Adapting Corporate Presentation Skills Training Practices for Use in a University Classroom

Judith A. Kolb

Pennsylvania State University, University Park

Both corporate and university sectors are engaged in the teaching of communication courses. As someone who has taught in both settings, I believe that trainers and professors have much to gain from pooling ideas. With this in mind, I first observed and then participated in a week-long "Presentation Skills" workshop taught in a Fortune 500 company to determine what aspects of that program might be transplanted to a traditional university public speaking course. I then took ideas gained from the workshop and applied them to the public speaking classes I taught at a western university. This article is an examination and discussion of this process.

INTRODUCTION

Some of today's most popular corporate training seminars and workshops cover subjects taken right from speech communication textbooks: leadership, facilitation of small groups, team building, negotiation, communication skills, presentation skills, and persuasion, among others. Since such courses focus on training rather than education, the subject matter is handled differently than in academia. Structural and funding differences also exist between corporate training and university teaching. Resources are more abundant in the corporate world, but time is a luxury. The one-day training course is the norm. Even with these differences, however, there is much that training facilitators and university instructors can learn from each other.

Purpose

Trainers, most of whom have at minimum an undergraduate degree, are able to use the ideas and experiences gained in college classrooms in the development of training programs. University instructors, however, do not have the reciprocal privilege since they have less access to corporate training programs. Knowledge of "what goes on" in business training should be useful information for instructors, particularly for those teaching performance-based courses or units such as public speaking. Both trainers and instructors share the common objective of improving the public speaking skills of participants/students.

With this in mind, I examined a presentation-skills workshop taught in a corporate setting to determine what aspects of that program might be transplanted to a traditional university public speaking course. Ideas gained from the workshop were applied to the public speaking classes I taught at a western university. This article is an examination and discussion of this process.

The corporate training program discussed in this paper is a week-long presentation-skills workshop presented to employees of a Fortune 500 manufacturing company. I chose this particular program because its length more closely approximated the typical university experience than did shorter presentation skills workshops. This particular workshop has been in existence since 1984 and is considered by management to be successful in improving employee public speaking skills. Participants also rate the workshop highly. I first observed and then participated in this workshop. During the two workshop weeks, I conversed freely with both facilitators and participants. Since the participants came from a variety of cities and often did not know each other, my presence in the workshop was not viewed as unusual. I subsequently talked to developers of this program and also viewed historic documents, including a file of past evaluations.

Format

From the many ideas and techniques utilized in this workshop, the following three were chosen as most appropriate for inclusion here: (a) the creation of a supportive, risk-taking atmosphere, (b) the use of speaker goal setting, and (c) the utilization of a "self-and-other" model for performance evaluation. Workshop and classroom experiences related to each of these themes is discussed. In this article, the terms "speech" and "presentation" are used interchangeably.

Training Program

The corporate presentation skills workshop met from 8:30 a.m. until 4:30 p.m. from Monday through Thursday and from 8:30 a.m. until approximately 2 p.m. on Friday, with a one-hour break for lunch each day and two breaks of 15-20 minutes throughout the day. Fifteen to eighteen participants were in each workshop.

Participants were given time during the workshop to work on speeches but were also expected to spend approximately one hour each night in preparing for the next day. In comparison to most organizational

workshops, this one demanded greater daily effort from participants. Each person was also expected to develop an action plan for how he or she would use the workshop skills upon returning to the job. This action plan was to be shared with each person's supervisor.

There were two workshop facilitators throughout the week. One had the primary responsibility for the instruction, critiquing, and organization; the other ran the videotaping equipment and occasionally gave demonstrations of speeches. The primary workshop facilitator started off each workshop segment by giving a 10-20-minute presentation of information pertinent to the next speaking exercise. Then a demonstration of the exercise was given. Participants were given time to prepare for their presentations, which were all videotaped. Preparation time varied according to the length and/or difficulty of the speech. Each trainee gave a total of 15 presentations during the week.

