

The Development and Test of the Public Speaking Competence Rubric

Lisa M. Schreiber, Gregory D. Paul & Lisa R. Shibley

In response to the demand for increased accountability within the university classroom, there have been calls for a new generation of rubrics that effectively assess students' competence in several areas, including public speaking. This article describes the development, test, and factor analyses of the Public Speaking Competence Rubric (PSCR), an 11-item descriptive rubric designed to be comprehensible to audiences both inside and outside the communication discipline. Study 1, which involved an assessment by five coders of 45 speeches, revealed a complex factor structure and a need to clarify two of the items. Study 2, in which three undergraduate students and one communication faculty person coded 50 speeches, revealed a relatively simple three-factor solution. Comparison of PSCR scores with student speech grades also supported the measure's predictive validity. The last part of the paper describes the potential pedagogical and assessment applications for the PSCR, the limitations of the study, and directions for future research. Overall, the PSCR appears to be a consistent and accurate measure of public speaking ability.

Keywords: Public Speaking; Speech; Competence; Effectiveness; Assessment; Rubric; Pedagogy

The long tradition in our discipline of teaching public speaking skills remains intact.—
Morreale, Hugenberg and Worley (2006, p. 433).

The Association of American Colleges and Universities has articulated a core set of higher education learning outcomes that are necessary “both for a globally engaged democracy and for a dynamic-innovation fueled economy” (Rhodes, 2010, p. 10). In the category of “Intellectual and practical skills” *oral communication* appears as an

Lisa Schreiber (Ph.D. University of Nebraska-Lincoln, 2002) and Gregory Paul (Ph.D. Texas A&M, 2009) are Assistant Professors of Communication at Millersville University. Lisa R. Shibley (Ph.D. Penn State, 2004) is the Assistant Vice President of Institutional Advancement and Planning at Millersville University. The authors wish to thank Jennifer Wood, Adam Lawrence, Marjorie Warmkessel, Morgan Hartranft, Nash Doud, and Burns Foster, for their assistance with this research project. The authors also wish to thank the two anonymous reviewers for their helpful comments and suggestions. Lisa Schreiber can be contacted at lisa.schreiber@millersville.edu

outcome. This is not particularly surprising given that communication skills are critical for intellectual development, career trajectory, and civic engagement. Communication courses have long been a part of university curriculum across the United States (Gibson, Gruner, Hanna, Smythe, & Hayes, 1980; Gibson, Hanna, & Huddleston, 1985), and they continue to be linked to general education outcomes today. Interestingly, though there are many types of communication competence, at most universities (57%) public speaking is the focus in the basic communication course that satisfies the “oral communication” general education outcome (Morreale, Hugenberg, & Worley, 2006).

At the same time that the AAC&U recommended that oral communication be a fundamental learning outcome, they also recommend that oral communication be “*practiced extensively*, across the curriculum, in the context of progressively more challenging problems, projects and standards for performance” (Rhodes, 2010, p. 12, emphasis added). Unfortunately, the public speaking course or basic communication course is often the *first* and *only* exposure undergraduate students (nonmajors) have to formal communication instruction; and while those of us who teach the basic course would like to believe differently, research shows that one course in isolation does little to influence students’ overall academic success (Allen, 2002). Clearly, students need more than one communication course to fully develop oral communication competence.

In an effort to remedy this deficit and in parallel to writing across the curriculum initiatives, a number of universities have instituted speaking across the curriculum (SAC) or communicating across the curriculum programs (CAC) to develop oral communication competence more fully beyond the basic course (Cronin & Glenn, 1991; Garside, 2002). Essentially, the goal of these courses is to implement communication instruction and assignments in courses outside of the discipline that build upon the instruction received in the basic communication course (Dannels & Gaffney, 2009). Although these programs have sparked controversy within the National Communication Association, they have both advantages and disadvantages for students and for communication departments (Cronin & Glenn, 1991; Dannels, 2001; Hoffs, 1994). A full discussion of SAC and CAC initiatives is beyond the scope of this paper, but such programs raise the question of how much and how well public speaking competence as a general education outcome is assessed across the university.

In their research on the basic communication course, Morreale et al. (2006) found that 85% of those departments surveyed used competency-based assessments. Most of these assessments relied on instruments developed by instructors (69%) or departmental assessment processes (24%). Only 3% of those teaching the basic course employed a university-wide assessment process, suggesting that though we may be proficient at assessing public speaking competence in our communication courses, for the most part our colleagues across campus lack the skills and tools necessary to gauge the extent to which their own courses contribute to public speaking competence during the trajectory of students’ education.

It is possible to identify essential expectations and criteria shared within and across institutions (Rhodes, 2010). Communication faculty are being asked to assist in the

creation of standardized assessments of oral communication competence on their own campuses. These assessment efforts are expected to intensify as the demand for greater accountability in higher education by federal and state agencies intensifies (Morreale & Backlund, 2007). Although efforts to date have been commendable, “The next generation of assessment will need to expand upon these practices with more precise and detailed strategies” (Morreale & Backlund, 2007, p. 48).

This research represents an attempt to move to the next generation of public speaking competence assessment via the development of a universally intelligible public speaking rubric that can be used by faculty and students across disciplines. In this article, we describe the development of a core set of public speaking outcomes which form the basis of the Public Speaking Competence Rubric (PSCR). We begin with a review of core public speaking competencies that appear across current public speaking rubrics, followed by a brief review of rubric types. The next sections describe the methods and results of two tests of the PSCR, particularly focusing on the factor structure and predictive validity of the measure. In the last portion of the paper, we discuss the potential applications of the rubric, limitations, and directions for future research.

Assessing Public Speaking Competencies

Although there are a limited number of rubrics published in the academic literature (Morreale, Moore, Surges-Tatum, & Webster, 2007; Morreale, Rubin & Jones, 1998; Thomson & Rucker, 2002), researchers have conducted a number of studies involving the assessment of public speaking both inside and outside the communication discipline (Allen, 2002; Blaszczyński & Green, 2010; Gschwend, 2000; Jones & RiCharde, 2005; Kirby & Romine, 2009; LaBanca, 2011; Morreale & Backlund, 2007; Noblitt, Vance, & DePoy Smith, 2010; Quianthy, 1990; Quianthy & Hefferin, 1999; Rhodes, 2010; Rubin, 1985; Weimann & Backlund, 1980). Each of these studies and rubrics identifies what their author(s) consider to be core competencies for the practice of public speaking. This section both describes and evaluates current approaches to assessing public speaking proficiency by first outlining the competencies contained in evaluations (i.e., the content) as well as the framework of evaluations (i.e., the measurement scale).

Public Speaking Competencies

In the 1970’s, the National Communication Association began an extensive project to identify core competencies for students (Morreale, Rubin, & Jones, 1998). Although a detailed discussion of the history of that effort is past the scope of this current study, it provides a useful starting point for identifying core public speaking competencies. Analyzing the product of the NCA’s efforts (Quianthy, 1990), along with published public speaking rubrics (Lucas, 2007; Morreale et al., 2007; Rhodes, 2010; Thomson & Rucker, 2002), reveals several central core competencies to include in any measure of public speaking proficiency.

Quianthy and Hefferin (1999) argue that “Effective oral communication involves generating messages and delivering them with attention to vocal variety, articulation,

and nonverbal signals” (p. 28). From this definition, the author outlines seven competencies across two general categories: message composition and message delivery. Within message composition are the competencies of purpose determination, topic choice, and fulfillment of oral discourse, which involves the identification and use of an appropriate thesis statement, supporting material, strategic word choice, and transition statements. The four competencies pertaining to delivery are vocal variety, articulation, language use, and nonverbal behavior. The author also argues that speakers should demonstrate well-adapted interpersonal skills, self-awareness, and a conversational approach to presentation. Together, this list identifies several competencies associated with adaptive message creation and message delivery.

