Every discipline needs to examine its product periodically by scrutinizing the research it is producing. A descriptive examination of the research of a discipline is important from two perspectives. First, it seems that an appropriate way to define an area of study is to examine the research produced within the parameters of the area. It is reasonable to state a priori what a given area of research ought to do, or ought to investigate, but an actual assessment of the research must be made a posteriori. Second, a descriptive examination is a critical step in theory building. It allows for an examination of content and research development within an area and also enables scholars to chart the emerging trends and needed directions for research.

Within the discipline of speech communication, the area of “communication and instruction,” including both communication education and instructional communication, is one in which periodic assessments of research have not been forthcoming. Certainly we do have some excellent overviews of research, but these are limited in various ways and each examines only a portion of the research and does not view it in its entirety.

Feezel, for instance, examined recent trends in certain major areas of speech communication research, but he imposed pre-selected categories upon the research and reviewed only 24 studies. Newcombe and Allen set forth seven guidelines for research in speech communication education, but did not actually review relevant research for each guideline. Scott and Wheless provided a fine overview of instructional communication theory and research, but they too pre-posed categories in grouping the research. In addition, their review included research from the field of education, and thus did not give a clear picture of research conducted exclusively by scholars in our field. In their essay on directional needs for research in communication education, Galvin and Cooper cited examples of appropriate research within each of four areas, but did not review all the extant research. Kibler, Bassett and Byers examined research on instructional objectives, while Bassett reviewed the 1977 issues of journals published by the Speech Communication Association (SCA). Lashbrook and Wheless focused on the relationship between learning theory and instructional communication, and Wheless and Hurt reviewed research on traditional and nontraditional instructional strategies. Finally, Daly and Korinek summarized research on classroom interaction, and Van Kleeck and Daly reviewed aspects of communication development related to instructional communication. Each of these review/synthesis articles serves a valuable purpose, but none functions as a descriptive examination of the research of scholars from our field in the area of “communication and instruction.”

Given, then, the need for an assessment of the research in our area, we set out to

Ann Q. Staton-Spicer is Associate Professor, and Donald H. Wulff is a Teaching Assistant in the Department of Speech Communication, University of Washington, Seattle.
conduct a descriptive examination. The purpose of this essay was to survey the published journal research in "communication and instruction" (communication education and instructional communication) from 1974 to 1982 in order to provide a categorization and synthesis.

PROCEDURES
For our review we surveyed the national journals published by SCA: Communication Education, Communication Monographs, Quarterly Journal of Speech, the regional journals: Western Journal of Speech Communication, Central States Speech Journal, Southern Speech Communication Journal, Communication Quarterly, and the journals and yearbook of the International Communication Association (ICA): Human Communication Research, Journal of Communication, and Communication Yearbook, from 1974 to 1982. We engaged in a five step process. First, one author began a preliminary examination of the journals in order to select relevant articles to be reviewed. We set two criteria for inclusion: (1) the articles had to be empirical studies, and (2) the articles had to focus on some aspect of either communication education or instructional communication. We defined research in communication education to include studies of the process of speech communication instruction, or the teaching of speech communication, in settings ranging from kindergarten (K) to college/university level, including the home and business and professional communities. Such research has generally focused on content, methods, strategies, and materials for teaching speech communication. Second, after one author had surveyed two years of articles and made tentative selections, both authors met to make a final decision for inclusion and to establish preliminary categories for the research. Approximately 10 categories of articles emerged as distinct. Third, using our two criteria for inclusion of articles and the emergent categories as guidelines, one author then examined the remainder of the published articles, selecting and categorizing relevant ones. The fourth step was for the other author to examine all of the selected articles and categorize them independently. When differences occurred, both authors discussed the categorizations and came to agreement. The final step was to collapse, refine, and pare down the categories in the most parsimonious, yet meaningful way. The result of this procedure was a collection of 186 articles classified into six categories. These articles will be identified and categorized in the next section.