University Classes

The public speaking classes were the laboratory component of a required core communication class. Students met in a large lecture hall for one hour per week to hear a lecture on the application of communication theory to public speaking. All student speeches were given in laboratory classes. Laboratory class size varied between 16 and 20 students; lab groups met twice a week for a total of 2 hours 40 minutes per week. Each student was required to give seven speeches in a 10-week period. Speeches were videotaped. Students were expected to spend time outside of class viewing at least three of these videotaped speeches with an instructor.

Students were not usually given class time to work on speeches. There was one instructor; various students from the classes volunteered to run the video equipment. The lab instructor gave a brief lecture and/or facilitated class discussion before each new assignment. The majority of class time was spent in the giving and critiquing of speeches.

Schedule of Speeches

Tables 1-2 provide details on the workshop and classroom presentations.

SUPPORTIVE, RISK-TAKING ATMOSPHERE

Students coming into public speaking classes know that not only will they be giving speeches but these speeches will be, in most cases, orally critiqued. In view of this, it is both crucial and difficult to create a supportive, risk-taking climate. Dance and Zak-Dance (1986a) state, "The teacher, and the students, are responsible for constituting a benign audience" (p. 19). Some students are more apprehensive than others. Beatty, Balfantz, and Kuwabara (1989) describe students with communication apprehension (CA) as being predisposed to feelings of conspicuousness, being easily embar-

Table 1
Workshop Speeches

Day	Type of Presentation	Length (in minutes)	In-class Preparation Time (in minutes)*
1	Accomplishment	3	15
	Oral reading	1	5
	Introduction of a speaker	½	10
	Acceptance of an award	½	3
2	Demonstration	1½	20
	Informative with aid	3	30
	Impromptu mime	½	—
	Impromptu talk	1-2	3
3	Description of goals for workshop	1-2	5
	Introduction of controversial topic	½	15
	Defense of beliefs	½	—
	Persuasive speech	3	30
	Call to action for change	3	30
4	Interactive presentation	10	30
5	Summary of week's progress	1	5

*Preparation time outside class varied among participants, but the calibre of presentations indicated that all speakers spent some time each night preparing for the next day's speeches.

rassed, and being more likely to interpret audience reactions in a more negative manner than do less-anxious speakers. Speakers with CA have more negative expectations of their performance and more negative and self-conscious thoughts during their presentations than do less anxious speakers (Ayres, 1988; Booth-Butterfield & Booth-Butterfield, 1990) and also experience negative and disrupted information processing after the speech is completed (Ayres, 1992).

Table 2
University Class Speeches

Type of Presentation	Length (in minutes)	Preparation Time Between Talks (in weeks)*
Informative speech with aid	3-4	1½
Impromptu	1-2	—
Research speech from assigned topic list	5	1
Impromptu	1-2	—
Speech on topic from supplementary text	5	1
Persuasive speech	2	1
Persuasive speech with Q & A	7-8	½

*With the exception of the two impromptu speeches—during which each student was given approximately 2 minutes, or the time of the preceding speaker's presentation, to prepare—students were not given class time to work on speeches. Preparation time between speeches varied according to whether a student was one of the first speakers or one of the last for any given assignment. Time listed is that between the end of one round of speeches and the beginning of the next.

Beatty (1988) found correlations between perceived subordinate status and public speaking anxiety and suggested that "students engage in a form of social comparison at least in terms of public speaking ability.

If the speaker perceives the audience as more competent than herself or himself, the result is increased anxiety" (p. 34). He states that student disclosures about the anxiety they feel help to reduce perceived dissimilarities. Connell and Borden (1987) suggest that small-group discussions that include self-disclosure help students to gradually reduce CA. Most public speaking courses offer ice-breaking activities. Self-disclosure opportunities offered as part of these activities may help students to feel less anxious when public speaking begins.

The instructor is also part of the audience. Bowers (1986) found that students reported less CA in classes in which the instructors de-emphasize their status. In his study, the students who did not know whether the instructor was a teaching assistant or a faculty member experienced less anxiety. Bowers (1986) and Dance and Zak-Dance (1986a) suggest that the development of a friendly classroom atmosphere might be facilitated if instructors and students call each other by their first names. This should only be done, however, if everyone is comfortable with this practice.