In a recent follow-up to their initial 1998 study, Morreale et al. (2007) engaged in extensive testing of the Competent Speaker Speech Evaluation Form (CSSEF; see Table 1). The CSSEF roughly reflects the competencies already articulated by NCA. Accompanied by a training manual that outlines the history, development, and use of the measure (<http://www.natcom.org>), the rubric comprises eight items assessed on a 3-point scale. The items assess how well a speaker engages in topic creation; purpose; vocal expression; organization; pronunciation, grammar, and articulation; physical behavior; language use; and use of supporting material. These eight items correspond to Quianthy’s (1990) competencies of purpose determination, topic selection, organization, articulation, vocal variety, nonverbal behavior, language use, and use of supporting material.

Along with the CSSEF, Thomson and Rucker’s (2002) Public Speaking Competency Instrument (see Table 2) is one of a handful of published rubrics for evaluating public speaking competence. The PSCS comprises 20 items measured on a 5-point scale. These items can be categorized into seven groupings: speech introduction (items 1–3), organization (items 4 and 5), supporting material (items 6–8), speech conclusion (items 9–12), verbal delivery (items 13, 14, 17, and 18), nonverbal delivery (items 15, 16, and 19), and general competence (item 20). With the exception of language use, Thomson and Rucker’s rubric roughly reflects the competencies comprising the message creation and delivery categories.

Table 1 Presentational Competencies from the NCA Competent Speaker Speech Evaluation Form (Morreale et al., 2007)

Item	Description
1	Chooses and narrows the topic appropriately for the audience and occasion
2	Communicates the specific purpose in a manner appropriate for the audience and occasion
3	Provides supporting material (including electronic and nonelectronic presentational aids) appropriate for the audience and occasion
4	Uses an organizational pattern appropriate to the topic, audience, occasion, and purpose
5	Uses language appropriate to the audience and occasion
6	Uses vocal variety in rate, pitch, and intensity (volume) to heighten and maintain interest appropriate to the audience and occasion
7	Uses pronunciation, grammar and articulation appropriate to the audience and occasion
8	Uses physical behaviors that support the verbal message

Table 2 Speaking Competencies from the Public Speaking Competency Instrument (Thomson & Rucker, 2002)

Item	Description
1	The speech begins with a strong attention getter
2	The purpose of the speech is clear in the introduction
3	I can identify the speech introduction
4	I can identify the main points in the speech body
5	The pattern of organization is clear in the body
6	Supporting material in the body of the speech is adequate
7	Supporting material in the body of the speech adds interest to the speech
8	Supporting material in the body of the speech aids my understanding of the topic
9	I can identify the speech conclusion
10	I can identify the purpose in the speech conclusion
11	I can identify a review of the main points in the conclusion
12	The closing of the speech is strong
13	The speaker's pace/speed makes the speech understandable
14	The speaker's volume makes the speech understandable
15	The speaker's behaviors (i.e., gestures) is smooth
16	The speaker's eye contact adds to the speech effect
17	The speaker is relaxed and comfortable when speaking
18	The speaker uses her/his voice expressively
19	The speaker uses his/her body expressively
20	The speaker is a competent communicator

In addition to the two rubrics discussed above, Lucas (2007) also proposed a speech evaluation form in his instructor's manual companion to his popular public speaking textbook (see Table 3). This form uses 22 items measured on a 5-point scale to assess five general categories: introduction (items 1–5), body (6–12), conclusion (items 13 and 14), delivery (items 15–18), and overall (items 19–22). In general, the measure is quite similar to the PSCS discussed above both in terms of measurement and item content.

Most recently, the Association of American Colleges and Universities (2007) undertook the construction of a series of descriptive rubrics to measure core undergraduate outcomes in a project entitled Value Assessment of Learning in Undergraduate Education (VALUE; see Table 4). One of the rubrics was the Oral Communication rubric, which was designed primarily for institutional use. This assessment tool was much broader than the previous rubrics. In fact, using a 4-point scale, the rubric identifies only five general competencies: organization, language, delivery, supporting material, and central message.

Across these rubrics, nine competencies were evident. Roughly corresponding to Quianthy's (1990) original list, these included determination of topic and purpose, use of supporting material, organization of ideas, speech introduction, speech conclusion, language use, verbal delivery, nonverbal delivery, and audience adaptation. The primary difference between the competencies emerging from the rubrics and Quianthy's list is the differentiation of introduction and conclusion from the organization category. Additionally, two of the rubrics (PSCS and the Lucas [2007] evaluation) nuance the fulfillment of the purpose of oral discourse by turning three

Table 3 Lucas (2007) Speech Evaluation Form

Item	Description
1	Gained attention and interest
2	Introduced topic clearly
3	Established credibility
4	Previewed body of speech
5	Related to audience
6	Main points clear
7	Main points fully supported
8	Organization well planned
9	Language accurate
10	Language clear, concise
11	Language appropriate
12	Connectives effective
13	Prepared audience for ending
14	Reinforced central idea
15	Maintained eye contact
16	Used voice effectively
17	Used physical action effectively
18	Presented visual aids well
19	Topic challenging
20	Specific purpose well chosen
21	Speech adapted to audience
22	Speech completed in time limit

of the five subtopics (supporting materials, organization, and word choice) into their own competencies. Thus, rubrics with appropriate content validity need to be able to address these nine core areas.

This is not to suggest that the nine competencies are the only areas in need of assessment. For example, the core competencies above reflect simply a baseline for assessment. Consideration of a selection of popular speaking textbooks (Beebe & Beebe, 2013; Brydon & Scott, 2008; Lucas, 2007; O'Hair, Stewart, & Rubenstein, 2010) revealed two additional competencies to consider: visual aids and persuasiveness. Although these competencies are not always applicable, valid assessment of persuasive speeches and/or speeches involving visual aids requires the consideration of these competences. Thus, evident in the literature on public speaking assessment were nine core competencies and two additional competencies that were appropriate for use under specific circumstances.

Types of Rubrics

Along with determining the content of public speaking assessments, it is important to look at the measurement approaches used by the instruments. There are two primary types of rubrics used to assess public speaking performance: rating scales and descriptive rubrics. This section describes and evaluates the two rubric types.

A rating scale rubric includes a list of the key competencies along with a rating scale to demonstrate a degree or level of aptitude. Performance levels on ratings scales

Table 4 Oral Communication Competencies, Achievement Levels, and Sample Performance Descriptions from the AAC&U Oral Communication Value Rubric (2010)

<i>Oral Communication Competencies</i>				
Organization				
Language				
Delivery				
Supporting Material				
Central Message				
<i>Achievement Levels and Sample Performance Descriptions</i>				
Milestone				
	Capstone 4	3	2	Benchmark 1
Organization	Organizational pattern (specific introduction and conclusion, sequenced material within the body, and transitions) is clearly and consistently observable, is skillful, and makes the content of the presentation cohesive	Organizational pattern (specific introduction and conclusion, sequenced material within the body, and transitions) is clearly and consistently observable within the presentation	Organizational pattern (specific introduction and conclusion, sequenced material within the body, and transitions) is intermittently observable within the presentation	Organizational pattern (specific introduction and conclusion, sequenced material within the body, and transitions) is not observable within the presentation

may be numeric (i.e., a score from 1 to 5 points), they may be descriptive (i.e., good, fair, poor), they may indicate the relative presence or absence of a behavior (i.e., often, sometimes, rarely), or they may correspond to some other criterion such as a grade. Rating scale rubrics are easy to generate and to use, but they have some shortcomings (Suskie, 2009). The most significant drawback is that the performance levels are not clearly described, so the difference between performance levels labeled as *highly effective*, *effective*, and *moderately effective* is not clear. As a consequence, rating can suffer from rater subjectivity, leading to the possibility of wide score variation, particularly when there are several raters. In addition, these types of scales do not provide students with detailed feedback, which makes it difficult for them to understand their mistakes and improve their performance in the future. Thus, we concluded that the rubrics utilizing a rating scale did not fit the pedagogical and assessment goals of our campus.

