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Abstract

College students who enroll in a public speaking course are able to define speech making concepts in formal assessments, but become challenged to effectively transition speech making conceptual learning into practice. Research has shown that creating a professional vision affords a practical guideline, a refinement of practice, and allows for self-constructed growth. It is hypothesized that a public speaking vision is needed to effectively transition conceptual learning into speech making performance. This exploratory case study makes an attempt to redesign a learning environment bridging conceptual learning to practice for seven college students enrolled in a public speaking course. Data were collected from three sources—documented video notes, survey responses, and interviews in efforts to understand the relationship between creating a speech making vision and implementing concepts in practice. Participants valued authentic video and being able to notice concepts in action; thus, creating a vision while collaboration provided participants with different perspectives and the opportunity to see what was missed. It is recommended that learning environments of performance based courses, such as public speaking, include learning opportunities for students to create a vision. Outcomes will inform learning and present new thoughts and ideas on transitioning conceptual learning into practice in performance based courses.
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CHAPTER I

Introduction

Public speaking comes in all shapes and sizes. For centuries public speaking art and practice has been studied. One of the most popular pieces of public speaking theory is *Rhetoric* published by Aristotle in 350 B.C.E. Public speaking continues today in forms of advocacy, business and political presentations, *YouTube* videos, webinars, podcasts, and live streaming; advancing messages on critical topics. Public speaking and the ability to communicate clearly is a 21st century skill that employers seek at the onset of employment (Zekeri, 2004). It is a skill needed in almost every industry that employs and works with people (Fraleigh, 2017). Enhancing knowledge and skills that lead directly to employment opportunities upon graduation is what makes it an important and popular course for undergraduate students.

Public speaking on an individual level consists of a class presentation, job interview, online presentation, leading a team of volunteers, or presenting at a workshop where the speaker influences others with their message (Fraleigh, 2017). Speaking publicly can be done well or it could go badly. When it goes badly, the outcome strongly affects how people think about us. Intelligent, business-savvy people end up boring their audiences because they fail to recognize that public speaking is an acquired skill that improves with understanding theory and practice (Osborn, Osborn, & Osborn, 1994). Popular strategies used to teach public speaking consist of peer assessment (White, 2009), collaborative learning (Liao, 2014), service learning (De La Mare, 2014), and specific activities that address fear and delivery style (Nie et al., 2020). This research introduces the use of authentic video to create a speech making vision.

Too often learning environments are complex and confusing for the undergraduate learner as they are navigating numerous courses concurrently. Traditional undergraduate students
enroll for 12-15 credits per semester. Most times, semesters consist of core required courses based on their discipline of study and general education courses required to meet graduation requirements. Historically, students have been conditioned to study concepts and then repeat the concepts on a formal assessment. Preparation for assessments may consist of memorizing techniques and creating study aids. This approach may be effective for science and mathematics courses, but the art of public speaking is different. Public speaking is a course where learning is assessed based on ability to effectively demonstrate use of concepts within the speech performance. Through my years of teaching public speaking, I have found that students are challenged with effective use of concepts within the speech delivery. Effective public speaking requires the ability to creatively position and tailor each concept meeting the speech’s purpose while satisfying the audience’s needs. I have found that some students hesitate, while others struggle to implement speech making concepts in a creative and effective manner in fear of being wrong. In addition, speech anxiety is a common problem. An example from my own teaching experience that puts this into context is a performing arts major student modeled creativity during his informative speech on how to change a flat tire by using non-automotive props in the classroom. The class was not only informed on how to change a flat tire but the creative use of concepts and props made a lasting impression. Students witnessed first-hand what creativity could look like in a speech and how to use it effectively. Seeing the concepts in action allowed for a deeper learning experience. John Dewey (1958) frames learning as a way of experiencing interactions that informs individual learning. One interaction in the example consisted of a personal story that resonated with the class making it an effective attention getter. Learning environments must be effective in magnetizing students to take an active role and interact with their learning. Three relevant factors that influence learning for this study are:
1. Technology advancements