Room arrangement may also contribute to atmosphere. Bowers (1986), for instance, found that students who sat in the traditional classroom-row arrangement experienced more CA than did students who sat in other configurations.

Workshop

The facilitators were crucial in setting the tone for this workshop. After checking to see that no one objected, everyone was addressed by his or her first name. Although one facilitator had a Ph.D., he did not use his title.

People of varying educational levels and organizational status participated in each workshop. Some of the scientific professionals and managers had graduate degrees; the floor supervisors generally had GEDs. A few of the participants were excellent speakers from the first day; others were barely able to get through the first few speeches.

A major challenge in this workshop was to create a cohesive, supportive group and a challenging, but non-threatening, atmosphere that would facilitate learning and risk-taking. From the first day, the feeling expressed by the facilitators was that this was a laboratory, a safe place to try new things. Familiar advice was, "Try this tomorrow—if it doesn't work, you can always try something else." The facilitators throughout the week made deliberate "mistakes" in presentations and took such mistakes in stride, seeing the humor in them. Participants were encouraged to see the humor in their own mistakes and not to be afraid to fail.

The first workshop activity, an ice-breaker, was a name-association exercise. After other goal-setting and group activities and a short lecture, participants worked in dyads for 15 minutes to prepare for their first assignment—a 3-minute "accomplishment" speech. These speeches were delivered before lunch on the first day. Since preparation time for speeches was usually minimal, the speeches were extemporaneous (planned, but not written out) and, to this instructor, a welcome relief from the memorized and/or read speeches that are often delivered in university classes. A negative effect of the lack of preparation time was that the speeches contained less content than do typical classroom speeches. Tables were arranged in a horseshoe format, open to the front. All speeches were given within the open space of this horseshoe. Notes were discouraged since there was no table, lectern, or podium for the speakers to use.

The emphasis in this workshop was on individual improvement in speaking skills. Comparisons to other speakers were discouraged since there was such a varying level of competencies among the participants. Each person was encouraged to pick one or two things that she or he would work on throughout the week. Participants helped each other in developing their speeches. Individuals who had no difficulty in sketching a speech outline in 10–15 minutes spent the rest of the preparation time helping the people who had more trouble. Facilitators also circulated freely to offer advice and individual coaching.

Class Application

In this and subsequent "class application" sections, I make comparisons between second-year classes (classes I taught after attending the workshop) and first-year classes. The description of university classes given earlier in this paper applies to both first- and second-year classes.

Setting the Tone

I was very impressed with the effect that a risk-taking atmosphere had on the workshop participants. They tried new things, and, as a result, became better speakers. I wanted to recreate this atmosphere in my classroom but realized that the grade element present in the university setting might work against students' "taking a chance."

On the first day, I emphasized that the lab was a learning experience—a chance to experiment and try new things: "If you're not making mistakes, you're not experimenting, or learning." Ice-breaking activities were utilized to relax the students. I shared with the class some of the speeches I had given that did not go as expected. Students talked in small groups about similar experiences and anxieties they were experiencing at the thought of this required class. I also emphasized that every individual has her or his own style and that the point of the class was for each person to improve presentation skills and further develop that individual style.

As actual speeches began, some students worried about appearing foolish or about receiving a lower grade if they experimented. The most risk appeared to be in moving away from note or lectern dependency. All but a few of the 110 students did try, however; and once they saw the results on tape and heard their classmates' comments, they usually became converts, even if they did maintain their longing for the safety of the lectern.

There was increased self-disclosure during second-year classes compared to first-year classes, both during critiques and discussions and in the stories told during speeches. Alternate explanations exist, of course (differences in students, for example), but I believe that the atmosphere in the class contributed to the relaxed feeling that led to the students' comfort with self-disclosure.