Whereas rating scale rubrics lack specificity, descriptive rubrics (also known as analytic rubrics) “replace the checkboxes of rating scale rubrics with brief descriptions of the performances that merit each possible rating” (Suskie, 2009, p. 142). These descriptions spell out the performance standards for each outcome or

competency on the rubric, and consequently make explicit the difference between an *advanced* and a *proficient* performance. Descriptive rubrics are quantifiable in that raters score individual parts of the performance first and then sum or average the individual scores to obtain an overall score (Mertler, 2001).

As with rating scales, there are several advantages and disadvantages of descriptive rubrics. One advantage of these rubrics is that they can be used for both formative and summative assessment (Brookhart, 2004). Furthermore, because of their precision, descriptive rubrics are considered the gold standard of rubrics and are a good choice when assessment results may be used for major decisions (accreditation, funding, or program continuance), when several faculty are assessing student work (the precision allows raters to be more systematic and less subjective in rating performance), when it is important to give students detailed feedback on their strengths and weaknesses, and when “skeptical audiences will be examining the rubric scores with a critical eye” (Suskie, 2009, p. 145). From an institutional self-accountability standpoint, these types of rubrics are more useful as they are objective and allow for the evaluation of outcomes over fixed points in time, thereby allowing for longitudinal assessment of undergraduate learning (Katz, 2008). The disadvantages of descriptive rubrics include the considerable time investment in creating the rubrics (Suskie, 2009) and the fact that raters may find that initially scoring takes longer with descriptive rubrics than with rating scale rubrics (Bargainnier, 2004; Brookhart 2004). However, the degree of feedback gained for students and teachers is significant, making the advantage of using descriptive rubrics substantial (Mertler, 2001).

In short, both approaches—rating scales and descriptive rubrics—have their relative advantages and disadvantages. Although rating scales may work well under certain conditions, the pedagogical and institutional advantages of descriptive rubrics suggests that they may be better candidates for providing a reliable way to assess public speaking proficiency for both expert and nonexpert evaluators.

Evaluation of Existing Measures of Public Speaking Competence

Given the discussion above, there were two criteria to use when evaluating the suitability of current public speaking evaluation instruments. Namely, to what extent do they measure all relevant content areas, and how effective is the measurement approach? Applying these criteria to current assessments reveals both strengths and weaknesses of these instruments.

Although each of the rubrics discussed above addresses some of the nine competencies to differing degrees, there were apparent limitations to each in terms of item precision and assessment. Regarding precision, the measures appeared to be problematic either for not being precise enough or for being overly specific. For example, the AAC&U’s VALUE rubric (Rhodes, 2010) suffered from a lack of precision, simply outlining five general criteria. In the CSSEF, seven of the eight competencies hinged on “being appropriate to the audience and the occasion” (Morreale et al., 2007, pp. 13–16). However, *audience adaptation* seems to be a competency that is distinct from practices such as use of supporting materials and

organization. For example, it is possible to use an extensive number of sources with the possibility that the audience might not find those sources to be credible. On the other hand, measures such as Thomson and Rucker's (2002) PSCS appeared to be overly specific at some points, separating, for example, *identification* of an introduction from its *quality*. Essentially, whether the instruments above provided an appropriate level of accuracy was up for debate.

Additionally, some of the measures appeared to suffer from either too many items to assess or too few. Both Lucas' (2007) assessment form and the PSCS contained over 20 items on which to evaluate a speaker. Evaluating a speech on so many items, although likely enhancing precision, can be problematic in its inefficiency and length. On the opposite end of the spectrum, the VALUE rubric (Rhodes, 2010) simply contained five items. In all, the content of these rubrics left room for improvement.

In terms of method of measurement, each of the rubrics followed a similar approach in that they used a rating scale. However, given the problems of rating scales and the potential benefits of descriptive rubrics, there was reason to believe that an alternative method of measurement may be more conducive to thorough and reliable assessment. In short, although each of these rubrics has their strengths, there appeared to be a need for a rubric that assessed all nine core competencies and two optional skills in a way that gave appropriate feedback to students and held sufficient precision.

Methods

Measure Development

Serving on both the communication department and the university general education outcomes assessment committees, the first author of this research project was commissioned with the task of either locating or constructing a public speaking assessment tool that would have utility for classroom instruction, speech grading and student assessment in both the Fundamentals of Speech course and in upper-level courses in other disciplines. Because the instrument was to be used by students and faculty outside of the communication department, it needed to be applicable to a range of different speeches and universally intelligible by those who had minimal exposure to communication instruction.

Based on the extant research on competencies, the instrument was designed to assess nine core outcomes and two optional outcomes (see Table 5). Each of these competencies was measured on a 5-point scale. Five levels of performance, with corresponding scores and descriptors, were selected to provide more precision in feedback for faculty evaluators and students. Performance levels were arranged in order from best to substandard performance (i.e., advanced, proficient, basic, minimal, deficient). As per Bargainnier's (2004) suggestion, to the extent possible, the outcomes were sequenced to flow with the natural steps of the speech. The descriptions of the different score levels were developed (first top level of performance, then lowest level of performance, then intermediate levels of performance), with each

Table 5 Core and Optional Performance Standards for the PSCR

Item	Competency
<i>Core performance standards</i>	
1	Select a topic appropriate to the audience and occasion
2	Formulate an introduction that orients the audience to the topic and speaker
3	Use an effective organizational pattern
4	Locate, synthesize and employ compelling supporting materials
5	Develop a conclusion that reinforces the thesis and provides psychological closure
6	Demonstrate a careful choice of words
7	Effectively use vocal expression and paralinguistics to engage the audience
8	Demonstrate nonverbal behavior that reinforces the message
9	Successfully adapt the presentation to the audience
<i>Optional performance standards</i>	
10	Skillfully make use of visual aids
11	Construct an effectual persuasive message with credible evidence

Table 6 Description of Performance Standards

Standard	Description
Advanced	Language is exceptionally clear, imaginative and vivid; completely free from bias, grammar errors and inappropriate usage
Proficient	Language appropriate to the goals of the presentation; no conspicuous errors in grammar; no evidence of bias
Basic	Language selection adequate; some errors in grammar; language at times misused (e.g., jargon, slang, awkward structure)
Minimal	Grammar and syntax need to be improved as can level of language sophistication; occasionally biased
Deficient	Many errors in grammar and syntax; extensive use of jargon, slang, sexist/racist terms or mispronunciations

dimension or outcome considered separately for each level of performance (see Appendix A). Table 6 provides a sample description for word choice.

Before proceeding to test the measure, we asked faculty members at our university to provide feedback as to its face validity. They suggested changing the point values on the measurement scale from a range of 1–5 points to a range of 0–4 points, where 0 points indicated the absence of the competency. In addition, faculty suggested very minor changes in the phrasing of several descriptors. After responding to that feedback and making the alteration, we began an empirical assessment of the measure that involved two studies, as well as an analysis of its predictive validity using grades obtained during speech classes.

Study 1

The first assessment utilized 45 speeches artifacts (16 informative and 29 persuasive) located using a convenience sample drawn from two introductory speech classes taught by the second author and another instructor at the university. Course professors asked

students in their classes if they would be willing to allow their recorded informative and persuasive speeches to be analyzed to test the validity of a new public speaking rubric. If students agreed to participate, they were asked to read and sign the human subjects consent form. No extra credit was offered. All students' speeches were recorded so as to provide a consistent classroom speech environment, with only the speeches of the individuals who gave their informed consent being used as data.

Five faculty members (including two of the authors) volunteered to serve as coders. Of the five coders, three were Communication faculty members, one was a faculty member in Political Science, and one was an administrator in Institutional Assessment. The three Communication faculty members had public speaking teaching and assessment experience, whereas the other two coders had limited experience in speech assessment.

Coders underwent training on the rubric using sample student speeches found online or recorded in the classroom at the university. Before practice coding began, the lead author explained each item on the rubric, walking the coders through the descriptions. The coders then practiced using the PSCR by watching each speech and discussing their ratings. To ensure appropriate level of agreement before the actual assessment of speeches, we assessed intercoder reliability on both informative and persuasive speeches using the intraclass correlation coefficient of absolute agreement statistic (Shrout & Fleiss, 1979). Results suggested an appropriate level of agreement ($r \geq .7$) on all items and on overall rating to proceed. Coders first assessed the group of informative speeches before the persuasive speeches. Coding took place over several days to try to minimize the effects of fatigue on assessment.