2. Increase in using recorded media

3. Diversity; student sense of belonging

As part of a first day ice-breaker activity students introduce themselves and disclose why registered for the course and how they want to improve their public speaking skills. It is here that students share they are unsure and do not view themselves as public speakers before taking a course on public speaking, specifically, Public Speaking 01:192:380. From my perspective and teaching experience, learning this art requires looking beyond the words used in the speech and focusing on the concepts, structure, and delivery of the speech. Research shows that video allows the student to untangle conceptual structure. Tobolowsky’s 2007 article, *In Practice* discusses how students who viewed video, provided a more thoughtful explanation of what was depicted in a film and pushed them to use and develop their analytic skills- specifically they gained “a better understanding of what I needed to do…” (p. 24). This research study will use visual media to demonstrate speechmaking concepts in practice. Video will be followed by small group collaboration to encourage dialogue on creatively and effectively refining concepts as “learning is driven by curiosity about the here-and-now and the anticipation of the future” (Kolb, 1984, p.132). Public speaking competency is a sought after skill driven by employment hiring demands. College students look to master this skill set prior graduation to increase their employability. This exploratory case study will build upon a constructivist learning approach to justify the approach of using authentic video to provide a public speaking vision and then collaborative learning to refine knowledge. This approach will be referred to as an authentic video learning and collaboration (AVL&C) design.
Since students do not have a clear understanding of public speaking for the purpose of this course, this dissertation examines the use of authentic video learning and collaboration to create a speechmaking vision. The purpose of the research was twofold, first it was to see how noticing speechmaking concepts assisted in creating a conceptual vision and second, was to identify how collaboration assisted in creatively refining concepts. Any research that can inform future research studies and practices that focus on design of learning environments will benefit students and professors of practice. The following chapters identify the research questions that guide this learning design, a review of literature, methods used to gather and analyze data, and recommendations for further research.

**Problem Statement**

Today’s traditional college-aged students have been connected to new technology and multimedia throughout their lifespan and easily access digital learning resources such as *YouTube, Google video, and Lynda.com* in their personal learning process, yet in the traditional college education environment, digital learning resources are not being used at the same rate to accentuate the learning process. In support of the shift in mode from lecture to learning with video, Kress (2003) points out that “given that the communicational world around us is moving to a preference for image in many domains, the new technology facilitates, supports and intensifies that preference” and concludes that “the dominance of the screen is currently the most potent medium” (Kress, 2003, p. 5). The problem that I see is that undergraduate students enrolled in a traditional semester long public speaking course do not gain a conceptual understanding of speech making concepts within a singular speech before they develop and perform their own graded speech. I have observed that what is most challenging for public speaking students is that they are expected to immediately apply conceptual theory by
performing it in their next speech. Students writing an essay on public speaking theory may be one thing but demonstrating speech theory requires students to practice understanding and developing concepts before performing their knowledge live, with no room for editing. My response to this critical educational problem makes an attempt to redesign learning in an undergraduate public speaking course using an authentic video learning and collaboration (AVL&C) design to learn core competencies of public speaking in action before creating and delivering a graded speech product. For the purposes of this study, authentic video is defined as using an age appropriate student recorded speech delivered in accordance to the assignment directions and one that is parallel with the learner in representing beliefs, values, and who they are. While watching the authentic video participants will create a vision by noting when concepts are noticed, then will break out into groups to discuss what was noticed and any areas for improvement. I define creating a conceptual vision as seeing the core concepts intact within the same speech. The vision serves as a full example. The collaboration will allow for refinement of learning. Professionally, I look for innovative ways where all students can learn. Strengthening learner centered instruction can be leveraged to impact the learning. More specifically I find that students seek ways to make authentic connections to their learning so that they can connect and develop their skills at a deeper level. Such an approach can lead to increased student engagement, deeper level of understanding, and increased competency. Learning without an authentic video puts the students at a disadvantage because the students do not have a relevant and relatable point of reference to examine, critique, and support their newly acquired knowledge from the readings, lectures, and classwork. Without authentic context, students appear to be disengaged from the learning and often need help recognizing how facts or concepts connect. Using the authentic video as a case study has learning benefits. Styer (2009) uses case
studies to engage biology students in active learning and found that case studies promote thinking skills, allow for discussions, reasoning, and conclusions. Gillham (2000) defines a case study as “a unit of human activity embedded in the real world, which can only be studied or understood in context, exists here and now, and merges so that precise boundaries are difficult to draw” (p.1). A case study can be a single case or it can be many cases. For the purpose of this research, one case, defined as authentic video learning, is used in an attempt to answer the research questions. The methods section will discuss setting, the participants, and the data collection methods used for this study.

