
- Delpit, L. D. (1988). The silenced dialogue: Power and pedagogy in educating other people's children. *Harvard Educational Review*, 58, 280-98.
- Edwards, R. (1990). Sensitivity to feedback and the development of self. *Communication Quarterly*, 38, 101-11.

- Fujishin, R. M. (1976). *Student attitudes toward giving and receiving oral student criticism in the public speaking classroom*. Unpublished masters thesis, San Jose State University.
- Gaines, R. N. (1979). Doing by saying: Toward a theory of perlocution. *Quarterly Journal of Speech*, 65, 207-17.
- Glaser, B. G., & Strauss, A. L. (1967). *The discovery of grounded theory: Strategies for qualitative research*. Chicago, IL: Aldine.
- Goetz, J. P., & LeCompte, M. D. (1984). *Ethnography and qualitative design in educational research*. Orlando, FL: Academic Press.
- Grice, H. P. (1975). Logic and conversation. In P. C. Cole, & J. L. Morgan (Eds.), *Syntax and Semantics* (pp. 165-89). New York: Academic.
- Holtzman, P. D. (1960). Speech criticism and evaluation as communication. *Speech Teacher*, 9, 1-7.
- Hymes, D. (1962). The ethnography of speaking. In T. Gladwin & W. Sturdevant (Eds.), *Anthropology and human behavior* (pp. 13-53). Washington DC: Anthropological Society of Washington.
- Hymes, D. (1974). *Foundations in sociolinguistics*. Philadelphia, PA: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Kenner, F. (1967). Symposium: IV. Using the recorder in teaching speech in high school. *Speech Teacher*, 16, 217.
- Lincoln, Y. S., & Guba, E. G. (1985). *Naturalistic inquiry*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.
- McCroskey, J. C., & Lashbrook, W. B. (1970). The effect of various methods of employing videotaped television playback in a course in public speaking. *Speech Teacher*, 19, 199-205.
- Nyquist, J. D., & Wulff, D. H. (1982). The use of simultaneous feedback to alter teaching behaviors of university instructors. *Journal of Classroom Interaction*, 18, 11-17.

- Nystrom, C. L., & Leaf, R. (1939). The recording machine as a teaching device. *Quarterly Journal of Speech*, 25, 433-38.
- Peterson, O. M. (1961). Teaching speech content. In W. W. Braden (Ed.), *Speech methods and resources* (pp. 63-98). New York: Harper and Row.
- Philipsen, G. (1976). Places for speaking in teamsterville. *Quarterly Journal of Speech*, 62, 15-25.
- Porter, D. T., & King, G. W. (1972). The use of videotape equipment in improving oral interpretation performance. *Speech Teacher*, 21, 100-12.
- Preston, T. L., & Todd-Mancillas, W. R. (1985). A grounded ethnographic inquiry into teacher oral feedback. *Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Speech Communication Association*. Denver, CO.
- Quigley, B. L., & Nyquist, J. D. (1990, November). Using video technology to provide feedback to students in the performance course. *Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Speech Communication Association*. Chicago, IL.
- Robinson, K., & Kerikas, E. J. (1963). *Teaching speech: Methods and materials*. New York: David McKay.
- Rosaldo, M. Z. (1982). The things we do with words: Ilongot speech acts and speech act theory in philosophy. *Language in Society*, 11, 203-37.
- Rubin, R. (1984). Communication assessment instruments and procedures in higher education. *Communication Education*, 33, 178-80.
- Schenone, C. M. (1981). *An investigation of the attitude of high, medium and low self-concept college students toward receiving instructor-delivered oral criticism in the public speaking class*. Unpublished masters thesis, San Jose State University.
- Searle, J. (1965). What is a Speech Act?" In M. Black (Ed.), *Philosophy in America* (p. 221-39). Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.
- Searle, J. (1969). *Speech acts: An essay in the philosophy of language*. Cambridge, MA: Cambridge University Press.

- Searle, J. (1976). A classification of illocutionary acts. *Language in Society*, 5, 1-23.
- Searle, J. (1980). A classification of illocutionary acts. *Language in Society*, 5, 1-22.
- Searle, J. & Vanderveken, D. (1985). *Foundations of illocutionary logic*. Cambridge, MA: Cambridge University Press.
- Sprague, J. (1971). *An investigation of the written critique behavior of college communication instructors*. Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Purdue University.
- Sprague, J. (1991). Reading our own speech critiques as texts that reveal educational goals, instructional roles and communicative functions. *Basic Course Communication Annual*, 3, 179-201.
- Sprague, J. (1992). Expanding the research agenda for instructional communication: Raising some unasked questions. *Communication Education*, 41, 1-25.
- Staton-Spicer, A. Q. (1982). Qualitative inquiry in instructional communication: Applications and directions. *The Communicator*, 12, 35-46.
- Staton-Spicer, A. Q., & Wulff, D. H. (1984). Research in communication and instruction: Categorization and synthesis. *Communication Education*, 33, 377-91.
- Tannen, D. (1990). *You just don't understand: Women and men in conversation*. New York: Ballantine Books.
- Verderber, R. F. (1973). *Instructor's manual: The challenge of effective speaking*. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth Publishing.
- Vogel, R. (1975). Speech criticism effectiveness: A classification and suggestion for future research. *Today's Speech*, 23, 39-46.
- Wittgenstein, L. (1969). *Preliminary studies for the philosophical investigations', generally known as the blue and brown books*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.