Data analysis proceeded in two stages using SPSS. First, we explored intercoder reliabilities on each of the items and the overall score using intraclass correlation of absolute agreement. The next stage involved the use of exploratory factor analysis to investigate the underlying factor structure of the model without an assumption of a single factor structure. Instead, in line with Quianthy's (1990) articulation of two competency categories, analysis proceeded on the assumption that, for example, organization, content, and delivery could represent three different (yet positively correlated) factors. That is, a speaker could have excellent delivery of a poorly structured and supported speech. Because content and delivery could be positively correlated with one another rather than opposites, we used principal components analysis with an oblique (direct oblimin) rotation rather than an orthogonal rotation procedure such as varimax. Interpretation of the results involved the inspection of the Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) statistic, the results of Bartlett's test of sphericity, the item plot, the scree plot, and item communalities in the context of research and theory on public speaking to determine the appropriate number of factors to accept in a model (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2001).

Results

Inspection of intraclass correlations indicated sufficient intercoder agreement on most items and an overall score (see Table 7). Additionally, the KMO statistic (.878)

Table 7 Intraclass Coefficients (r), Study One

Item	Overall	Informative	Persuasive
1	.64	.62	.37
2	.79	.82	.68
3	.8	.83	.65
4	.84	.85	.87
5	.84	.85	.86
6	.85	.84	.70
7	.84	.86	.78
8	.77	.83	.524
9	.54	.54	.56
10	.7	N/A	.7
11	.814	N/A	.814
Overall	.91	.93	.88

and Bartlett's statistic ($\chi^2(36) = 202.93, p = .000$) indicated that the measure was suitable for factor analysis.

A two-factor model emerged, accounting for 68.9% of the total variance. Inspection of the pattern matrix and item plot revealed a complex structure, with items two and nine loading similarly onto both factors and other items (four and seven) loading weakly onto their factors. When adding items 10 and 11, the underlying factor structure became less clear. Additionally, during the assessment of the speeches, intraclass correlations among the five coders for two items—item one (topic appropriateness) and item nine (audience adaptation)—were lower than desired, particularly during persuasive speeches.

Discussion

The initial study revealed two important findings. First, in line with our assumptions, it suggested the possibility that a single-factor structure may not adequately match the data and that a multifactor measure may be more valid. Second, overall, it suggested that, while the majority of items could be interpreted and utilized consistently across multiple coders (of varying experience levels), the clarity of the descriptions of items one and nine could be improved to enhance the reliability of the measure. Doing so could also improve the simplicity of the underlying factor structure. As a result, after altering the descriptions for those two items, a second study was used to check the reliability, factor structure, and validity of the PSCR.

Study 2

We followed up the first assessment with an analysis of 50 different speeches (25 informative and 25 persuasive) conveniently sampled from the first author's introductory public speaking classes. As in the first study, all speeches were recorded and participants were asked if they would be willing to give their consent to have their

speeches analyzed. Only speeches of those students who read and signed the human subjects consent form were used as data.

Because there was an interest in whether nonexperts could reliably use the PSCR, the second author recruited three undergraduate Communication students from an undergraduate research methods course to serve as coders alongside the lead author. As with the first study, coders were trained on the rubric using sample student speeches either found online or recorded in the classroom at the university. Before practice coding began, the lead author explained each item on the rubric, walking the coders through the descriptions. After this, the coders watched each speech and then discussed their ratings using the PSCR. As with the first study, intercoder agreement was measured using the intraclass correlation coefficient of absolute agreement (Shrout & Fleiss, 1979). Results suggested an appropriate level of agreement ($r \geq .7$) on all items and on overall rating to proceed. As with Study 1, coders rated the speeches independently. If there was a large discrepancy between ratings on a particular dimension, or if there were any questions as to the substance or purpose of the speech, coders asked clarifying questions of one another or justified their answers.

Data analysis of the measure followed the same approach as in Study 1. In addition to assessing intercoder agreement and factor structure, we also inspected the measure's predictive validity, comparing the PSCR score to the grade assigned to the speech by the lead author during her class.

Results

Examination of intercoder agreement expressed as intraclass coefficients demonstrated somewhat improved reliabilities for items one and nine, although agreement during persuasive speeches was lower than desired (see Table 8). Looking at items one through nine, both the KMO (.830) and Bartlett's statistic ($\chi^2 (36) = 224.048$, $p = .000$) indicated the suitability of the model for factor analysis.

As with the first assessment, two factors with eigenvalues greater than 1 emerged, along with a third factor with an eigenvalue of .954, accounting for 63.83% of the variance but with a somewhat complex structure. In examining the scree and item

Table 8 Intraclass Coefficients (r), Study Two

Item	Overall	Informative	Persuasive
1	.69	.82	.51
2	.76	.79	.65
3	.81	.85	.69
4	.93	.95	.88
5	.75	.86	.82
6	.73	.69	.77
7	.83	.85	.82
8	.70	.80	.46
9	.86	.90	.81
10	.83	.85	.72
11	.84	N/A	.84
Overall	.93	.94	.921

Table 9 Means, Standard Deviations, and Intraclass Correlations, Items 1–11, Assessment 2

Item	M	SD	Intraclass correlation
1 Selects a topic appropriate to the audience and occasion	2.59	.39	.694
2 Formulates an introduction that orients the audience to the topic and speaker	2.43	.44	.761
3 Uses an effective organizational pattern	2.36	.50	.807
4 Locates, synthesizes, and employs compelling supporting materials	2.13	.91	.931
5 Develops a conclusion that reinforces the thesis and provides psychological closure	2.35	.44	.751
6 Demonstrates a careful choice of words	2.59	.42	.728
7 Effectively uses a vocal expression and paralanguage to engage the audience	2.17	.58	.835
8 Demonstrates nonverbal behavior that reinforces the message	1.78	.4	.701
9 Successfully adapts the presentation to the audience	2.19	.53	.864
10 Skillfully makes use of visual aids	2.10	.55	.833
11 Constructs an effectual persuasive message with credible evidence	2.20	.54	.840

plots along with item communalities (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2001), we hypothesized that a three-factor model would be more appropriate. The three factor model did, in fact, fit the data more closely than did the original two-factor model, resulting in a simple scale that accounted for all nine items and explained 74.42% of the variance. Items 1 and 9 (topic adaptation) loaded onto one factor ($\alpha = .72$), items 2–7 (speech presentation) loaded onto another factor ($\alpha = .854$), and item 8 (nonverbal delivery) loaded onto its own factor (see Table 9–11).

When adding item 10 (use of visual aids), a three-factor solution was most appropriate when considering item plots, communalities, and the screen plot. This solution accounted for 76.32% of the variance. Items 1, 4, 6, and 9 (topic adaptation) loaded onto one factor ($\alpha = .748$), items 2, 3, 5, 7, and 10 (speech presentation)

Table 10 Interitem correlations, Items 1–11, Assessment 2

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
1	–										
2	.470**	–									
3	.409**	.792**	–								
4	.491**	.520**	.512**	–							
5	.352*	.638**	.674**	.622**	–						
6	.508**	.439**	.462**	.552**	.507**	–					
7	.266	.595**	.503**	.512**	.586**	.472**	–				
8	.286	.363	.252	.222	.258	.111	.350	–			
9	.591**	.529**	.625**	.510**	.466**	.390**	.158	.306*	–		
10	.544**	.611**	.678**	.427*	.577**	.463*	.703**	.524**	.445*	–	
11	.243	.637**	.665**	.711**	.755**	.533**	.437*	.162	.628**	.126	–