Students enroll in a three credit undergraduate public speaking course to satisfy graduation requirements and to strengthen a skill that is of interest to employers; thus leading to employability. Each fall and spring semester, approximately 29 different sections of Public Speaking 04:192:380 are offered where approximately 725 students elect to enroll in Public Speaking. In my past six semesters of teaching Public Speaking, I have observed students struggle with the ability to effectively incorporate speech making concepts into their speech. This leads me to the impetus that fueled this research— (1) students do not have a clear vision of the concepts in practice and (2) that some students may not feel comfortable creatively refining concepts in an effective manner.

**Lack of Public Speaking Vision.** Students lack a practical guide or a conceptual vision of speech making concepts within a speech. Students are able to recall individual definitions of concepts but are challenged with the difficulty of implementing the concept in a creative manner that affords effective speech making. For example, math students are disciplined to follow formulas in order to get to the one-and-only correct solution. This does not demonstrate that the relationship of numbers is completely understood. Public speaking is an art. It is grounded in
theoretical concepts yet a meaningful vision and individual creativity is needed to tailor the message purposefully, surprising many students. During the first introductory class of each of my semesters, I ask students to introduce themselves, share a fun fact, and then share their vision of public speaking. The general consensus is ‘standing’ and ‘talking to an audience’. While this is somewhat true, it does not entirely portray the full public speaking picture.

Effective public speaking is a skill that is built on theoretical speech making concepts, research, planning, creativity, and practice. Organizationally, speeches include three sections—introduction, body, and conclusion. Within each section there are needed components for the speech to be effective. Figure 1 represents the speech structure used in this course and concept placement.

**Figure 1**

*Speech Structure and Concept Placement*

Navigating the effective use of speech making concepts requires creating a vision. The eight concepts that are the focus of this research are listed below:
I hypothesize that a lack of an effective public speaking vision specific to this course, such as use of speech components and the larger vision of the speech itself handicaps learning. Navigating the use of these concepts effectively requires creativity.

**Lack of creativity.** Reviewing recent federal educational initiatives surfaces why teaching and learning creativity is limited, if not absent in the formative years of education. In
addition, Egan, et al. (2017) discussed that there is a lack of consensus on the key elements of creativity in higher education and that the creative processes can challenge current teaching strategies.

Educational initiatives provide assistance for organizing common goals and developing education locally. Initiatives can focus on different areas while multiple initiatives can be followed within the same education system (Kontio, 2012). Summarizing recent federal K-12 initiatives explains the lack of student creativity in higher education.

From January 2009 to January 2017, the Obama Administration operationalized a set of K-12 level educational reforms ensuring that every child in the country receives the education he or she deserves (U.S. Department of Education, n.d.). The purpose of reform was to open access to higher quality of education. However, in some reform initiatives, creativity was diminished by providing students with model answers and study guides that mirrored the assessment but not the freedom to express individual ideas. The 2014 budget added funding focusing on science, technology, engineering, and mathematics (STEM) in preparation for a future skill deficit predicted by economists. English’s (2016) criticism of STEM integration in K-12 settings included various interpretations of STEM education and inequitable discipline representations. Vasquez, et al. (2013) identify that features of integration start with concept creation then progresses to concept integration with other STEM disciplines. Education initiatives like this, while much needed, become examples of how curriculum changes over time and how other important disciplines, such as music, art, history, philosophy became secondary, or in some cases extinct due to non-priority status and lack of funding. McWilliam and Lee (2006) concluded that it is a fantasy that traditional education should solve and can solve every problem. Solving every problem creates curriculum competition by adding broad-based social programs such as obesity,
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stranger-danger, and “if you see something, say something” to the curriculum (McWilliam & Haukka, 2008). Meshing of traditional subject education with personal educational campaigns comes at a cost when students enter higher education or continue into employment. The creative competency gained in domains such as music and art has been tempered throughout the K-12 setting, leaving today’s college students creatively disadvantaged.