Young, S. (1974). Student perceptions of helpfulness in classroom speech criticism. *Speech Teacher*, 23, 222-34.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

Table 1A
Breakdown of Taxonomy According to Categories and Subcategories

Category-Subcategory	Students Male/Female	Positive-Negative	Content-Delivery	*Instructors A-B-C-D-E	Total
Directives					
Real Question	7-11	6-12	10-8	1 - 5 - 4 - 6 - 2	18
Exam Question	2-1	0-3	1-2	1 - 0 - 0 - 2 - 0	3
Pedagogical Question	2-6	0-8	7-1	2 - 3 - 1 - 0 - 2	8
Rhetorical Question	1-3	2-2	0-4	2 - 1 - 0 - 0 - 1	4
Request	5-3	0-8	4-4	0 - 2 - 2 - 1 - 3	8
Simple Suggestion	4-14	0-18	6-12	5 - 1 - 4 - 2 - 6	18
Retrospective-Suggestion	1-9	0-10	10-0	4 - 0 - 2 - 1 - 3	10
Advise-Simple	7-8	0-15	10-5	7 - 0 - 2 - 3 - 3	15
Advise-Retrospective	11-8	0-19	13-6	8 - 8 - 1 - 0 - 2	19
Simple Command	14-20	4-30	11-23	7 - 2 - 6 - 5 - 14	34
Command/Praise	1-1	0-2	0-2	1 - 0 - 1 - 0 - 0	2
Command-Explanation	5-6	0-11	4-7	4 - 0 - 2 - 1 - 4	11
Warning	1-0	0-1	0-1	0 - 0 - 1 - 0 - 0	1
Assertives					
State	10-20	21-9	19-11	3 - 7 - 4 - 5 - 11	30
Rule Giving	9-16	7-18	7-18	3 - 3 - 12 - 6 - 1	25
Rule Explaining	8-9	4-13	4-13	3 - 1 - 6 - 4 - 3	17

Conjecture	15-9	16-8	6-18	1 - 5 - 10 - 2 - 6	24
Judge-Simple Label	53-72	106-19	81-44	29 - 27 - 31 - 12 - 26	125
Judge-Speech Feature	13-22	30-5	22-13	8 - 7 - 8 - 5 - 7	35
Judge-Improvement	6-12	18-0	5-13	8 - 2 - 6 - 0 - 2	18
Indirect Judgment	27-50	47-30	36-41	24 - 15 - 14 - 10 - 14	77

Expressives

Thank/Closure	8-7	15-0	15-0	5 - 1 - 2 - 6 - 1	15
Sincere Thank	4-5	9-0	5-4	1 - 4 - 3 - 0 - 1	9
Personal Feeling	18-11	27-2	24-5	3 - 18 - 7 - 1 - 0	29
Congratulate	1-4	5-0	3-2	1 - 2 - 1 - 0 - 1	5

Declaratives 0

Commissives 0

Linked Acts 10-12 0-22 12-10 4 - 7 - 3 - 1 - 7 22

Miscellaneous & Uninterpretable 6-9 N/A N/A 5 - 2 - 3 - 3 - 2 15

TOTAL 140-123-136-76-122 597

*Instructors A, B, and C are female; D and E are male.

APPENDIX B

Transcription of Teacher's Oral Critiques Categorized According to Taxonomy

Directives

Real Questions

Did you feel yourself prepared enough for the body of the speech?

How do you feel the environmental issue would stick?

How do you feel about it?

Cindy, how did you feel about it?

I have a question for you, you have given three speeches now and the first time you spoke you said you felt like walking out the door and not coming back, how do you feel now?

I don't know, it that how you were feeling [regarding freezing up]?

What do you think about your speech?

Ken, were you a little nervous to start?

When you were talking about the kelp and the whale towards the very end, how did that fit in?

What can we do about that [video being distracting]?

At home, how did it [speech] run for you?

Do you normally speak at a fairly rapid rate anyway?

What amount of time was it [first speech]?

Well, just let me ask you this, what did you do with your first speech in terms of time and the information?

Were there any connections between the past and what we're familiar with here?

Remember I made the recommendation that you folks read the chapter on introductions and conclusions?

What happened [to cause you to loose control of your speech]?

What caused that [nervousness]?

Exam Questions

What should you do when you see me signal that your time is up?

What was the specific purpose of the speech?

"More worse." Would be what?

Pedagogical Questions

Is it necessary to always use the word *he* all the time?

Two questions Miss Speaker, please explain to me what UVA and UVV stand for.

Second question, you cited in your speech a study at Yale University, what was your source on that?

Only one visual?

Only one visual?

How are you going to explain them [main points] when they work against each other rather than for the case?

Now, how it that [affirmative vs. counter argument] different from what you just told us?

Last question, where did your information come from?

Rhetorical Questions

I wanted to know how convinced you were [from your voice].

I was just wondering if you were trying to overcome a fairly long rehearsal time [by speaking so fast].

You were very convincing at points and I was wondering, is she beginning to shift at all?

How could we not [be persuaded]?

Requests

Let's look at some things [vocal characteristics] I'm going to ask you to work on.

I'll ask you to work on articulation and pronunciation.

I would ask, to slow down a bit.

Please don't forget to tell us where you got your information.

Walt, don't apologize to me please, when you start.

Please remember to cite your sources.

Here is some areas I'll ask you to work on for your next speech, let's expand your transitions.

Make that [preview] clearer to us, just to please an old man.

Simple Suggestion

Maybe rather than note cards, prepare some visual aids.

Maybe increasing the energy and fluency.

Maybe getting audience involvement sooner.

You can pause and add some internal summaries.

You might want to check some of your grammar.

That is not a world major issue so you might find that the rebuttal would go back to the fact that you were exaggerating the case to benefits the negative's refutation.

That [taking a pause] would be my only thought.

One of the things I want to suggest is that you slow down your rate.

[You might want to] always say multicultural which obviously means more than one, right without having to distinguish bi, tri, quatro.

Just be aware that you're still clicking back and forth [from gesturing freely & freezing up].

Try not to read to us.

Try not to use notes, use cards.

Try to force yourself to take a pause.

Try to avoid that [using etc.] at all costs.