CATEGORIZATION AND SYNTHESIS OF RESEARCH

I. Teacher Characteristics
Three major groups of research emerged to form the category of teacher characteristics: studies of the relationship between 1.) various teacher characteristics and student learning, 2.) teacher characteristics and teacher effectiveness, and 3.) teacher attitudes and expectations. In addition, there were three distinct, small clusters of studies and a miscellaneous category.

Relationship between teacher characteristics and student learning. Eight studies focused on the relationship between teacher behaviors/characteristics and some aspect of student learning. Characteristics investigated included indirect and direct influence, perceived credibility, homophily, attraction, communicator style, disclosiveness, teacher-student solidarity, interpersonal solidarity, immediacy, and nonverbal expressiveness. Positive relationships were found between teacher credibility and student recall, homophily and classroom learning, communicator style/disclosiveness and learning, nonverbal expressiveness and student affect, and teacher-student solidarity and student affect, behavioral intent, and short-term cognitive learning.

Relationship between teacher characteristics and teaching effectiveness. Included in this cluster of studies were seven which examined teacher characteristics and their relationship to perceived teaching effectiveness. General teacher communicator style was related both to effectiveness, and to two dramatic style behaviors: is entertaining, and engages in double takes. Dramatic and relaxed style behaviors were reported as indirectly linked to teaching
effectiveness.\textsuperscript{31} Teacher immediacy,\textsuperscript{32} delivery skills, time spent in contact with students, dynamism, and liking for students\textsuperscript{33} were found to be predictors of student perceptions of teaching effectiveness.

**Teacher attitudes and expectations.** Eight studies addressed teachers' attitudes, perceptions, and expectations about various aspects related to students. Elementary teachers were found to form negative expectations of children who were high communication apprehensives,\textsuperscript{34} while college teachers were found to expect less success potential for high than low communication apprehensives.\textsuperscript{35} In another study, high school teachers' expectations for nonhandicapped and deaf students were examined.\textsuperscript{36} Three studies dealt with teacher perceptions of student attractiveness. Among the findings were: 1.) children perceived as unattractive received fewer interactions than those perceived as attractive,\textsuperscript{37} 2.) children perceived as attractive have a friendly, attentive, and relaxed communicator style,\textsuperscript{38} and 3.) teachers seem not to have direct sex bias in regard to attractiveness.\textsuperscript{39} In studies of teachers' linguistic attitudes, ratings of children reflected judgments of confidence-eagerness, ethnicity-nonstandardness,\textsuperscript{40} and socio-economic status.\textsuperscript{41}

**Teacher credibility.** There were two studies of teacher credibility other than those relating the construct to student learning or teacher effectiveness. One reported the development of an instrument to measure the source credibility of basic speech communication instructors,\textsuperscript{42} and a second found students' perceptions of teacher credibility to be dependent upon vocal cues.\textsuperscript{43}

**Teacher communication concern.** In one study the communication concerns of preservice and inservice elementary school teachers were identified and conceptualized according to a framework of self, task, and impact.\textsuperscript{44} In a case study of a university instructor, a relationship was found between the teacher's concerns about communication and his classroom behavior.\textsuperscript{45}

**Profile of an effective teacher.** In a Delphi survey of secondary speech/drama teachers, competencies needed by effective teachers were identified and a profile of the competent teacher of speech and drama was developed.\textsuperscript{46} Using a multidimensional scaling analysis, a second study investigated the perceived personality and behavioral correlates of the ideal interpersonal communication instructor.\textsuperscript{47}

**Miscellaneous studies of teacher characteristics.** There were four unrelated studies of teacher characteristics. The first was an examination of three classification systems for teacher nonverbal behaviors.\textsuperscript{48} A second studied differences in the communication behavior of prospective teachers related to the quality of their interpersonal construct systems.\textsuperscript{49} The third investigated communication apprehension (CA) of teachers and found a greater proportion of high communication apprehensives in the lower elementary grades than in the higher levels.\textsuperscript{50} A final study investigated teacher language and found a tendency toward the use of sexist language.\textsuperscript{51}

## II. STUDENT CHARACTERISTICS

Two large groups of studies emerged to comprise the category of student characteristics: 1.) studies relating to student CA and speech anxiety (SA), and 2.) studies taking a developmental approach to examining student communication abilities. In addition, there were several smaller groups of studies.