Each speech was to be videotaped, so the purpose of videotaping was discussed during the first week of class. These students, more so than the previous year's students, appeared to view videotaping as a positive experience. Comments such as, "I can't wait to see this on tape," were heard and one day when one recorder had been stolen and the backup recorder was not working, students voted to meet for an extra class period rather than give speeches without the recorder. Even allowing for the fact that the less-prepared students might have voted for postponement simply to give themselves more time to practice their speeches, I was encouraged that, for whatever reasons, the students wanted their speeches recorded. Students also occasionally brought other students with them when viewing their videotapes and often wanted to show their really bad first speech to their friends.

Desk Arrangement

Desks were placed in a horseshoe arrangement open to the front. There was a desktop lectern on the instructor's desk, but students were encouraged to get away from the lectern as much as possible and to use the space in the horseshoe. There were many benefits to the horseshoe arrangement. Students participated more fully in discussions since they couldn't hide in the back of the room, there was less side talk (students talking in groups of two or three), the audience was more attentive during speeches, speakers appeared to relax earlier in the course as compared to the previous year's students who sat in the traditional classroom-row arrangement, and students became more involved with one another and with the instructor since I sat in the horseshoe.

This arrangement encouraged greater physical interaction between speaker and audience. It also was more reflective of real-life speaking situations than is the classroom-row arrangement. Adults may be able to avoid formal podium speaking, but most working adults cannot avoid speaking at informal meetings—situations where lecterns are not generally available.

SPEAKER GOAL-SETTING

Most public speaking instructors attempt to get students to set improvement goals for themselves after they give their first speech. Many students, however, have as their primary goal the reduction of anxiety in public speaking situations. Recent studies (Beatty, 1988; Beatty, Balfantz, & Kuwabara, 1989; Beatty & Friedland, 1990) suggest that the primary causes of public speaking anxiety are more trait-like than situational in nature; such internal anxieties exist regardless of the situation (Hamilton & Parker, 1993). Therefore, students with communication apprehension (CA) will not likely notice a reduction in anxiety simply by getting used to the public speaking situation. If their primary goal of anxiety reduction is not met, students might feel that they are making no progress. Concentration on other more realistic goals should cause students to feel that they are making progress and also might center their attention on something other than their anxiety.

Students usually need help in setting realistic goals for themselves. Overly general advice is of little value. As Pelias (1989) states, "It is doubtful that a highly apprehensive student speaker will find much relief by thinking positively" (p. 51). Students benefit from practical advice, for example, from tips on how to improve their introductions on their next speeches. Beatty (1988) found that a high percentage of anxious student speakers engaged in defective choice-making in selecting speech-introduction strategies. Since speaker heart rates peak during the first two minutes of a speech (Behnke & Beatty, 1981; Behnke & Carlile, 1971; Porter, 1974), instructors should stress to students the importance of their planning introduction strategies that take into account their degree of nervousness.

Suggestions such as using aids in order to take audience attention off oneself or utilizing movement during the early part of a speech in order to manage anxiety are the type of suggestions that are likely to be of use to students. Specific skill improvement, however slight, may help to alter the perception that one's performance is deficient. This shift in perception may reduce feelings of anxiety (Chesebro et al., 1992).

Workshop

At the beginning, middle, and end of the workshop, participants wrote down speaking goals for themselves. One of the speaking assignments was to discuss the goals they wrote down in the middle segment. The goals set at the beginning of class were in most cases unrealistic and centered on not being nervous. The facilitators worked with each person to develop realistic goals. This process continued throughout the workshop since participants were encouraged to set goals for each new speaking assignment. After each speech, the speaker talked about his or her progress toward individual goals. Audience discussion would often help a speaker

come up with subsequent goals. Once people gave up the idea of totally overcoming nervousness or being as good a speaker as someone else, they usually felt good about their progress.

Class Application

I encouraged students to view the first speech as an opportunity for each speaker to get a preliminary idea of her or his speaking style. Students were encouraged to do the best job they could but not to have overly high expectations for this first speech. The usefulness of the Video Tape Recorder (VTR) in allowing individuals a chance to see themselves as others see them was stressed. Students utilized the VTR to set subsequent speech goals.