Here is what I would add to just polish the organization, transitions and that's that.

OK, I would just keep working with the voice.

So, I think that it would be incredibly helpful to slow down your rate of speaking, even though it might feel unnatural.

Another way we can slow down is with transitions.

Retrospective Suggestion

I might have suggested introducing the oil sooner.

You might have played the tape first, then followed the quote.

You might want to define your terms so we are sure that we understand cholesterol levels.

So, you might want to start with something, "How many of you know people who are in their 80's who are still strong and active?"

[A question would be effective] 'Cause most of us here probably know people . . . again, what is old to you? Is it 55, is it 70, is it 80?

As a minor point, you might want to consider, the Macy's bag was a bit larger than was necessary. Something smaller might have been better.

You could have used a hypothetical example, however, that would take more time.

I would have liked to see more detail [in introduction], perhaps what you intended for us.

I think perhaps if there had been more continuity [with language] then it would have been easier for people to follow.

Can we just put everything on one piece of tape and just have a stop? Time it. Time a piece of video to show, maybe three times, then stop, and then have it on hold, and then time another, maybe looking at the bullet for a period of time, and then stop it.

Advise-Simple

Watch your phrasing, you said, "she's three months late." I said to myself, "I don't know if that's cause for murder."

Remember, observe the audience, don't talk to your visual aid.

Remember, the question/answer period is evaluated.

Sometimes not complete [oral documentation], for example, the Yale study, be sure to tell us where you got that, the source you used.

Now you can allow yourself to move beyond it [concentration on problem], you've got the awareness and with the awareness. . . and your already successful attempts to change it.

I want to remind you to time yourself when you're practicing and even if you suspect that you're going to go over, you need to edit well enough in advance so that you can prepare and practice what you've edited out, so that you feel comfortable.

[You need] Smoother transitions as you move from the story back to the use of evidence and making points because almost like a trumpet volunteer, as you went back into the story because you said, "I'm going back to the story."

It would be better to pause, then use vocal interferences.

We talked about this, when I signal for time it tells you to tie up the loose ends.

But when you're going to use opinion make sure that the analysis of it goes directly to the argument.

Make sure you're dealing with issues, not solutions: you got a little off track there.

Make sure when you're analyzing the argument that you give evidence to support what you're saying.

You need to make sure that when you're making one statement in the affirmative, that you're going against it in the negative, or avoid that particular issue.

In your introduction be sure to let us know what you're going to talk about.

What we plan, what we rehearse, what we prepare, we must stay with it.

Advise-Retrospective

I prefer the black [for visual aid color].

Jennifer, I had no idea [what your speech topic was]: I wish you oriented us a little about sleeping.

I really thought you were going to tie it [conclusion] into your introduction.

I thought it [visual aid] should have been red.

I really thought you would take up every single second.

I thought if we would get you to slow down just a little, we could understand more of what you are saying.

I thought you would do what Steve did and take the book and go neener, neener, neener [referring to visual aid].

I think very seriously, you could have given it from the stand point that in . . . I can't remember his name . . . Male Practice . . . what's his name Robert something or other . . . has written a whole series . . . he is from the University of Illinois . . . on all the different testing done on females and that frequently the testing that is done for females has been done inaccurately or incorrectly or they have done testing that is inappropriate. Some people have gone in frequently for tests and they have been misread.

I think you could have used the falling of the book.

So, you could have taken his view on . . . Middleson is his name . . . his approach to over-testing in women, negative results, the testing labs, saying that women have been fine when they haven't been, then dying as a result of it.

You could have documented your map, it could have been a source.

You could get that condescending voice there [during counter point].

You could have asked us a question and then got back to my opponent on the other side of the issue [in introduction].

Rather than you introducing it [subject, problem/solution] and you really could have had a crackerjack opening in terms of catching our attention about age.

You could have zeroed in on aspects of inappropriate use of testing and diagnoses from doctors to counteract the problem rather than going the absurd route.

I would have really appreciated, however, a little less reading this time.

I would have started immediately with the story and then bring in your components.

I would have liked for you to have a more powerful beginning.

So that [starting with a question in the introduction] would be a better way to start.

Simple Commands

Trust yourself.

Avoid memorization.

Let your instincts guide you.

So keep it [relaxation] in shape.

Distribute your weight evenly.

Distribute your weight evenly.

Look at us.

Watch the hands on your hips.

Watch against the verbal clutter.

Watch physical presence.

Watch the use of flip flop on arguments.

Polish the language.

Just polish, polish, polish.

Just . . . you know your material . . . just talk with us.

This leads to my third point [for improvement], your note cards, be careful to only write on one side of your cards.

Work on that [freeing gestures].

Breathe and slow down a little bit.

So just slow it down a little more.

Balance the documentation.

Replace the notecards with a visual aid.

Increase the natural conversational quality.

Now, let it [concentration on fillers] go.

Let it [concentration on fillers] go now.

When you see me signal, go to your conclusion.

Put it [hat] back on your head, or God help me, turn it around.

When you are orienting your audience, give us some landmarks.

Get that story going, but get it going in a very fluent way. Pull us in, I mean use the emotional appeal. Get that Pathos going, pull, pull, pull.

Talk to a few truants.

Get out of here, go get some rest.

Don't show your audience all your cards.

Again, don't forget dates [referring to documentation].

Don't feel obligated to continue, go to your conclusion.

I don't want you to use etc., be specific.

Command/Praise

You still need to work on fluency, but it is more fluent than ever before.

Keep working on it [eye contact]: nonetheless, it was significantly better.

Command/Explanation

You need a more direct path to the audience, look at them.

Get rid of your note cards, you lose your eye contact.

Give conclusion strength and conviction, we all need to know that you were there.

Go into detail, that will fill up some of that space.

Let them [hands] loose, you'll be amazed what they'll do.