**Student CA and SA.** There were 20 studies dealing with some aspect of CA or SA, six conducted with K–12 students. Oral CA was found to exist among 1st to 12th graders and to be measured reliably by the Measure of Elementary Communication Apprehension (MECA).\textsuperscript{52} Children in the primary grades had the lowest levels of CA,\textsuperscript{53} and both source and receiver CA differed at the junior high, high school, and college levels.\textsuperscript{54} Low communication apprehensives had higher I.Q. scores than either moderate or high apprehensives,\textsuperscript{55} while CA was negatively correlated to junior high students' attitudes toward school and final grades.\textsuperscript{56} Finally, a hypothesized relationship was not found between community size and a person's level of CA.\textsuperscript{57}

A second set of studies included five articles examining the relationship between college student CA and achievement. Low communication apprehensives were found to have higher academic achievement in traditional interaction-oriented educational systems,\textsuperscript{58} while high and low apprehensives did not differ in lecture and laboratory classes.\textsuperscript{59} Another study found that oral and receiver CA had negative effects on achievement, but this conclusion did not hold for writing apprehension.\textsuperscript{60} Within mastery learning systems of instruction, high and moderate apprehensives did not differ greatly in achievement, while low apprehensives appeared to achieve less efficiently.\textsuperscript{61} Finally, low communication apprehensives in an oral performance basic course received the highest course evaluations.\textsuperscript{62}

In nine additional studies, various aspects of CA and SA were examined. Included were studies of CA and receiver comprehension, ratings of authoritativeness, and speech effectiveness.\textsuperscript{63} SA scale development,\textsuperscript{64} psychological\textsuperscript{65} and physiological\textsuperscript{66} patterns of SA in public speakers, effects of CA on students' satisfaction with instructional strategies,\textsuperscript{67} values of those with different levels of CA,\textsuperscript{68} preferences for style of classroom arrangement and seating choice,\textsuperscript{69} the roles of parent/home and school variables in predicting CA,\textsuperscript{70} and various measures of CA-related problems in students.\textsuperscript{71}

**Developmental studies of students' language/communication abilities.** Ten studies examined students' language/communication abilities from a developmental perspective. Variables investigated included inference making and recall,\textsuperscript{72} role-taking and referential communication,\textsuperscript{73} compliance levels and use of directives,\textsuperscript{74} perspective-taking,\textsuperscript{75} listener-adapted communication,\textsuperscript{76} appropriate adaptation,\textsuperscript{77} interpretive strategies,\textsuperscript{78} prosocial behavior,\textsuperscript{79} use of persuasive appeals,\textsuperscript{80} and centered spoken language.\textsuperscript{81} In these studies, comparisons were made among the abilities of children of different age and grade levels. Five additional studies focused on children's communication abilities as they related to cognitive complexity.\textsuperscript{82}
Communication competence. Three studies dealt with some aspect of communication competence, but did not take a developmental perspective. First, an instrument was developed to assess interaction involvement as a dimension of competence. In a second study, students' competence was defined from classroom teachers' points of view, with results suggesting the compliant communicator. Finally, factors affecting the learning of interpersonal competence were identified.

Student self-concept changes in the basic course. There were two studies of changes in students' self-concepts during the basic course. One reported that although the ideal self-concept of most students remained stable during the semester, self-concept tended to improve. A second found that sex and course grade accounted for a significant portion of the variance in self-concept scores.

Miscellaneous studies of student characteristics. Eight studies of student characteristics could not be grouped in a meaningful way. Included were studies of: the influence of organizing skills on recall and ability to plan and problem-solve, the relationship of six predictor variables—listening comprehension, extrinsic motivation, verbal organizational ability, initial information, aroused interest, and intrinsic interest in topic—to student comprehension and retention of a lecture, the communication-related experiences distinguishing effective from ineffective college student speakers, the communication efficiency of students from different social class backgrounds, the relationship of student eye movement to test scores, student television viewing, variables discriminating among high, moderate, and low argumentatives, and finally, the question of "why debaters debate."