* $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$

Table 11 Factor Loadings and Communalities, Items 1–9, Assessment 2

	Item name	Factor 1	Factor 2	Factor 3	h^2
1	Selects a topic appropriate to the audience and occasion	.053	.821	.033	.719
2	Formulates an introduction that orients the audience to the topic and speaker	.676	.217	.230	.740
3	Uses an effective organizational pattern	.635	.297	.092	.691
4	Locates, synthesizes, and employs compelling supporting materials	.623	.308	-.141	.648
5	Develops a conclusion that reinforces the thesis and provides psychological closure	.825	.060	-.012	.727
6	Demonstrates a careful choice of words	.608	.283	-.354	.659
7	Effectively uses a vocal expression and paralanguage to engage the audience	.974	-.340	.146	.824
8	Demonstrates supportive nonverbal behavior	.103	.184	.879	.873
9	Successfully adapts the presentation to the audience	.034	.872	.136	.817

Table 12 Factor Loadings and Communalities, Items 1–10, Assessment 2

	Item Name	Factor 1	Factor 2	Factor 3	h^2
1	Selects a topic appropriate to the audience and occasion	-.061	.214	.876	.818
2	Formulates an introduction that orients the audience to the topic and speaker	.804	.052	.100	.786
3	Uses an effective organizational pattern	.989	-.165	-.012	.886
4	Locates, synthesizes, and employs compelling supporting materials	.127	-.022	.783	.742
5	Develops a conclusion that reinforces the thesis and provides psychological closure	.818	-.122	.117	.744
6	Demonstrates a careful choice of words	-.038	-.158	.874	.699
7	Effectively uses a vocal expression and paralanguage to engage the audience	.765	.278	-.062	.738
8	Demonstrates supportive nonverbal behavior	.010	.955	.045	.938
9	Successfully adapts the presentation to the audience	.232	.104	.539	.544
10	Skillfully makes use of visual aids	.595	.376	.101	.736

loaded onto another factor ($\alpha = .863$), and item 8 (nonverbal delivery) again loaded onto its own factor (see Table 12).

When adding item 11 (construction of an effectual persuasive message) to the measure along with items one through nine, a three-factor model also appeared, with all three factors having eigenvalues above 1. The model accounted for 78.72% of the variance. Items 1 and 9 (topic adaptation) loaded onto one factor ($\alpha = .758$); items 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, and 11 (speech presentation) loaded onto another factor ($\alpha = .899$); and item 8 (nonverbal delivery) again loaded onto its own factor (see Table 13).

Measure Validity

To investigate the predictive validity of the measure, we compared the scores on these speeches with the percentage grades assigned to these speeches during the semester. For the measure to be valid, the overall average score generated using this measure

Table 13 Factor Loadings and Communalities, Items 1–9, and 11, Assessment 2

	Item Name	Factor 1	Factor 2	Factor 3	h^2
1	Selects a topic appropriate to the audience and occasion	-.024	.791	.118	.664
2	Formulates an introduction that orients the audience to the topic and speaker	.561	.011	.377	.709
3	Uses an effective organizational pattern	.537	.389	.342	.789
4	Locates, synthesizes, and employs compelling supporting materials	.900	.074	-.189	.791
5	Develops a conclusion that reinforces the thesis and provides psychological closure	.725	.184	.223	.765
6	Demonstrates a careful choice of words	.770	.044	.116	.669
7	Effectively uses a vocal expression and paralinguistics to engage the audience	.852	-.555	.026	.827
8	Demonstrates supportive nonverbal behavior	-.027	.019	.938	.874
9	Successfully adapts the presentation to the audience	.358	.826	-.081	.913
10	Skillfully makes use of visual aids	.864	.280	-.176	.872

should be positively correlated with the grades assigned to the speeches using different rubrics during the semester. The informative speech grading rubric used in the classroom comprised 20 items measured on a 5-point Likert-type scale. The persuasive speech grading rubric was an open-ended structured observation guide (a rubric without a rating scale; see Suskie, 2009) containing nine graded categories, a list of competencies for each category, and point values assigned to each category.

Rather than generalizing across both informative and persuasive speeches, and given that the item-loadings differed across the two speeches, we looked individually at the correlation of the overall scores and individual factor averages with the speech grade within a given genre (informative or persuasive). For informative speeches (all of which used visual aids), positive, significant correlations emerged between speech grade and overall score ($r = .723, p = .000$), factor 3 score (items 1, 4, 6, and 9) ($r = .660, p = .000$) and factor one score (items 2, 3, 5, 7, and 10) ($r = .665, p = .000$), but not for item 8 ($r = .317, p = .122$). For persuasive speeches (of which all but five did not use visual aids), speech grade was significantly and positively correlated with overall score ($r = .572, p = .008$) and factor one score (all items except 1, 8, and 9) ($r = .607, p = .005$), but not with factor two (items 1 and 9) ($r = .248, p = .291$) or item 8 ($r = .026, p = .914$). In short, for the most part, the PSCR demonstrated somewhat strong predictive validity.

Discussion

The purpose of study 2 was to investigate the effects of clarifying items 1 and 9 and to explore whether inexperienced coders could reliably use the measure. Investigation of the reliabilities and underlying factor structure suggested a clearer measure, though with some potential areas for improvement.

With regard to informative speeches, the PSCR demonstrated sufficient reliability and predictive validity. With regard to persuasive speeches, the lower intercoder reliabilities may have weakened its predictive validity. Two additional factors may

have had an impact on the predictive validity scores. First, different grading rubrics were used for the informative and the persuasive speeches. In addition, speech coding occurred after the semester had ended, and only the raw scores from students' speeches were available, but the students' ability to stay within the time limit and their scores on their speech outlines were also calculated into their final grade for the speech. While the ability to limit speaking time to the constraints of the situation can be considered an aspect of speech competency, this was not one of the competencies directly measured on the PSCR. What's more, though it can be argued that outline construction may show evidence of *knowledge* of speech competency, this facet of speaking is not inevitably correlated with competency and also was not addressed on our instrument.

Two other observations are worth noting. First, when adding item 10 (visual aids), the underlying factor structure changed, with items 4 and 6 moving to a different factor. This movement of items to a different factor may have occurred because visual aid use was more strongly associated with both organizational clarity and dynamism rather than topic adaptation. For example, inspection of Table 12 reveals that the item referring to organizational pattern loaded most highly onto factor 1. Visual aids may have been associated with the clarity of speech organization in that students used slides to distinguish and identify speech components such as the introduction (factor 2), body (factor 3), and conclusion (factor 5). Visual aids also may have been associated with vocal expression in that they both assess delivery style (i.e., visual dynamism and vocal dynamism). This ordering of items may have led to items 4 (supporting material) and 6 (language use) being more closely associated with message creation (though supporting material) and adaptation (through language).

The final observation is with regard to item 8. Across both studies, item 8 (nonverbal behavior) continued to stand by itself. It did not correlate significantly with either informative or persuasive speech grades. However, the lack of a significant correlation is unsurprising given that it was one item and that there are numerous other considerations besides nonverbal dynamics that come into play when undertaking speech assessment. A possible correction to this may simply involve either deleting the item or nuancing it further to break it down into two items: one regarding body language and the other regarding oculesics

General Discussion

Analysis indicated that the PSCR exhibited appropriate reliability and predictive validity. Additionally, faculty and student raters from a variety of academic departments were able to understand the descriptions provided for each item and implement them consistently. The items also loaded in a relatively simple structure, with high communalities and theoretically expected relationships among items within each factor. Thus, the psychometric data indicate that the PSCR shows promise as a measure of public speaking competence for use in both instructional and assessment contexts.

Of special interest in the findings was the emergence of a multifactor solution rather than a single-factor solution. Despite the fact that this finding may be surprising, it is not all that unexpected. Speeches require expertise in a number of areas, including researching an idea, crafting the content of the idea, and delivering the idea in a way that is well adapted and dynamic to audiences. Thomson and Rucker (2002), for example, organized the 20 items in their measure into four areas even though their data analysis revealed a single factor. It is entirely plausible that individuals may be proficient in one area (such as delivery dynamism) but lacking in another (such as content craftsmanship). The fact that the two most reliable factors that emerged related to both content and delivery suggests that the measure assesses the two primary responsibilities of a competent speaker: putting together the speech content and delivering that content well.