So, I want you to work on developing your content so this [loss of concentration] doesn't happen again because I really want you to be able to put forth what you want. You deserve to get the benefit of that, and they deserve that as well.

The way you discussed different aspects of cholesterol, you need a summary of those points. Explain more of the drug dealing with the cholesterol.

Make sure that you worked a little more on projecting so your voice is perfectly clear.

Work on balance: first point fully documented, second point one source, third point not one documentation.

Work on fluency, you were stumbling on some the things you were trying to say.

Which leads me to the next area that can be polished and that's movement and gestures, verbal transitions coordinated to move and just move right into the next point.

Warning

Because believe me if you don't practice the next speech and the final speech your ass is going to be grass.

Assertives

Statements

OK, in your outline you say that you used an article, Los Vegas, by Barney Vagel.

That's [introduction] audience involvement.

We were talking about a tradition here.

We will talk about this [time limit] as we go.

We'll polish the documentation as we go along.

You asked us if we had any questions.

You ran about eight minutes in the speech.

You started out really strong and then something happened 2/3s into the speech.

Matt, you said something about your attention device and we commented on it.

Let's face it, if you could pull off a comic review up there, you would.

Your material was relatively complicated.

And of course, the fact that you're all dressed up and look like a little JFK, doesn't hurt.

Alright, in your affirmative you talked about the need or not the need, the violence, and how it with change in the future, and how it will only increase.

Content development, I heard four sources.

I think the rest of the class in not going to be able to comment on this, so I'll let them make comments, then I'll address a specific issue.

I will ask one thing, I was a little confused.

I'm going to ask you one question.

I know how you planned for this to go.

Then again, I missed a little because we were playing with the camera.

Exceptional strong points, I agree, ten years ago we wouldn't have heard a speech on oil changing from a woman.

That's [introduction] an attention getting device.

This [transitions] may go all the way back to the attention device.

Fear appeal, what else are they covering up? The inferences.

The guns were in blue [reference to visual aid].

He is blushing.

Nervousness took over.

Sounds pretty lethal.

I am also understanding that [not memorizing] created a different type of pressure for you and I understand that and I appreciate that.

It is a minor point [using a large visual].

There are worse things in the world that could happen [than freezing gestures].

Rule Giving

It's [citing sources] real important.

I highly recommend it [reading chapter]; strong beginning, strong ending.

This is real important to keep in touch with that [staying within the time limit].

You have to be very careful not to hurt an audience [when you talk about a sensitive topic].

Well let's change that, he or she, only because I know it in no longer done. It's just a gender bias, lets get rid of it. Let's teach our children never to play with that.

Even when we're working with debaters, we ask them not to be visually abusive, as well as vocally.

Even if it [speaking] feels weird, that's OK.

Even though you, of course, hear yourself say them [fillers], very once in a while, that's OK.

The audience doesn't know how much you're leaving out.

The audience doesn't know [if you don't mention every point].

They [audience] will never know the order of the speech, cause you're the only one that knows it.

That [asking questions] kind of recovery is really a listener-speaker event.

[Dwelling on a delivery problem] Because it is in your brain. It's like when you learn a particular [swimming] stroke or breath that you have to have. You're very aware of it when you first learn it, then when you've been practicing it and when you start feeling more comfortable with it you stop thinking about it, and you simply do it and it is similar to that.

It may take a little time to feel comfortable and adept in using the notecards.

This wasn't a great violation [going over time limit]; better to have something a little short.

And it is alright to use opinion [in your argument].

There is no harm in speaking in a rapid rate, unless that rapid rate interferes with your understanding.

People do the same thing [limit hand movement] with pockets.

The video tape even with the assistance, and all the help, what have you, you're going to get fooled.

There were a lot of things I didn't even know and the best audience to persuade is one that is well informed.

I'll give you some key terms [to note persuasion], "It is necessary, it is important." Those are value judgment words.

Now, and this is true I think with most of us, when we find something that we want to change, we become overly concerned and overly aware of it so that every time we do it, or hear it, or say it, we're aware of it.

It is as simple as that, I mean you know, I've never known anyone, including myself, who could give a competent presentation for these next two speeches without practice.

It's incredibly, incredibly difficult and some of us can be incredibly adept with that [memorizing], however, we never be adept at having a relationship with the audience if we memorize.

And sometimes the window, for some reason we don't want to look at the window, and sometimes we don't want to look where we sat down because that's where we're coming from, because we want to run back to our seat.

Rule Explaining

So it's a lot easier to learn how to juggle the use of preparation, practice and notecards to relating to the audience then it is to memorize it and then trying to very artificially and arbitrarily force yourself, because you can't because you're inside your own head when one has memorized.

[You should slow down] Because if you slow down your rate it is going to be easier for the native English speaker to understand pronunciation, because many of the words you pronounce are not an English pronunciation, but if you give us a couple seconds, we'll get it.

You guys have heard it now, the complete run of information on documentation, the authors, the titles, the dates and it blends right into the speech.

[If you memorize] You forget one word of a phrase and everything else that follows it disappears.

Remember that you're going to lose one of the more important areas of nonverbal by simply shadowing it out [by wearing a hat].

When you maintain a good eye contact level with you audience, it helps us buy into your package.

'Cause when we read, we get monotone, we can't help it.

[Need to speak slower] because your goal is to get us to comprehend and not struggle.

The one question I would raise is when you were wearing a hat during a speech, with lighting overhead, there is a shadow that starts with the bill of the hat and goes to your chin, so that our view of your eyes is automatically limited.

Remember an attention device serves two purposes, not only does it get audience attention, but it helps you settle into your speech.

I think it would be hard for anyone sitting here who may have dealt with the problem to listen to that message and maybe not feel a sense of anger.

You will thank yourself for having a packaged conclusion, so when you have to truncate your speech, you have some place to go.