III. Teaching Strategies

In this category, six groups of studies emerged as distinct, articles related to: ways of teaching particular types of courses, particular teaching strategies, strategies to reduce CA or stage fright, methods of improving children's language skills, strategies for admitting students to instructional programs, and strategies for assessing communication skills.

Methods of teaching particular courses. This group of articles included studies of teaching strategies for the basic course, as well as for courses in public speaking, oral interpretation, listening, and medical communication. Two examined strategies for teaching the basic course, one comparing traditional methods with programmed instruction, and the second investigating non-traditional methods.

Four studies investigated aspects related to the teaching of public speaking. Included were examinations of video and audiotape feedback, the effectiveness of a public speaking package, four approaches used to teach about visual aids, and the effectiveness of an approach to teaching public speaking to prison inmates.

Two studies dealt with strategies for teaching oral interpretation. One probed the value of the presence of a narrator, while the second was a survey of oral interpretation courses to determine student literature preferences.

One study dealing with strategies for teaching listening comprehension to college freshmen found comprehension improved with the use of programmed instruction.

A final study reported the teaching approach and assessment of a course in medical communication.

Particular teaching strategies. In addition to studies of three fairly traditional strategies—games and simulations, television, video-tape—this group of articles also included some less traditional approaches. Three studies dealt with experiential learning (games, simulations, exercises) as a teaching strategy: an investigation of the nature and extent of the use of games and simulations in speech communication instruction, an investigation of student reactions to the use of games and simulations in large lecture classes, and the development and testing of a classification and retrieval system for exercises in nonverbal communication.

Six investigations centered on the use of television. In four of these, learning and/or critical viewing skills increased when adults interacted with their children and verbalized about program content. Another study developed, implemented and evaluated lesson plans to teach children to understand television and to use it as a strategy for improving language and thinking skills, while a final one described a critical viewing approach to teaching children about television.

Two studies investigated the use of videotape as an instructional strategy, one in teaching public speaking, and one in teaching children about hospitalization.

Humor as a strategy was the focus of three studies: an examination of patterns of humor usage in the college classroom, an analysis of the amount and type of humor used in communication textbooks, and an investigation of the effects of humorous illustrations on acquisition and motivation, appeal and persuasibility.

A final study examined two strategies for teaching students to write using inclusive generic pronouns: an authority innovation-decision approach and an optional decision model.

Strategies to reduce CA or stage fright. Three studies reported methods of reducing CA: providing speakers with artificial heart rate feedback during their speeches to convince them that their stage fright levels were low, participating in a systematic desensitization program, and participating in a cognitive modification program in which teachers are informed both about CA and about students who are high in CA.

Methods of improving children's language. Two studies found story reading to be an important strategy for improving language behavior. Another focused on children's sentence comprehension, and a final study found expansion to be a useful strategy for helping children with the rules of conversation.

Strategies for admitting students to instructional programs. The first study in this category investigated procedures used to assign students to remedial oral communication instruction. The second reported results for using the PRCA as a criterion for admitting students to a CA lab.
Strategies for assessing communication skills. One study reported the development of an instrument as a method of assessing communication skills, while a second was a survey of various assessment procedures for speaking and listening skills.

Miscellaneous articles on strategies. There were several unrelated studies of various strategies. Included were studies of laboratory training in leadership orientation, student-run public campaigns, the communication internship, the process of visualizing or overtly verbalizing during a learning task, and finally, the use of behavioral objectives as a teaching tool.

IV. SPEECH CRITICISM AND STUDENT EVALUATION

Speech criticism. The category of speech criticism and student evaluation encompassed two general groups of research, the first dealing with the criticism or evaluation of student oral performance. Seven of these articles dealt with the evaluation of public speeches, studies of: student perceptions of the degree of helpfulness of the feedback they received from teachers and from peers, the impact of sex differences, the effects of sex on leniency, halo, and trait errors, trait errors for low and high credibility speakers, and the use of videotapes for speech critiques. The final study examined the effects of debate judges' consultations prior to balloting.