Students were required to view their first speech by a set date. Although students could normally view tapes with any core instructor working in the viewing lab, they were encouraged to view this first tape with their own instructor in order to discuss goals. During the first speech viewing, students focused more on speaker appearance than on the presentation itself. As time passed, however, most students appeared to become more objective judges of their own performances. As with the workshop participants, students had to be steered away from "I want to be less nervous" and encouraged to focus on more realistic goals, such as utilizing fewer notes and thus increasing eye contact.

The focus during the VTR viewing was on the goals each student had set and the progress the student was making toward reaching the goals. If a particular technique a student had tried did not work, the instructor and student together were able to analyze why not and decide upon a future strategy.

Goals for the subsequent speeches were discussed after the critiques of each speech. The student first identified what he or she felt should be the main goal for the next speech. Then other students would offer practical suggestions. The goals were tied in with the viewing of the videotapes. Often a student would try something new—for example, utilizing more body movement—and during the self-critique would say that the movement had felt uncomfortable. If the class felt that the delivery was much improved with the new movement, the student would say that she or he wanted to see the videotape before making a decision on what to do for the next speech.

One caution should be mentioned to instructors who choose to use the goal-oriented approach in conjunction with videotaping—many students want to view their tapes after every speech. If the university schedule is not set up to accommodate this, students (and instructors) may become very frustrated. An alternate plan is to allow students to take their videotapes home for viewing. This alternative is discussed further in the section on performance evaluation.

PERFORMANCE EVALUATION

Any instructor who has ever taught a public speaking course or unit knows the importance of giving feedback on student performance. According to Book (1985), the purpose of providing feedback in the public speaking course is threefold: (a) to inform the speaker about the audience's reaction to the speech, (b) to make suggestions for improvements on future speeches, and (c) to motivate the speaker to speak again or to enjoy speaking (p. 16). An additional purpose of feedback is to encourage a student to grow in self-understanding (Edwards, 1990; Quigley & Nyquist, 1990).

Several studies (Book, 1985; Book & Simmons, 1980; Booth-Butterfield, 1989; Dedmon, 1967; Edwards, 1990; Ogilvie & Haslett, 1985; Sprague, 1971; Young, 1974) have investigated the feedback process. There is no "one right way" to deliver feedback. Sprague (1990) probably speaks for many instructors when she gives what she calls the "definitive answer" on the type of feedback that is most effective, saying, "It depends" (p. 1).

Instructors are not the only ones who may be uneasy at the prospect of evaluative feedback. Several researchers (Ayres, 1986, 1988; Booth-Butterfield & Booth-Butterfield, 1986; Daly & Buss, 1984; Greene & Sparks, 1983) have found that expectation of evaluation leads to heightened anxiety about oral performance. Roubicek (1990) says that humans take criticism of almost anything better than they "can take direct criticism of our person as we present ourselves in a performance situation" (p. 4). Evaluation about performance must be given carefully. It may be helpful for speakers to evaluate or critique themselves before other evaluation begins.

Self-Critique

Pelias and Pelias (1988) suggest that when students are self-absorbed, it is difficult for them to assimilate the perspectives of others. When students first sit down after giving a speech, they may still be running a tape of their performance in their heads and may not be ready to listen to what anyone else has to say. Letting speakers talk first about their own impressions may allow them to be more receptive to comments from others.

Use of VTR

The use of VTR greatly enhances the use of self-critiques. Students are able to step outside themselves and adopt the role of self as observer (Quigley & Nyquist, 1990). There are cautions to be observed, however. It is important that students view their tapes with either their instructor or with someone who is trained in facilitating feedback; otherwise, little improvement may occur (Booth-Butterfield, 1989; Sorenson & Pickett, 1986). An instructor can also point out to the student that although he or she may have felt extremely

nervous, the nervousness was not readily apparent to the audience. Beatty (1988) found that most of the students in a study he did believe, "if speakers appeared confident they must be confident" (p. 37). Students usually are nervous about appearing nervous; seeing that they do not appear to be as nervous as they feel should help them to concentrate on things other than their apprehension.