If something goes wrong, you should be a little bit of a poker player.

Yet, at the same time, I want you to understand that the more comfortable you feel and become with that [not memorizing speech], the easier it gets.

If you're moving so fast [speaking], it doesn't give us time to catch up to it until you're past the point.

If you're talking to a group of people, however, and you're trying to convince them, you may not want to have that particular nonverbal cueing.

So you were using the very basic principle of taking that which is known in order to explain the unknown.

Conjecture

So even though I understand that you felt, that you were thrown off base, that you didn't pick up that thread, that you lost it in the beginning, that you didn't pick it up in the manner that you intended to, I felt that also.

When you got to visual aids, you found a pace.

You had a lot of information and you felt obligated to be so precise.

And you did, you started to get a rhythm.

You knew that we could not see the detail of the picture if you had stayed behind the podium, so you moved forward and allowed us to see much more clearly than what we would have before.

So with this one [speech] something was happening to cause you to talk slow, add more or you weren't timing yourself during the final stages of your practice.

When you started the speech you were revving your engine a little bit.

You had your hands locked up, you wanted to gesture, but your hands wouldn't let you go.

The content development - where you slowed down the most and really started talking to us - was when you started showing us your visual aids.

After the first videotape, you started to relax and smile; your gestures loosened up.

And you feel comfortable up there.

A physical reflection that you just used a filler. If your brain says "oh, no" than you body says, "oh, no."

I felt that you weren't as smooth as you wanted to be.

[I felt you weren't smooth] Cause I know how smooth you can be, and you are, and how much you thought about this.

It felt clear to me that you had a lot of information.

And the pacing you were doing; well I think it helped you a little because when you read you got a little monotone.

I think one thing that came out of the speech was your interest and enthusiasm for the topic.

I think you found your comfortable spot just around your second point; I saw you kinda relax into it.

So the objectives that you had for yourself, I think that you fulfilled.

In delivery technique, I had that natural sense that you were just talking to us.

I knew that [got main points and subpoints mixed up] was what happened and I said "OOPS."

I just want to validate that you did great for having 4/5s of your notecards elsewhere.

So, I can tell that [you weren't pleased with performance], and I know other people couldn't.

I could also tell that you were getting jammed up, and that you didn't cover the material that you had intended to cover.

Simple Label

Big improvement [reference to visual aid].

Conversational style.

Really nice summary.

Nice job.

Nice clear delivery.

Overall nice job.

Not too shabby.

Great job.

Great use of visual aids; they were good.

Good job.

Good energy.

Good organization.

Brandy, good organization.

Bob, good organization.

Good documentation.

Good visual aid.

Good extemporaneous presence.

Good content development.

Good documentation of sources.

Good energy and delivery.

Good energy and delivery.

Good organization of material.

And so that was good usage [of space] of you.

Good use of evidence to support your five points.

Energy good, nice conversational style.

Good organization in your speech, good visual aids: clear easy to read.

Good opening, set the scene of what was going on.

Good attention device and then coming back to the conclusion.

Very good audience involvement, and then lead into exactly what you're going to say.

Very well organized.

Very effective delivery.

Very effective speech and very informative.

Very interesting, very organized, very clear. You had great visual aids.

Content development, documentation was fairly clear throughout.

Delivery technique, excellent energy.

Clear pattern of organization.

Clear pattern to follow.

It was very, very fluid.

It [speech] was very well organized, also.

It [citing sources] gave you great credibility, well done.

It was very good, very informative.

It [linguistic information] really was . . . it was very impressive.

It [introduction] was so quick; I was thinking "what is going on?"

It was very direct.

It was a little on the short side.

It is not easy for you to stay with the problem.

It helps because you're really arrogant [regarding counter argument].

It was very informative, very interesting: we appreciate hearing about that.

It was abundantly clear to the audience that you felt more comfortable with the situation and that came across well.

It's [student's delivery] wonderful.

It's [student's delivery] dynamic and conversational at the same time.

I think you succeeded [in personalizing speech]. I really do.

I think the body of information and the timing of the speech was perfect.

I think that it [use of vocabulary] is to be applauded.

I think reading a quote to begin with is not a bad idea until you get your rhythm.

I think also you're going to need a little less reading.

I think you needed stronger appeals.

I don't think you need to deal with anymore of the subject than that.

I thought, well, it [holding hands behind back] isn't distracting.

I thought that [definition] was really interesting.

I thought the introduction prepared us pretty well.

I thought that [audience involvement] was very interesting.

I thought it [use of video] was very effective. Good experimentation.

I thought it was very well organized.

I thought your visual aids had an almost entertaining quality.

I thought the early part of the delivery, when you were still getting used to this, as a little formal and a little stiff.

I thought it [delivery] was a little awkward at first, a little choppy.

I thought it [being convincing] was a good use for you.

I'm hearing some things that I think are problematic with this [delivery].

I can easily divide your speech into three main parts; good organization.

Actually, I'll have to piggyback on all the comments that have been made because they are all valid.

We were watching you adapt [due to lack of time] and it was good.

We had to go on the basis of your opinion, rather than good strong reliable resource material.

We pick up the tea cup with our little finger up. There is a gentile sense of . . . [regarding voice quality].

You did a nice job lady.

You did a nice job.

You're doing a nice job.

You adapted well [to time running short].

You were successful.

You were very clear in your information.

You had a wealth of information

You had a great vocal style.

You were incredibly organized.

You have this interesting information.

You did the best with what you had available to you.

Your delivery was good.

You had a good attention device. It was clear.

You did a nice job of moving quickly to your conclusion without making people feel that we had missed something.

You have tremendous energy. That is what it is.

You're documenting your sources, the material was here, good visual aids.

You were strong and dynamic, yet still you looked relaxed.