Student evaluation of teachers and courses. The nine studies comprising this group included investigations of student judgment in evaluating classroom experience, surveys of how departments use student evaluations, and development of evaluative measures.

One study compared the dimensions of judgment used by college undergraduates, while another examined such judgments of graduate students. Several studies investigated factors that influenced student evaluations of instructors, including perceptions of instructor fairness, student knowledgeability, and a student's relationship with the instructor. In a survey of speech communication department chairpersons, results indicated widespread use of student evaluations. In a study of the effect of differing administrative instructions, student evaluations were found to be more harsh when an administrative use was suggested. The final studies were reports of instrument development, one to measure a teacher's affective communication, and one to evaluate communication courses.

V. SPEECH CONTENT

Three groups of studies comprised the category of speech content. The first group included surveys to identify communication skills needed by various specialists. A second set surveyed and analyzed textbooks to determine the nature of the treatment of particular content. Finally, several experimental studies isolated important content variables or tested the effects of teaching various content areas.

Surveys to determine communication skills/competencies. Three studies dealt specifically with communication skills needed by businesspersons. Surveys were conducted of recent college graduates in business, chief executive officers of business companies, and first-line managers of manufacturing firms.

Seven studies identified communication skills important for various target persons or courses. Included were surveys of communication specialists, speech communication M.A. graduates in non-teaching careers, police officers, radio and t.v. managers, research scientists employed in companies, and instructors of courses in organizational communication. A final study surveyed coordinators of language arts programs and conducted a literature review to identify the speaking and listening competencies considered essential for high school graduates.

Textbook surveys/analyses to determine communication content. Two studies employed textbook surveys to determine how particular content was treated. One focused on conflict in undergraduate speech communication textbooks, and the other on the presentation of gender identity in interpersonal communication texts.

Experimental studies related to content of public speaking courses. Four studies tested the effects of variables salient to public speaking. Two studies of message organization found that students who heard organized informative messages had higher scores than those who heard disorganized messages, and that organized speeches received more positive trait errors. A third study reported that an increase in eye contact significantly increased a speaker's credibility. A final study found that speech delivery had little effect on attitude change, recall-comprehension, or ethos.

Miscellaneous studies related to content. Five studies focused on various aspects of speech communication content. Included in this disparate group were studies of: (1) the impact of public speaking and interpersonal communication courses on behavioral changes, (2) the effects of participation in an intercultural communication workshop on cross-cultural attitudes, (3) the relationship between student performance on a cognitive interpersonal test and the ability to select appropriate interpersonal strategies, (4) the effect of training in literary analysis on an oral interpreter, and (5) successful communicative behaviors in the interview.

VI. SPEECH COMMUNICATION PROGRAMS

The studies in this category consisted primarily of surveys to determine the status of speech communication programs.

High school speech communication programs. The first group of articles consisted of six surveys of high school speech programs. They included surveys of speech activities in Tokyo high schools, content and teaching methods in high school summer debate workshops, junior high speech programs in Ohio, and high school speech communication programs in New York, Michigan, and across the United States.
CONCLUSION

One of the values of this index is that it provides a means by which we can begin to assess the contribution of research in the area of “communication and instruction” to disciplinary distinctiveness. In his article on the disciplinary status of speech communication, Gouran contends that “The problem of distinctiveness . . . is not so much a result of the divisions of subject matter as it is of the questions asked and the potential they possess for sorting out the complexities of the process of communication in its many contexts.” Following Gouran’s suggestion, we conclude by identifying the major questions that arise from our categorizations and assessing their value with respect both to the area of “communication and instruction” and to our knowledge of the communication process within the discipline.

A casual examination of six research categories indicates that several major questions for each category are readily apparent, including the following:

Teacher Characteristics:
What are the teacher communication characteristics related to student learning?
What are the teacher communication characteristics related to perceived teaching effectiveness?
What attitudes and expectations do teachers have for students with various communication characteristics?