The purpose of learning changes in higher education. Kontio (2012) identifies that the role of educational initiatives in higher education addresses the competence requirements of the working life, a change from the K-12 setting. This translates to higher education institutes pairing subject content learning with employable 21st century workplace skills. Since creativity is acknowledged as a key skill for 21st century learning (Egan, et al., 2017), professors need to encourage or in many situations develop student creativity. Today’s workplace is fast-paced, requires self-direction, and productivity (Kivunja, 2015) with communication skills being the most valued, yet overlooked, sought after skills (Choren, 2015). Hiring managers will ask about communication skills as speaking publicly has become employer expectations for most industries (Lawson, Gill, Feekery, & Witsel, 2019). At the college level, going beyond discipline discourse is a shift and requires professors to consider specific learning environments that include 21st century workplace skills. I hypothesize that a speech making vision is needed for the creative refinement of concepts to occur.

Context

The research study is using a three-credit undergraduate Public Speaking Course 04:192:380 that fulfills communication major requirement and general education requirement. Over 25 sections of the course are offered each semester. Each section has the same learning objectives, assignments, grading scale, uses the same curriculum guide, and follows similar
pacing ensuring continuity throughout the multiple sections. Students are required to purchase the text. The department provides all teaching materials; although Professors are able to provide their own recorded lectures and add learning activities as appropriate. All sections use the Canvas learning management system, use the Informative Speech Outline (Appendix A) and follow the same assignment grading rubric (Appendix B).

The AVL&C design relied on video to put speechmaking in its correct context for speech making learning. The design also relied on collaboration where students can dialogue, problem solve, brainstorm, and expand their thinking with the creation of new ideas. To address context and creating a vision, authentic video was used to guide students in being able to notice the use of theoretical concepts during a speech. For this design, authentic video was defined as student speech from a previous term that fulfills the assignment requirements and vision is defined as seeing the core concepts intact within the same speech. To address creativity, the design included collaboration to assist in noticing and discuss use of creativity when rationalizing concept use. I hypothesize that this design will afford noticing concepts to create a speech making vision and the generation of a deeper understanding that includes creatively refining concepts. The design’s approach was supported by a conceptual framework of learning, technology, and collaboration.

**Purpose of the Study**

Public speaking requires creativity when making content and delivery style decisions. The study was designed to develop and strengthen the learning of speech making skills. Specifically, the study focused on creating a conceptual vision and gaining the creative mindset needed for a successful speech. An authentic video followed by collaboration was used to create a conceptual vision within the context of public speaking. Video and discussion were used to create a focus towards noticing speech making concepts, idea generation, and creative concept
refinement. Through using critical thinking skills, creating a vision, and allowing for discussions, collaboration, reasoning, and drawing conclusions, this approach enabled students to apply knowledge and prepare for their own individual speech performance. It is hypothesized that students will acquire knowledge through the design itself, generating new ideas and learning through reflection, allowing students time to deepen their understanding and relationship of concepts. In the domain of public speaking there is limited research that tackles creativity using authentic video in the process of learning speech making. There is noted research on using video games or gamifying learning, but further research is needed on using authentic (non-gaming) video to facilitate learning outcomes specific to an undergraduate course in public speaking. The study focused on the need to notice concepts, create a vision, and use of creativity in speechmaking.

This study is important because it explores the design of a learning environment in a popular general education course and contributes to the phenomenon of undergraduate learning. Duncan-Howell (2010) elaborates that instructors can no longer just be transmitters of information. They must change with the times; they must be innovators in order to better serve students’ educational interests. It is critical to the field of research and professional practice to make an attempt to redesign learning using the AVL&C design approach to learn core competencies of public speaking. Outcomes will inform educators and learning scientists on how students leverage the need to acquire 21st century skills in higher education. This study aimed to enhance the literature and practice on teaching public speaking in a higher education setting and how college students can learn skills that are underdeveloped. Specifically, this design will deepen student learning and practice discussion by exploring the following research questions:

Q1: Does the design help students notice important speech making concepts?
Q2: Does collaboration assist in idea generation and creatively refining concepts?