You were very up front and honest with us [regarding opinions in argument].

You have this very subtle humor that is quite appropriate.

You definitely owned power and control as the speaker by manipulating the environment in the manner that you needed.

You have a nice way of relating the material.

And in the question/answer period you were much more natural and conversational.

Alright so you were very, very successful in that manner [expressing family closeness].

Alright you were up there a strong and a dynamic delivery.

I mean your presentation the first speech was great.

You still need to orient us with a nice strong thesis.

You needed a stronger opening.

You needed more sources.

You're going into nice rhetoric and nice phrasiality.

Your negative supported what your affirmative said and that can be a problem.

Your energy was up there, very positive.

Your process is working for you now.

She was well informed.

She adapted well.

This was definitely a demonstration speech.

This is not true confessions time. You don't have to admit that [just wrote speech out].

The second one [visual aid], the color was fine.

The appeals were wonderful.

The organization was easy to follow.

The first visual aid was excellent.

Right, so that was good use of that particular principle [going from known to unknown].

So that [moving to show visual] was very effective.

That [use of rhetoric] kinda stands out that you're working on an erudite speech here.

And the energy, very effective and you did the 90% of the presentation.

Just like with most speakers, just a little bit of a choppy start.

Still strong voice, very conversational.

More of an attention getting device at the beginning of the speech.

All in all, the speech did not fail at all.

Some of your repetitious lines were on the redundant side.

Story was a little bit fuzzy.

Yet at the same time Jeremy, you have a wonderful way of speaking.

Speech Feature

Very clear pattern of organization; causes, effects, controls.

This one [second speech], it was very, you know, Paula and I both said when you were finished "Paul has such a pleasant way of relating himself and his information."

A little bit of rolling of the foot, you roll you left foot around into a strange position.

Then all of a sudden you found a pace you were more comfortable with, from then on it was a nice flowing speech.

You had a good argument on the retirement age in terms of Reagan signing a bill to extend, well actually, to drop that whole concept.

You had a good-natured approach to a topic that dealt with lethal toxicity.

You made it known that you were using opinion, so that is fine.

You have the visual center, "How could you possibly believe what the affirmative said?" You gave that stance: "How ridiculous! How Absurd!"

You did a really good job with your [previous] informative [speech], and I really liked when you said "Remember in the informative when I said . . ."

You played down the moral aspect of the abortion issue, although, fear I thought was appropriate.

And you know when you were doing your critique [of another student's speech earlier today]? Because you couldn't read everything, it sounded so nice and you were really starting to look up.

You were using the categorical allness that no child wants to be kept home from school, no child really wants to be at school so you've that contradiction there because there are children that don't want to go home at night; they want detention. So when you have suspension that encourages school attendance and detention discourages school truancy.

Again just like I said to Steve, you were dynamic, well cited, you were well informed, but you were relaxed up there and were in control.

Your visual aids were used well; you kept them out of sight.

Your credibility was heightened when you told us you had done it, you had jumped.

[Your posture] It wasn't a military rest. It wasn't stiff. I mean it was a very relaxed holding of hands behind the back.

Within yourself you might feel you need to get better, but as a professional evaluator, I need to tell you that the difference between your eye contact of the first speech and the second was superb.

Good attention device, led right into why, when, how and then summarized that.

Good use of the visual aids, you introduced them.

Good organization, three main points and a summary tying back into the beginning.

The concepts you were presenting were fairly complicated and interwoven and so we needed to have some time to think, to absorb, "now, what's that definition? . . . and how does that . . . and oh."

The first speech was two to three minutes, so you were right on the money with the time on the first one [speech].

It was very concrete, relevant information. You gave us a good overview of what was happening in the culture, but also very personalized of you.

But it [use of story] was a very effective tool, so I'm glad you won out, "will she like this or not?" [the use of story]

Other than minor [reaction to the timekeeper's] holding up the sign and [your look of] "I'm going to kill you because I still had five minutes of material left," other than that minor little homicidal thought that you had, it was really very, very smooth in what you were presenting and a lot of depth.

Miss Maggie, alright. Maggie has been known to us to have fairly strong introductions, again this was no let down.

Projected Labor Shortage, that was great.

One cannot help be bombarded with knowledge of these traditions.

I am going to say right now that you looked real relaxed, and it wasn't until you found your time running a little short that the um's started to kick in. Because I again was going, "OK, they weren't there until the end when they started to crop up." And it was like watching you readjust everything and [I observed you asking yourself] "how can I fit this in?"

Then I wrote "discussion of two main points overlapped, model and prices with main points in speech."

I thought the use of vocabulary was really good, excellent; the range of vocabulary, not just music vocabulary, but your vocabulary as well.

I thought that [showing pictures of your family] was very appropriate.

If I track your organization, I saw the attention device; the umbrella, very creative.

The thing I felt was done well was the fact that you knew it was going to take some time to set up, so you had things to talk about and fill in that time.

Nice haircut, we can see your face.

Improvement

Big improvement.

I've seen incredible improvement.

That [citing sources] has improved tremendously.

You also improved on your fillers.

You did a nice job of improving.

You definitely improved on those [fillers].

You're definitely improving in terms of your stance in front of the audience.

So in conjunction with the fillers, you improved on those [gestures] also.

This time was better, you looked at your audience.

The volume was much, much better.

The one area you noticed improvement is when she started speaking in the beginning and she was way up here and now she is keeping it right below the register where she normally talks.

You're getting better at it [documentation].

It was very well organized and your eye contact was 100% better than it was before.

Delivery technique, much more relaxed and confident.

You are getting stronger vocally.

More of a presence than I've seen.

OK, your voice was stronger than it has been.

Good conversational tone, you have come along way.

Indirect Judgment

But you documented the sources.

You did credit the author of your text book.

You seemed much more relaxed.

And so that effort [regarding eye contact] you were making definitely paid off.