Student Characteristics:
How do CA levels differ among children K–12?
What is the relationship between student CA and school achievement?
How can we measure CA and SA?
What are the important factors in children’s communication development?
What communication skills of children are related to cognitive complexity?

Teaching Strategies:
What are effective approaches to teaching various speech communication courses?
How have the strategies of games and simulations and videotape been used in speech communication instruction?
How can learning from television be enhanced?
How has humor been used to enhance learning?
What strategies are effective in reducing CA, in improving children’s language, and in assessing communication skills?

Speech Criticism and Student Evaluation:
What is the impact of sex differences on speech criticism?
How valuable do students perceive speech critiques?
What are the dimensions of judgment used by students in evaluating classroom experiences?
What factors influence student evaluation of instructors?
Speech Content:
What communication skills/competencies are needed by various occupational groups?
What is the empirical basis for various aspects of content we teach in public speaking courses?

Speech Communication Programs:
What is the status of various high school speech communication programs?
What is the status of the basic speech communication course?
How do speech communication graduates view their training?
What is the status of the teaching of various areas within the field?
What is the status of graduate programs in speech communication?

With regard to the value of these questions for the area of "communication and instruction," we believe that most are, indeed, important. A picture of the teacher as a communicator is beginning to emerge, and we can see the complexity of the process of communication development in children. Certain methods of teaching have been documented as effective in achieving various goals, and we are accumulating knowledge about the evaluation process. There is a body of empirical data upon which to base some instructional decisions about the content of what we teach in our courses. Finally, there are comparative data regarding program offerings. Taken as a whole, research addressing the above mentioned questions constitutes a body of facts about three of the four communication requisites that Gouran cites: 1.) message producers (teachers and students), 2.) messages (strategies of teaching and content), and 3.) targets (generally students). 194

A number of people are producing research that tries to address systematically a single "question" in depth. Noteworthy examples include the research on communication apprehension by McCroskey and his colleagues, Behnke, Beatty, and Kitchen's studies of speech anxiety, Clark and Delia's work on communication strategies and cognitive complexity, and the research of Norton and his associates on teacher communicator style. While these researchers focus on particular variables, their work also contributes to Gouran's fourth requisite, that of a "means of linking the agents." 195 When, for example, Norton examines teacher communicator style as it relates to student perceptions of teaching effectiveness, we begin to see the importance of teacher-student interaction and the links between message producers and targets.

Ongoing programs of research such as the ones cited above serve as the necessary building blocks for increasing our understanding of the area. Our review revealed, however, that instead of systematic research programs, isolated or one-shot studies were the norm. Although a single study may address an important question of interest and generate predicted results, it is not likely to contribute to an integrated understanding of the teaching-learning process or the process of teaching speech communication. The importance of an area of research does not lie in isolated research findings, but in the relationship among findings across studies.

In a similar vein, it seems that the many one-shot studies are of limited value in contributing to disciplinary distinctiveness. In considering the value of the research questions with respect to the discipline, we must look beyond the area of "communication and instruction." We must ask whether the potential answers to the questions will enhance our understanding of communication across contexts. It is in the ongoing programs of research that we find the major contributions of "communication and instruction" to the discipline. We have, for example, researchers examining the relationship between teacher characteristics and teaching effectiveness. Variables such as credibility, homophily, communicator style, and immediacy are salient not
just to "communication and instruction," but to other contexts as well. These concepts can be, and have been, investigated with respect to organizational leaders, discussion leaders, and public speakers. Variables that emerge as critical in the study of teachers and students as communicators can be investigated for applicability in other settings. Another example can be seen in the question of "What attitudes and expectations do teachers have for students with various communication characteristics?" If teachers have higher expectations for low communication apprehensives and for students who are physically attractive, it may also be the case that professionals and businesspersons respond in similar ways.