Implications

This study has a number of implications for public speaking instruction in the introductory course and in nonmajor courses, as well as application beyond the classroom. For speech instruction, the PSCR can serve several pedagogical functions. First, faculty can use the PSCR to articulate course and assignment expectations at the beginning of the course, as well as to provide feedback to students on their attainment of regular milestones. Although instructors tend to view rubrics narrowly as tools for grading and assessment, students report that rubrics help them learn and achieve (Reddy & Andrade, 2010). Research indicates that students appreciate rubrics because they are useful in planning their approaches to assignments, help them to produce higher quality work, help them to focus their efforts and reduce their anxiety about assignments (Andrade & Du, 2005). Students also report that rubrics help them to identify critical issues in assignments, help determine the amount of effort needed for an assignment, and help students estimate their own grades prior to turning in the assignment (Bolton, 2006). The PSCR provides students with a clear description of what is expected in advance of their speech assignment. Additionally, because it provides students with a clear picture of where each aspect of their performance is located on a continuum of skill sets, it can help reduce questions about grades.

Second, the PSCR may help level the playing field in the speech classroom. Marcotte (2006) argues that withholding assessment tools like rubrics is unfair to students, because when instructors do not explicitly articulate the qualities they are looking for when grading, learning becomes a hit-or-miss endeavor. She adds, "The result is that many students struggle blindly, especially nontraditional, unsuccessful, or underprepared students who tend to miss many of the implied expectations of a college instructor, expectations that better prepared, traditional students readily internalize" (p. 3). Levi and Stevens (2010) concur that rubrics are particularly helpful for nontraditional students (who have an increasing presence on our campuses) such as non-native speakers of English, international students, students

who are the first in their families to go to college, and students who are less well attuned to the expectations of the university.

Third, faculty can use the rubric not only to grade and provide feedback on speeches, but also to train students to use the PSCR as a means of self- and peer-evaluation. According to Gschwend (2000), the primary purpose of rubrics should be to enrich student learning by providing students with specific feedback about the strengths and weaknesses of their performance, so that students can take ownership of the learning process and set goals for their own achievement. It is in this practice of self-assessment that students develop habits of mind that encourage them to be lifelong learners. Evaluating peers' speeches with the PSCR, can not only provide an additional source of feedback for the speakers who are being evaluated, but it can also allow student raters to recognize and avoid common pitfalls and to emulate the behaviors of effective speakers.

In addition to its pedagogical versatility for speech instructors, the rubric can also be used by faculty across campus because it allows them to add their own course or assignment-specific outcomes to the rubric. Because of the clarity of the item descriptions, faculty outside of the communication department can learn to use the PSCR to score speeches so that students can refine their public speaking skills as they progress through their major coursework. Evaluating students' presentations across programs allows students to grasp the key components of effective presentations and use feedback from their last presentation to improve performance on their next presentation (Bargainnier, 2004; Moskal, 2001). The PSCR and accompanying scoring sheet (see Appendices B and C) were designed so that items could be removed or added without impacting the average final score. For instance, item 10 (students will skillfully make use of visual aids) can be omitted from the scoring sheet if the student's speech does not contain a visual aid. The score is simply computed by adding the scores from the relevant outcomes, and then it is averaged by dividing the total by the number of items scored. This enables faculty to focus on all or just a portion of the learning outcomes, depending upon the goals of the course assignment. This also means that discipline-specific presentation outcomes can be added to the rubric, while still maintaining the core public speaking outcomes.

Finally, to maintain campus-wide consistency in analyzing the extent to which core public speaking standards are being met, the PSCR can be used as instrument for institutional assessment. In the context of general education outcomes, using a common rubric can provide uniformity across courses without impact to faculty's academic freedom and flexibility in the classroom (Katz, 2008). For example, the instrument can be used in the classroom while students are giving presentations, with the scoring sheets collected across courses for analysis. Additionally, samples of students' recorded speeches can be collected and later analyzed by an assessment committee. If it is possible to collect artifacts from the same students through the course of their college career, then longitudinal studies can also be conducted.

Such usage, though, requires two considerations. First is the issue of training. Whether working with experts who have evaluated speeches for years or nonexperts who are evaluating speeches using a rubric such as the PSCR for the first time,

institutions need to provide ample time and resources for training the evaluators in the use of the instrument. This applies for communication faculty who have evaluated speeches for years, noncommunication faculty involved in assessment, and graduate students who are beginning their classroom development. Such training can sharpen eyes for detail as well as help evaluators gain a better appreciation for the nuances of speech evaluation. This training, though, raises possible political implications, particularly for CAC institutions. For example, some departments may be tempted to offer their own speech courses as substitutes for those housed in communication departments. It may also lead to a tightening of flexibility in how faculty members evaluate student speeches in their own classrooms. Such issues are worthy of consideration when undertaking assessments of competencies such as oral communication.

Limitations and Future Directions

There are a few notable limitations to this study. The first limitation concerned the narrow range and small sample size of speeches we selected for testing. Informative and persuasive speeches were only drawn from several sections of a freshman-level speech course. In addition, the small sample size in both studies may not have generated enough power to more adequately test the underlying factor structure and item loadings (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2001). Not only should future testing involve a larger sample size, but it should also aim to sample different types of speeches as well as speeches from differing grade levels. This would provide a chance to test the versatility of the PSCR in different contexts.

We also concluded that the instrument needed more refinement on several different levels. Of primary concern is item 8. Although it should logically fit under the message delivery factor, it did not load there in either study. Although we believe that the assessment of nonverbal delivery is an important component of assessing speaking competence, users of the PSCR may want to consider adding another item to complement item 8, editing the description of item 8, or even deleting it altogether. In addition, interrater reliability on the persuasive speeches was lower than we would have liked, and we need to determine whether this was a product of message agreement/disagreement, preferences for a different organizational style, or coder fatigue (in both tests the persuasive speeches were coded last). It may also be that the descriptors on this item need to be refined.

Along with the above notes, the studies did not assess the test–retest reliability of the measure. Doing so in future explorations could underscore the stability of the measure over time rather than in a single test.

Conclusion

Overall, this study was an attempt to improve upon existing measures of public speaking competence in order to aid in classroom learning and make campus assessment efforts more consistent and efficient. We developed a core set of public

speaking outcomes and an accompanying descriptive Public Speaking Competence Rubric, which is flexible enough to be used in a variety of disciplines and can accommodate a variety of assignments. Analysis of the data indicated that, with slight alterations, the instrument was an effective tool at assessing students' public speaking competence. Additionally, the evidence suggests that instructors from disciplines other than communication and students can understand and utilize the measure after minimal training. Although further testing of this instrument is warranted (particularly in different disciplinary settings), the PSCR appears to be a robust instrument for use in the classroom and as an assessment tool.