Did you all feel that: "I just have to tell you everything about both sides now?"
[during a persuasive speech]

You have all the parts in place now.

You could tell you practiced.

You have the capacity to really be natural.

Yes, you did. No, no, no, you did. You made it sound personal.

You had credibility, your personal experience.

You're looking more at your audience.

You projected your voice, and that was something else.

You have a lot of research into yours [speech].

You've got it [dropping fillers].

You turned your back to us a little [while discussing what was written on the chalk board].

By holding your cards up, you did read it a little.

You tended to look at the visual aid quite a bit.

You really relied on your problem/solution to introduce the subject.

Let me, I know you went the [reducto ad] absurdum route here.

You went over the maximum time limit.

You stayed with the issue at hand.

You were really flying along today.

Your ten minute speech ran fifteen minutes.

Except that you were only facing one side and I asked you . . .

Every time you would look up and just really explain to us, you had the attention of this audience.

You could have avoided what you thought or your personal experiences with it [argument] and stated what you did, but you didn't [and that was good].

You would also refer to bicultural occasionally, and then single cultural occasionally, and then multicultural occasionally.

You definitely kept our suspense [with visual], we didn't know what was in it [bag].

So nonverbally you were sending off all kinds of cues about what needed to be done in terms of our acceptance of the affirmative and what you were saying.

Don, I didn't hear you say where you got your information from, but that [students answer] didn't have anything to do with where you got the information.

Matt, I can not believe you didn't go overtime.

In looking at your argument, there were a couple points that you argued opinion, but most were dealt with evidence.

You know your material so well, you documented, you did the research, everything was in place.

When you start out there is a tone, a voice there, that you know what you're talking about and you're pulling us in and there is an almost soothing.

You wanted to catch our attention, it's not mickey mouse club, going into just arguing ages.

You red flagged, this could be a problem here because I am using opinion.

You talked about, there were a lot of major problems going on in the world, homelessness and so on, but that truancy was not a major problem.

OK, but you said violence will increase in your affirmative, you also told us in your negative that violence is going to increase in the movies and the we are basically doing it.

"You had a 'pitcher' of your girls behind." We know it was a "picture."

We noticed your feet cross over each other every time you made a point.

We knew what you were talking about because you reacquainted us with the topic.

Now, if we had a rebuttal statement, we would have fun with that [counter argument] because you never stated that truancy was a problem.

We are compelled to keep listening because you are actively involved with the audience.

She clashed on every issue and she looked at it from a stand point of a negative case, tearing it apart, the infrastructure of the affirmative.

She took off with that speech and just about blew all the smog out of the valley.

She sounded like a typical debater; going with the outline format, going head to head with the issues.

She wanted us to be informed, be safe.

I mean you related personal information about yourself as not only the manager. I mean when you say things like "we come close to fist fights in some of these manager meetings," that's pretty personal. "My bike up a tree cause I played a joke on them."

When you allowed yourself to be relaxed your hands and movement and gestures, then it was almost like a freeze frame and you would go back to the podium, hands in the pockets.

You knew your material because when you were talking about what you knew about, the water, you became, you had a lot of gestures, it's almost like you could have thrown the cards away.

I can tell you practiced.

I was able to follow the pattern of organization.

I heard documentation.

I just kinda lost your conclusion.

I signaled you for time.

I can tell from your voice that you mean business.

I think everybody was going "what? [regarding introduction], oh yes."

I heard a summary and a close, so the organization is here.

I understand that [you were tempted to read because] there was a lot of information.

I could see [from your outline], what the rest of the class couldn't see, that you had to watch the time and make some leaps and leave some things out.

I thought that potentially the sense beyond the specific concrete information - the sense of the warmth and the community that you were presenting in the speech - came through from the very first words that you spoke.

Bob, what I have seen is a lot of relaxation.

It [student's delivery] gets us relaxed to watch you.

It [visual aid] really created a sense of curiosity in our minds.

It was also a major difference in terms of how you related to the audience because you had not memorized the speech.

It [amount of eye contact] was a major difference and your relationship with the audience.

And it [tone of voice] is rare to get that when you are discussing a counter point because you're ready for velocity and roar and then there is this gentle sense of "they are wrong."

Pronunciation of "fallacious."

Affirmative did not say it was a major problem, they said that it was a problem in the high schools that affected the student, parents, and the community.

Not the nervous jitters that you had before.

Documentation and sources, we heard that all the way through.

Because everything is in place [besides three areas to work on].

There was no attention getting device, you just moved right in.

There were a couple times this speech started to drift into persuasion.

Then it was graphic as well, compel us to look at it [video tape].

Now that really isn't going head to head on the issue.

The appeals to intelligence and our pocketbook, our concern for living [were effective in the introduction].

Expressives

Closures

Thank you.

Thank you.

Thank you.

Thank you.

Thanks a lot.

Thanks Dave.

Thanks Karen.

Thank you Brian.

Matt, thank you.

Thank you John, I hope you feel better.

Let's move on.

OK, good.

Alright, Good.

Alright.

Alright.

Sincere Thanks

Well, thank you for not going overtime.

Thank you very much for sharing your family.

Thank you, thank you for getting up there and trying not to look at those cards, cause I know that it is a temptation; it works as a barrier.

Thank you very much May-Yen for that information.

Thank you for doing that [practicing next two speeches] for me George.

Thank you, your time was 7:03, right on the button.

Much better presentation and I am grateful for that.

I appreciate that fact that you use personal experience. Boy, did you get our attention!

And you told us each point, you let us know there's things we need to be aware of. I appreciate that.

Personal Feelings

But overall, I am quite, quite impressed.

I am so impressed with your improvement in this class.

I'm impressed, I'm impressed.

I was very impressed with the linguistic information that you were giving us.