Dance and Zak-Dance (1986a) state that students watching themselves are often uncomfortable with the image they see on the screen and may need to reassess their self-concepts after this experience. Students are quite vulnerable when first seeing themselves on videotape. They may notice only the negative aspects of their appearance or performance and totally overlook the positive elements of their speech. Since gestures and movements may look more exaggerated on videotape than they were in the live presentation (Dance & Zak-Dance, 1986b), students need to be told this or they will jump to faulty conclusions about their own performance and may be more anxious about giving subsequent speeches.

Home-Viewing

If logistics necessitate having students view their speeches at home, instructors need to prepare the students for this experience. One way to do this would be for the instructor and students to view and then discuss a tape of one of the instructor's classroom presentations. During the discussion, differences between videotaped and live performances could be pointed out, and the students could join the instructor in identifying strengths of the presentation and areas for improvement. Or, if the instructor preferred, a tape of a student volunteer could be substituted. Another suggestion, offered by one of the reviewers of this paper, is to include a feedback form with every tape sent home with a student. The reviewer, who has used this self-directed process, believes that, while it is less than ideal, it is adequate and necessary because of time and resource constraints. Certainly not all instructors have access to the type of laboratory situation described in this paper. Presentation skills may be only one of several units of content covered in a business communication course. Home viewing may be the only alternative. In such cases, I would suggest that instructors set the stage for video viewing and, additionally, pay particular attention to the post-viewing performance of students who appeared particularly nervous during the first presentation.

Audience Critique

Self-critique used alone, even with the aid of a VTR, does not give the speaker a complete picture. As research consistently shows, individuals are not accurate observers of their own behavior (Bernard, Killworth, & Sailer, 1979). Performers and observers view the same

event differently (Sypher & Sypher, 1984). Shrauger and Schoeneman (1979) examined studies of self/other agreement and reported low correlations on such agreement. Kolb (1993) found that team leaders and team members did not always agree on areas of effective and ineffective leader performance.

Speakers, particularly overly anxious speakers, may underestimate the effectiveness of their speech performance. Young (1974), for example, found that highly anxious students are more apt to view feedback as helpful, but they are also more apt to expect to receive negative feedback. Such students also use more negative comments when critiquing their own speeches (Booth-Butterfield, 1989). Feedback from outside sources may help to balance negative self-evaluations generated by students.

Evaluation about content is better received than is evaluation about performance (Dance & Zak-Dance, 1986a). Evaluative comments should be specific but tactful (Dance & Zak-Dance, 1986b) and should focus on what can be done in the next speech to improve performance.

Workshop

After each speech, the individual who gave the speech was the first to critique. The facilitator would first ask, "What do you think you did well in this speech?" It usually took several tries before the speaker said something positive. He or she almost always wanted to start with what was done poorly. This was discouraged, however, and the speaker was forced to consider what was done well. If the speaker could not think of anything, the group would help. After the person finished the positive critique, the facilitator asked, "What would you do differently if you were to give the speech over?" After the individual had finished her or his self-critique, the audience, including the facilitator, would make comments. The emphasis was on stressing all the positive things the person did and on choosing one or two things to work on for the next speech.

After each speech except the very short ones, the videotape operator showed a brief clip of the person's speech before the critiquing began. This allowed the person to see what he or she looked and sounded like—helpful information in preparing for the next speech. The critiques were also taped so the person did not have to try to remember what everyone was saying. During the entire workshop, the focus was on each person determining what worked for her or him by trying out different things.

Class Application

After each student finished a speech and the applause died down, I asked the student what she or he did well. As with the participants in the workshop, students did not want to talk about the good things; they wanted to

discuss what they did poorly. They did, however, manage to follow the format. Only after the positive aspects of the speech were covered, did I ask what one thing would be done differently if the speech were to be given again.

Since the speaker opened the evaluative discussion, he or she had some control over the content and direction of the discussion. This appeared to take some of the anxiety out of the critiquing process. The audience offered comments after the speaker finished the self-critique. Members took their cue from the speaker and were as honest and open as the speaker appeared to want them to be. Class feedback was very encouraging in stressing the particular strengths each person had as a speaker. As the class progressed, more constructive criticism was offered, depending upon each person's skill and anxiety level.