References

- Allen, T. H. (2002). Charting a communication pathway: Using assessment to guide curriculum development in a re-vitalized general education plan. *Communication Education, 51*, 26–39. doi: 10.1080/03634520216502
- Andrade, H., & Du, Y. (2005). Student perspectives on rubric-referenced assessment. *Practical Assessment, Research & Evaluation, 10*, 1–11. Retrieved from <http://pareonline.net/pdf/v10n3.pdf>
- Association of American Colleges and Universities (2007). College learning for a new global century: A report from the National Leadership Council for Liberal Education and America's Promise. Washington, DC: Association of American Colleges and Universities. Retrieved from http://www.aacu.org/leap/documents/GlobalCentury_final.pdf
- Bargainnier, S. (2004). Fundamentals of rubrics. In D. Apple (Ed.), *Faculty guidebook* (pp. 75–78). Lisle, IL: Pacific Crest.
- Beebe, S. A., & Beebe, S. J. (2013). *Public speaking handbook* (4th ed.). New York, NY: Pearson.
- Blaszczyński, C., & Green, D. J. (2010). Speaking off the cuff: Strategies and activities for developing presentation confidence. *Journal of Applied Research for Business Instruction, 8*, 1–5.
- Bolton, C. F. (2006). Rubrics and adult learners: Andragogy and assessment. *Assessment Update, 18*(3), 5–6. doi: 10.1002/au.183
- Brookhart, S. M. (2004). Assessment theory for college classrooms. *New Directions for Teaching and Learning, 100*, 5–14. doi: 10.1002/tl.165
- Brydon, S. R., & Scott, M. D. (2008). *Between one and many: The art and science of public speaking* (6th ed.). New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.
- Cronin, M. W., & Glenn, P. (1991). Oral communication across the curriculum in higher education. *Communication Education, 40*, 356–357. doi: 10.1080/03634529109378860
- Dannels, D. P. (2001). Time to speak up: A theoretical framework of situated pedagogy and practice for communication across the curriculum. *Communication Education, 50*, 144–158. doi: 10.1080/03634520109379240
- Dannels, D. P., & Gaffney, A. (2009). Communication across the curriculum and in the disciplines: A call for scholarly cross-curricular advocacy. *Communication Education, 58*, 124–153. doi: 10.1080/03634520216513
- Garside, C. (2002). Seeing the forest for the trees: A challenge facing communication across the curriculum programs. *Communication Education, 51*, 51–64. doi: 10.1080/03634520216500
- Gibson, J., Gruner, C., Hanna, M., Smythe, M. J., & Hayes, M. (1980). The basic course in speech at U.S. colleges and universities: III. *Communication Education, 29*, 1–9. doi: 10.1080/03634528009378387
- Gibson, J., Hanna, M. S., & Huddleston, B. M. (1985). The basic speech course at U.S. colleges and universities: IV. *The Basic Course Annual, 34*, 281–291. doi: 10.1080/03634528509378620

- Gschwend, L. (2000). Every student deserves an assessment tool that teaches. *Communication Teacher*, 14, 1–5.
- Hoffs, M. J. (1994, November). Building community: Integrating communication curriculum between courses in other disciplines or “Speaking Across the Curriculum.” Paper presented at the Annual meeting of the National Communication Association, New Orleans, LA.
- Jones, E. A., & RiCharde, S. (2005). *NPEC Sourcebook on assessment: Definitions and assessment methods for communication, leadership, information literacy, quantitative reasoning, and quantitative skills*. Washington, DC: National Postsecondary Education Cooperative.
- Katz, S. N. (2008). Assessment and general education: Resisting reductionism without resisting responsibility. *Liberal Education*, 94, 30–37.
- Kirby, D., & Romine, J. (2009). Develop oral presentation skills through accounting curriculum design and course-embedded assessment. *Journal of Education for Business*, 85, 172–179.
- LaBanca, F. (2011, October). The 21st century oral presentation toolbox: How to effectively implement oral presentations in your science classroom. *The Science Teacher*, 51–55.
- Levi, A. J., & Stevens, D. D. (2010). Assessment of the academy, for the academy, by the academy. In T. Rhodes (Ed.), *Assessing outcomes and improving achievement: Tips and tools for using rubrics* (pp. 5–7). Washington, DC: Association of American Colleges and Universities.
- Lucas, S. E. (2007). *Instructor’s manual to accompany the art of public speaking* (9th ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Marcotte, M. (2006). Building a better mousetrap: The rubric debate. *Viewpoints: A Journal of Departmental and Collegiate Teaching, Learning and Assessment*, 7(2), 1–11. Retrieved from <http://faculty.ccp.edu/dept/viewpoints/w06v7n2/rubrics1.htm>
- Mertler, C. A. (2001). Designing scoring rubrics for your classroom. *Practical Assessment, Research & Evaluation*, 7(25), n.p. Retrieved from <http://PAREonline.net/getvn.asp?v=7&n=25>
- Morreale, S. P., & Backlund, P. M. (2007). *Large scale assessment in oral communication: K-12 & higher education*. Washington, DC: National Communication Association. Retrieved from http://dev.natcom.org/uploadedFiles/Teaching_and_Learning/Assessment_Resources/PDF-Large_Scale_Assessment_in_Oral_Communication_3rdEd.pdf
- Morreale, S. P., Hugenberg, L., & Worley, D. (2006). The basic communication course at U.S. colleges and universities in the 21st century: Study VII. *Communication Education*, 55, 415–437. doi: 10.1080/03634520600879162
- Morreale, S. P., Moore, M. R., Surges-Tatum, D., & Webster, L. (2007). “The competent speaker” speech evaluation form (2nd ed.). Washington, DC: National Communication Association. Retrieved from http://www.natcom.org/uploadedFiles/Teaching_and_Learning/Assessment_Resources/PDF-Competent_Speaker_Speech_Evaluation_Form_2ndEd.pdf
- Morreale, S. P., Rubin, R. B., & Jones, E. (1998). Speaking and listening competencies for college students. Washington, DC: National Communication Association. Retrieved from http://www.natcom.org/uploadedFiles/Teaching_and_Learning/Assessment_Resources/PDF-Speaking_and_Listening_Competencies_for_College_Students.pdf
- Moskal, B. M. (2001). Scoring rubrics: What, when and how? *Practical Assessment, Research, and Evaluation*, 7 (3), n.p. Retrieved from <http://PAREonline.net/getvn.asp?v=7&n=3>
- Noblitt, L., Vance, D. E., & DePoy Smith, M. L. (2010). A comparison of case study and traditional teaching methods for improvement of oral communication and critical thinking skills. *Journal of College Science Teaching*, 39, 26–32.
- O’Hair, D., Stewart, R., & Rubenstein, H. (2010). *A speaker’s guidebook: Text and reference* (4th ed.). New York, NY: Bedford St. Martin’s.
- Quianthy, R. L. (1990). *Communication is life: Essential college sophomore speaking and listening competencies*. Washington, DC: National Communication Association.
- Quianthy, R., & Hefferin, D. (1999). Speak up! A college competency assessment tool. *Popular Measurement*, Spring, 27–30. Retrieved from <http://www.rasch.org/pm/pm2-27.pdf>
- Reddy, Y. M., & Andrade, H. (2010). A review of rubric use in higher education. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 33, 435–448. doi: 10.1080/02602930902862859

- Rhodes, T. (Ed.). (2010). *Assessing outcomes and improving achievement: Tips and tools for using rubrics*. Washington, DC: Association of American Colleges and Universities.
- Rubin, R. R. (1985). The validity of the communication competency assessment instrument. *Communication Monographs*, 52, 173–185. doi: 10.1080/03637758509376103
- Shrout, P. E., & Fleiss, J. L. (1979). Intraclass correlations: Uses in assessing rater reliability. *Psychological Bulletin*, 86, 420–428. doi: 10.1037//0033-2909.86.2.420
- Suskie, L. (2009). *Assessing student learning: A common sense guide* (2nd ed.). San Francisco, CA: Wiley.
- Tabachnick, B. G., & Fidell, L. S. (2001). *Using multivariate statistics* (4th ed.). Needham Heights, MA: Allyn & Bacon.
- Thomson, S., & Rucker, M. L. (2002). The development of a specialized public speaking competency scale: Test of reliability. *Communication Research Reports*, 67, 449–459. doi: 10.1080/08824090209384828
- Weimann, J. M., & Backlund, P. (1980). Current theory and research in communication competence. *Review of Educational Research*, 50, 185–199. doi: 10.3102/00346543050001185

Appendix A: Table 14

Public Speaking Competence Rubric

Performance standard The student . . .	Assessment Criteria				
	Advanced 4	Proficient 3	Basic 2	Minimal 1	Deficient 0
1. Selects a topic appropriate to the audience and occasion	Topic engages audience; topic is worthwhile, timely, and presents new information to the audience	Topic is appropriate to the audience and situation and provides some useful information to the audience	Topic is untimely or lacks originality; provides scant new information to audience	Topic is too trivial, too complex, or inappropriate for audience; topic not suitable for the situation	A single topic cannot be deduced
2. Formulates an introduction that orients audience to topic and speaker	Excellent attention getter; firmly establishes credibility; sound orientation to topic; clear thesis; preview of main points cogent and memorable	Good attention getter; generally establishes credibility; provides some orientation to topic; discernible thesis; previews main points	Attention getter is mundane; somewhat develops credibility; awkwardly composed thesis; provides little direction for audience	Irrelevant opening; little attempt to build credibility; abrupt jump into body of speech; thesis and main points can be deduced but are not explicitly stated	No opening technique; no credibility statement; no background on topic; no thesis; no preview of points
3. Uses an effective organizational pattern	Very well organized; main points clear, mutually exclusive and directly related to thesis; effective transitions and signposts	Organizational pattern is evident, main points are apparent; transitions present between main points; some use of signposts	Organizational pattern somewhat evident; main points are present but not mutually exclusive; transitions are present but are minimally effective	Speech did not flow well; speech was not logically organized; transitions present but not well formed	No organizational pattern; no transitions; sounded as if information was randomly presented