Scott, I was so impressed with your improvement. Thank you so much.

I loved the fact you used social concern and our pocket book [as appeals].

The accusations, I loved.

The appeals of this speech, I just loved.

I loved your beginning.

And I loved that there is hope [reference to appeals].

I liked your rhetoric in terms of a small esoteric sampling. I mean that is a key phrase in there.

I liked you using the story.

I like the fact that you brought the piece of equipment in.

I liked your use of humor.

I also liked your citings.

I liked your transitions. I liked the fact that you helped us out, told us exactly where we were going.

You know what I liked? I liked the way you redefined monitoring and discussion.

You know what I really liked about your speech? I mean really liked, you stopped reading and you started explaining, you got animated and all of a sudden eye contact, just connected with everybody.

There are two things I really liked about your speech; you have so much enthusiasm and you were so well informed.

It is a joy to watch you; the vocal variety, the nonverbal, the enthusiasm.

I really enjoyed the pictures of your family.

I enjoyed the appeals, social concern, "we can start saving lives if we begin using this."

It's nice to have a positive association with that [Korean] word, then many of us do.

I felt like I was watching a person who was incredibly prepared and who feels comfortable enough with his material that he could smile, he could walk around, he could look directly, very directly at people.

It was clear that you rehearsed a lot and yet I did not feel like I was watching a actor give a performance in a play.

Yeah well, I hope you keep being as successful as you are with that misguided approach George.

Some of the language . . . the A's reign of terror. I thought, "Oh this is beautiful."

I found myself cheering' "come on you can make it."

I have never seen a gun case in my life; you showed me something I've never seen before.

Congratulate

So, I commend you [on documentation].

So yes, way to go Theresa.

My hearty congratulations.

You just wanted us to have that information and I am so happy for you.

So, I want to support you in the changes you've made [regarding memorization]

Linked Acts

Your intentions were sterling, but you allowed yourself to become a bit over-involved perhaps.

There was a purpose statement there, but I thought it could have been a little more specific as well.

You had two main points, but your visual aids threw you off.

I followed the pattern of arrangement, but the transitions between the main points were short.

I thought it was cute use of economic problems and creating more classroom space, but what were your sources on that?

You mention the drug, but you don't talk about what it is capable of doing.

I did not hear a great thesis sentence, but you have the introduction, body and conclusion down well.

Your organization was clear, but you need to slow down, cause when you finished I was tired.

Your points were clear, but the prices threw you off.

I heard an orientation statement, but boy I had to listen with both ears really fast to get it all; ozone, ozone effect, earth being polluted and I jotted those down very quickly.

It took courage on your part to even put that one [rebuttal speech] together going against what your original argument was, but I probably would have taken a different route.

You know your personality came through, and it was nice, but you were very fidgety.

[Nice flow] Except the very end when I thought you must have been out of time.

There is a lot of energy and we want to get it under control.

You seem more comfortable with it, though you're still reading a bit.

So, well done, just slow down a little.

[I asked if you were nervous at the start] 'Cause I noticed that although your speech overall was so persuasive with a lot of appeals, you started out rapidly.

You definitely gave us a conclusion this time. You were packing up and leaving when you were giving us a conclusion.

Good organization, we'll polish the transitions.

Video was excellent until it became a distraction.

I enjoyed the chalk board, however, I don't think it needed as much explanation as maybe you did.

I really liked it, just a little less reading, OK?

Miscellaneous & Uninterpretable

I'm going to take the snorkel and dive to 300 feet to see if it works.

I'd like to talk to this fellow you interviewed. I liked his name Danny Hurley-by-the-way.

Megabyte, I have to ask, I still don't know what it is. Is that like an overbite?

And I will, of course, will be writing extensive notes regarding your feedback.

I'd still like to have more . . .

I had a feeling all the way through the speech that . . .

I just don't want you to be diluted into . . .

Again, this side of the room seems to get all of the attention.

[Everyone was paying attention] Except her who was sleeping through the whole thing. By the way.

You know some of my dearest friends are in their 70's and they run faster than I do. And my grandmother played centerfield for the family baseball team till she was 76.

If you're a snail you'll hate the speech either way.

If it [pesticides] is so lethal, why are the snails still eating my plants?

Do you see what I'm saying?

Any other comments?

What else?

APPENDIX C

Two Samples of Critiques in Context with Speech Acts Labeled

Instructor B:

Personal Feeling	I am so impressed with your improvement in this class.
Sincere Thank	I appreciate the fact that you use personal experience. Boy did you get our attention.
Simple Label	I thought it was very well organized.
Statement	I'm going to ask one question.
Pedagogical Question	Is it necessary to always use the word he all the time?
Rule Giving	Well let's change that. He or she, only because I know it is no longer done. It's just a gender bias. Let's get rid of it. Let's teach our children never to play with that.
Indirect Judgment	By holding your cards up, you did read it a little.
Personal Feeling	But overall, I am quite quite impressed.
Rule Giving	There were a lot of things I didn't even know and the best audience to persuade is one that is well informed.
Congratulate	My hearty congratulations.

Instructor E:

Simple Label	Good organization.
Conjecture	I think one thing that came out of the speech was your interest and enthusiasm for the topic.
Speech Feature	Good use of the visual aids, you introduced them.

Retrospective Suggestion	You could have used a hypothetical example, however, that would take more time.
Speech Feature	Good organization, three main points and a summary tying back into the beginning.
Simple Label	Really nice summary.
Simple Label	Content development, documentation was fairly clear throughout.
Miscellaneous & Uninterpretable	I'd like to talk to this fellow you interviewed. I liked his name Danny Hurley-by-the-way.
Indirect Judgment	But you documented your sources.
Simple Label	Good energy and delivery.
Advise-Simple	Remember observe the audience, don't talk to your visual aid.
Simple Label	Overall, nice job.