One side benefit of using self-critiques was that the more anxious students realized that even students who appeared very confident could not immediately think of anything good to say about their speeches. This increased everyone's awareness that speakers in general are too self-critical and that this tendency gets in the way of individual progress. By the middle of the class, most students were able to express quite easily what they had done well in their speeches, although the critical tendency was still there.

Students also had individual meetings with an instructor when they viewed their tapes. These sessions allowed for more in-depth discussions and suggestions. I completed a written evaluation during each student's speech. This evaluation form was filed in each student's folder and was available to the student both during class and during VTR viewing. Evaluative comments followed the traditional content and delivery format and were useful in tracking student progress in skill development and goal attainment. Written evaluative comments from three audience members per speech also were placed in each student's file. These written comments made it possible for someone other than the instructor to discuss a student's videotaped performance with her or him. (Note: In a home-viewing situation, these sheets could be sent home with the videotape.)

As the class progressed, the class took over more and more of the critiquing and appeared to develop a great interest in the progress of each speaker, particularly as a particular speaker tried a suggestion the class had offered. I found that the audience sometimes had better suggestions for the speaker than any that I had to offer. Class members became very adroit at phrasing feedback. Students also realized that a suggestion that worked very well for one student did not work well at all for someone else. Students learned that even the very best speakers in the class could make a poor decision in a choice of a speaking strategy or technique.

SUMMARY

In spite of the differences between corporate training and university teaching, each sector can learn from the other. The points of similarity appear particularly strong in performance-based courses such as public speaking. Speakers are anxious no matter what the setting. They inevitably compare themselves to the other speakers. The audience climate is crucial in both settings.

The corporate sector and academia can both benefit from a pooling of ideas. Even if ideas and techniques are not totally new, applications are likely to vary. While I learned from the corporate workshop, the facilitators also learned from me. I made several suggestions that were incorporated into the training program. Those of us who teach public speaking encourage speakers to use all their resources. I believe instructors and trainers benefit from the same advice.

REFERENCES

Ayres, J. (1986). Perceptions of speaking ability: An explanation of stage fright. *Communication Education, 35*, 275-287.

Ayres, J. (1988). Coping with speech anxiety: The power of positive thinking. *Communication Education, 37*, 289-296.

Ayres, J. (1992). An examination of the impact of anticipated communication and communication apprehension on negative thinking, task relevant thinking, and recall. *Communication Research Reports, 9*, 3-11.

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

Beatty, M. J., Balfantz, G. L., & Kuwabara, A. Y. (1989). Trait-like qualities of selected variables assumed to be transient causes of performance state anxiety. *Communication Education, 38*, 277-289.

Beatty, M. J., & Friedland, M. H. (1990). Public speaking state anxiety as a function of selected situational and predispositional variables. *Communication Education, 39*, 142-147.

Behnke, R. R., & Beatty, M. J. (1981). A cognitive-physiological model of speech anxiety. *Communication Monographs, 48*, 158-163.

Behnke, R. R., & Carlile, L. W. (1971). Heart rate as an index of speech anxiety. *Speech Monographs, 38*, 65-69.

Bernard, H. R., Killworth, P. E., & Sailer, L. (1979). Informant accuracy in social network data, IV: A comparison of clique-level structure in behavioral and cognitive network data. *Social Networks, 2*, 191-218.

Book, C. L. (1985). Providing feedback: The research on effective oral and written feedback strategies. *Central States Speech Journal, 36*, 14-23.

Book, C. L., & Simmons, K. W. (1980). Dimensions and perceived helpfulness of student speech criticism. *Communication Education, 29*, 136-145.

Booth-Butterfield, M. (1989). The interpretation of classroom performance feedback: An attributional approach. *Communication Education, 38*, 119-131.

Booth-Butterfield, M., & Booth-Butterfield, S. (1986). Effects of evaluation, task-structure, trait-CA, and reticence on state-CA and behavioral disruption in dyadic settings. *Communication Monographs, 53*, 144-159.