Table 14 (Continued)

Performance standard The student . . .	Assessment Criteria				
	Advanced 4	Proficient 3	Basic 2	Minimal 1	Deficient 0
4. Locates, synthesizes and employs compelling supporting materials	All key points are well supported with a variety of credible materials (e.g., facts, stats, quotes, etc.); sources provide excellent support for thesis; all sources clearly cited	Main points were supported with appropriate material; sources correspond suitably to thesis; nearly all sources cited	Points were generally supported using an adequate mix of materials; some evidence supports thesis; source citations need to be clarified	Some points were not supported; a greater quantity/quality of material needed; some sources of very poor quality	Supporting materials are nonexistent or are not cited
5. Develops a conclusion that reinforces the thesis and provides psychological closure	Provides a clear and memorable summary of points; refers back to thesis/big picture; ends with strong clincher or call to action	Appropriate summary of points; some reference back to thesis; clear clincher or call to action	Provides some summary of points; no clear reference back to thesis; closing technique can be strengthened	Conclusion lacks clarity; trails off; ends in a tone at odds with the rest of the speech	No conclusion; speech ends abruptly and without closure
6. Demonstrates a careful choice of words	Language is exceptionally clear, imaginative and vivid; completely free from bias, grammar errors and inappropriate usage	Language appropriate to the goals of the presentation; no conspicuous errors in grammar; no evidence of bias	Language selection adequate; some errors in grammar; language at times misused (e.g., jargon, slang, awkward structure)	Grammar and syntax need to be improved as can level of language sophistication; occasionally biased	Many errors in grammar and syntax; extensive use of jargon, slang, sexist/racist terms or mispronunciations
7. Effectively uses vocal expression and paralanguage to engage the audience	Excellent use of vocal variation, intensity and pacing; vocal expression natural and enthusiastic; avoids fillers	Good vocal variation and pace; vocal expression suited to assignment; few if any fillers	Demonstrates some vocal variation; enunciates clearly and speaks audibly; generally avoids fillers (e.g., um, uh, like)	Sometimes uses a voice too soft or articulation too indistinct for listeners to comfortably hear; often uses fillers	Speaks inaudibly; enunciates poorly; speaks in monotone; poor pacing; distracts listeners with fillers

Table 14 (Continued)

Performance standard The student . . .	Assessment Criteria				
	Advanced 4	Proficient 3	Basic 2	Minimal 1	Deficient 0
8. Demonstrates nonverbal behavior that supports the verbal message	Posture, gestures, facial expression and eye contact well developed, natural, and display high levels of poise and confidence	Postures, gestures and facial expressions are suitable for speech, speaker appears confident	Some reliance on notes, but has adequate eye contact, generally avoids distracting mannerisms	Speaker relies heavily on notes; nonverbal expression stiff and unnatural	Usually looks down and avoids eye con-tact; nervous gestures and nonverbal behaviors distract from or contradict the message
9. Successfully adapts the presentation to the audience	Speaker shows how information is personally important to audience; speech is skillfully tailored to audience beliefs, values, and attitudes; speaker makes allusions to culturally shared experiences	Speaker implies the importance of the topic to the audience; presentation is adapted to audience beliefs, attitudes and values; an attempt is made to establish common ground	Speaker assumes but does not articulate the importance of topic; presentation was minimally adapted to audience beliefs, attitudes, and values; some ideas in speech are removed from audience's frame of reference or experiences	The importance of topic is not established; very little evidence of audience adaptation; speaker needs to more clearly establish a connection with the audience	Speech is contrary to audience beliefs, values, and attitudes; message is generic or canned; no attempt is made to establish common ground
<i>Additional Performance Standards (To be added to grading rubric as needed)</i>					
10. Skillfully makes use of visual aids	Exceptional explanation and presentation of visual aids; visuals provide powerful insight into speech topic; visual aids of high professional quality	Visual aids well presented; use of visual aids enhances understanding; visual aids good quality	Visual aids were generally well displayed and explained; minor errors present in visuals	Speaker did not seem well practiced with visuals; visuals not fully explained; quality of visuals needs improvement	Use of the visual aids distracted from the speech; visual aids not relevant; visual aids poor professional quality

Table 14 (*Continued*)

Performance standard The student . . .	Assessment Criteria				
	Advanced 4	Proficient 3	Basic 2	Minimal 1	Deficient 0
11. Constructs an effectual persuasive message with credible evidence and sound reasoning	Articulates problem and solution in a clear, compelling manner; supports claims with powerful/credible evidence; completely avoids reasoning fallacies; memorable call to action	Problem and solution are clearly presented; claims supported with evidence and examples; sound reasoning evident; clear call to action	Problem and solution are evident; most claims are supported with evidence; generally sound reasoning; recognizable call to action	Problem and/or solution are somewhat unclear; claims not fully supported with evidence; some reasoning fallacies present; call to action vague	Problem and/or solution are not defined; claims not supported with evidence; poor reasoning; no call to action

© Lisa Schreiber 2010 Reprinted with permission.

Appendix B

PSCR Individual Student Score Sheet

Name or participant ID no. _____

Performance standards

Advanced	Proficient	Basic	Minimal	Deficient	Score
4	3	2	1	0	

The Student. . . .

1. Selects a topic appropriate to the audience and occasion
2. Formulates an introduction that orients audience to topic and Speaker
3. Uses an effective organizational pattern
4. Locates, synthesizes, and employs compelling supporting materials
5. Develops a conclusion that reinforces the thesis and provides psychological closure
6. Demonstrates a careful choice of words
7. Effectively uses vocal expression and paralanguage to engage the Audience
8. Demonstrates nonverbal behavior that supports the verbal Message
9. Successfully adapts the presentation to the audience
10. Skillfully makes use of visual aids
11. Constructs an effectual persuasive message with credible evidence and sound reasoning

Total score

Total divided by no. of relevant categories

Public Speaking Proficiency Rating

Proficiency Rating Scale (Optional)

4.00–3.25	Advanced
3.24–2.75	Proficient
2.74–2.25	Basic
2.24–1.00	Minimal
.99–0	Deficient

Appendix C

PSCR Individual Student Score Sheet: Sample Record sheet

Participant ID Number 04321

Performance standards

Advanced	Proficient	Basic	Minimal	Deficient	Score
4	3	2	1	0	

The Student . . .

1. Selects a topic appropriate to the audience and occasion	4
2. Formulates an introduction that orients audience to topic and Speaker	4
3. Uses an effective organizational pattern	3
4. Locates, synthesizes and employs compelling supporting materials	4
5. Develops a conclusion that reinforces the thesis and provides psychological closure	3
6. Demonstrates a careful choice of words	3
7. Effectively uses vocal expression and paralanguage to engage the Audience	2
8. Demonstrates nonverbal behavior that supports the verbal Message	3
9. Successfully adapts the presentation to the audience	4
10. Skillfully makes use of visual aids	3
11. Constructs an effectual persuasive message with credible evidence and sound reasoning	N/A

Total score	33
Total divided by no. of relevant categories	3.3
Public Speaking Proficiency Rating	Advanced

Copyright of Communication Education is the property of Taylor & Francis Ltd and its content may not be copied or emailed to multiple sites or posted to a listserv without the copyright holder's express written permission. However, users may print, download, or email articles for individual use.