In addition to the examples mentioned, instructional communication researchers could add even more substantially to the distinctiveness of the discipline by constructing systematic programs of research that address other questions central to the discipline. For example, classroom interaction may be viewed as a process of group dynamics, or the teacher can be examined as a rhetorical strategist, a persuader. Classroom talk can be analyzed from a cultural perspective, or the classroom itself can be considered a communication system. Furthermore, the classroom environment is a rich setting in which to enhance our theoretical and empirical understandings of such aspects as communication competence and the functions of communication.

It seems that the research questions emerging from the categories of Teacher Characteristics and Student Characteristics make the most important contribution toward disciplinary-wide understanding of communication. The concepts examined in these two categories seem to approach the status of core disciplinary concepts that are important in contexts other than that of the classroom or the instructional environment. The questions addressed by communication education researchers, however, are important primarily to the area of "communication and instruction," and not for what they add to the distinctiveness of the discipline.

A FINAL NOTE

A great deal of empirical research in the area of "communication and instruction" has been generated during the last nine years. The sheer quantity of the research attests in some measure to the widespread importance accorded the area by those in the discipline. Even more critical than the quantity of research, however, are its quality and distinctiveness. Space limitations have precluded our offering a critical scrutiny of these two aspects, but our quick glance brings into question both the quality and distinctiveness. There are a number of important questions being addressed, both for the area and for the discipline. Those under the rubric of instructional communication are integral to the discipline as a whole, while those addressed by communication education researchers are germane largely to the area. There are, however, too many isolated studies that cannot be placed into a coherent framework. Although interesting and perhaps even of practical utility, such research does not build upon a systematic structure or contribute to the development of one. What we need are integrated studies that generate propositions from which we can build theory. It is our systematic programs of research which are building instructional communication theory, and, subsequently, contributing to the development of communication theory.
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10The *Communication Yearbook*, although not a journal as such, is published annually by ICA and is a collection of research articles. Consequently, we considered it a periodical and included it in our review.

11We relied on the definition of the empirical research by Ernest G. Bormann, *Theory and Research in the Communicative Arts* (New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, 1965), 252, as consisting of descriptive and experimental types, and distinct from historical and critical research. Our review included both qualitative and quantitative studies.

Because of the decision to limit to empirical studies, more communication education articles were excluded than instructional communication articles. There have been numerous articles about various instructional practices ranging from explanations of single classroom exercises to entire courses. Articles such as these, although of much practical value, were not consistent with our definition of empirical research and, thus, were not reviewed.

12The second criterion was at times difficult to establish. The foci of many empirical studies clearly were subsumed under definitions of the area and, thus, were included. When the contribution of a study of communication and instruction was questionable, however, we carefully scrutinized the rationale and discussion sections to determine author intent. When we felt the contribution to the area was doubtful and could find no explicit author intent to frame the study as one of communication and instruction, we excluded the article. For other articles, however, the nature of the study was such that the relevance was apparent to us even though the author may not have termed it a study of communication and instruction. Thus, the judgments to include or exclude articles for review were our own.
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50James C. McCroskey, Janis F. Andersen, Virginia P. Richmond and Lawrence R. Wheeless, “Communication Apprehension of Elementary and Secondary Students and Teachers,” Communication Education, 30 (1981), 122–132. This article is also reported in the category of “Student Characteristics.”
53McCroskey, Andersen, Richmond, and Wheeless. This article was also reported in the category of “Teacher Characteristics.”
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Anthony Mulac, “Effects of Three Feedback Conditions Employing Videotape and Audiotape on Acquired Speech Skill,” *Speech Monographs*, 41 (1974), 205–214. This article is also reported in the group of “Particular Teaching Strategies.”


112Mulac. This article was also reported in the group of "Methods of Teaching Particular Courses."


114Jennings Bryant, Paul Comisky and Dolf Zillman, "Teachers' Humor in the College Classroom," Communication Education, 28 (1979), 110-118.


...Mulac. This article was also reported in the category of "Teaching Strategies," and Paul L. Miles, "Student Video Self-Critiques," Communication Education, 30 (1981), 280-283.
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