Booth-Butterfield, M., & Booth-Butterfield, S. (1992). *Communication apprehension and audience avoidance in the classroom*. Edina, MN: Burgess Publishing Group.

Booth-Butterfield, S. (1988). Instructional interventions for reducing situational anxiety and avoidance. *Communication Education, 37*, 214-223.

Bowers, J. W. (1986). Classroom communication apprehension: A survey. *Communication Education, 35*, 372-378.

Chesebro, J. W., McCroskey, J. C., Atwater, D. F., Bahrenfuss, R. M., Cawleli, G., & Gaudino, J. L. (1992). Communication apprehension and self-perceived communication competence of at-risk students. *Communication Education, 41*, 345-360.

Connell, S. H., & Bordon, G. A. (1987). Incorporating treatment for communication apprehension into oral communication courses. *Communication Education, 36*, 56-61.

Daly, J., & Buss, A. (1984). The transitory causes of audience anxiety. In J. Daly & J. McCroskey (Eds.), *Avoiding communication* (pp. 67-78). Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications.

Dance, F. E. X., & Zak-Dance, C. C. (1986a). *Instructor's manual and test bank to accompany public speaking*. New York: Harper & Row.

Dance, F. E. X., & Zak-Dance, C. C. (1986b). *Public speaking*. New York: Harper & Row.

Dedmon, D. N. (1967). Criticizing student speeches: Philosophy and principles. *Central States Speech Journal, 18*, 276-284.

Edwards, R. (1990). Sensitivity to feedback and the development of the self. *Communication Quarterly, 38*, 101-111.

Greene, J., & Sparks, G. (1983). Explication and test of a cognitive model of communication apprehension: A new look at an old construct. *Human Communication Research, 4*, 158-163.

Hamilton, C. & Parker, C. (1993). *Communicating for results: A guide for business and the professions* (4th ed.). Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.

Kolb, J. A. (1993). Leading engineering teams: Leader behaviors related to team performance. *IEEE Transactions on Professional Communication, 36*, 206-211.

Kougl, K. (1980). Dealing with quiet students in the basic college course. *Communication Education, 29*, 234-238.

Ogilvie, J. R., & Haslett, B. (1985). Community peer feedback in a task group. *Human Communication Research, 12*, 79-98.

Pelias, M. H. (1989). Communication apprehension in basic public speaking texts: An examination of contemporary textbooks. *Communication Education, 38*, 41-53.

Pelias, M. H., & Pelias, R. J. (1988). Communication apprehension in the basic course in performance of literature. *Communication Education, 37*, 118-126.

Porter, D. T. (1974). Self-report scales of communication apprehension and autonomic arousal (heart rate): A test of construct validity. *Speech Monographs, 41*, 267-276.

Quigley, B. L., & Hyquist, J. D. (1990, November). *Using video technology to provide feedback to students in the performance course*. Paper presented at the Speech Communication Association Annual Meeting, Chicago, IL.

Roubicek, H. L. (1990, November). *Feedback: Instructional decisions to be made in performance courses*. Paper presented at the Speech Communication Association Annual Meeting, Chicago, IL.

Shrauger, J. S., & Schoeneman, T. H. (1979). Symbolic interactionist view of self-concept: Through the looking glass darkly. *Psychological Bulletin, 86*, 549-573.

Sorenson, R., & Pickett, T. (1986). A test of two teaching strategies designed to improve interview effectiveness: Rating behaviors and videotaped feedback. *Communication Education, 35*, 13-21.

Sprague, J. A. (1971). *An investigation of the written critique behavior of college communication instructors*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Purdue University, Lafayette, IN.

Sprague, J. A. (1990, November). *Situating our practice of speech criticism in the context of course goals*. Paper presented at the Speech Communication Association Annual Meeting, Chicago, IL.

Sypher, B. D., & Sypher, H. (1984). Seeing ourselves as others see us. *Communication Research, 11(1)*, 97-115.

Young, S. (1974). Student perceptions of helpfulness in classroom speech criticism. *Speech Teacher, 23*, 222-234. ☐