The literature review section will address the use of a conceptual framework and learning theories to support why authentic video learning followed by collaboration can lead to improved learning outcomes for undergraduate students who are enrolled in a public speaking course. It is my hope and expectation that this research leads to new research and will inform the future of public speaking pedagogy. Both public speaking and creativity are 21st century employable skills that employers seek at the time of hire which makes Public Speaking 04:192:380 a popular course for undergraduates. College students look to gain as many employable skills in their undergraduate studies as possible to increase their employability at graduation.
CHAPTER II

Literature Review

The purpose of the review of the literature was to investigate the history and effectiveness of learning environments designed to foster learning in higher education. The first section presents a synthesized research overview in the key areas of creating a vision, video technology, collaboration, and creativity that were used to inform this design. The second key area identifies the theoretical framework and how it was used to guide constructing a vision and building knowledge acquisition. The third section identifies and discusses the conjecture map used for this learning design. The literature reviewed focuses on design and learning outcomes. I have found that effective learning occurs if the learner is actively engaged in the learning process and uses authentic learning materials to further develop their learning. The AVL&C learning design leverages video and collaboration to provide a vision of speech making concepts specific to learning public speaking.

Noticing: Creating a Vision

People notice by watching, observing, reflecting or being punctilious. Noticing involves seeing what matters, what is important, or what is meaningful about a particular situation. Goodwin (1994) defines noticing in the context of professional vision that enables members of a profession to develop perceptual frameworks to view situations in particular ways. Iksan and Rahim use the term as a method to realize (2017). LeFebvre, LeFebvre, and Allen use noticing to allow for “recognition” (2016, p. 119). There is no one way to notice in educational settings because students have multiple ways of understanding and responding to learning. The remainder of this section will provide insight on the use of noticing in career development and student learning.
Professional Noticing

The teaching profession uses this approach for professional development. Goodwin’s (1994) research discusses how teachers use noticing to view the act of teaching so that they can reform their practice. In addition, Van Es and Sherin’s (2008) study addresses teacher development using video clubs. The club uses video to provide a professional vision not only to notice teaching in practice but to influence future teaching. In the video club, teachers watch and discuss short clips of videos from each other’s classrooms. Specifically, they were prompted to talk and elaborate on what they noticed in the video. Over time, the teachers were able to notice more complex issues in the video. For example, in the beginning, teachers commented on the climate in the classroom and then drilled down to student ideas raised during learning. This suggests that noticing beyond an environmental scan takes time. It was found that video clubs were powerful forums in which teachers could develop new analytic skills as they were able to notice and interpret features of classroom interactions. The results of the study support that noticing skills in the video with prompted talk translated to influencing skills needed. Noticing in the professional field of teaching enables teachers to formulate ways to develop and, in some cases, improve their practice through refinement. Other professions also rely on noticing. One example is Goodwin’s (1994) study with a group of archeologists. The results of the study concluded that noticing the contextual attributes of sand, like color, led them to interpretations about the landscape itself, such as determining if fire was present or previous vegetation.

Furthering the point of noticing in education, Van Es and Sherin’s Learning to Notice Framework (2002) is used to examine the improvement of a teacher's professional vision for modification of their instructional methods and approaches. In this context, noticing requires teachers to identify what is important, apply reasoning skills, and make connections between
specific events and broader principles of pedagogy. Two ways this can be accomplished is by “calling out” (Frederiksen, 1992) or “highlighting” (Goodwin, 1994). In both, it is the act of deciding what is meaningful and warrants further attention. Through this framework teachers apply reasoning skills to the educational situation using knowledge about the subject matter, how students think, and how they react to situations in the moment. Making the connection allows teachers to think within the context of teaching and learning rather than a stand-alone situation. Noticing, within the concept of reform, creates a professional lens or a visual representation of what good teaching looks like.

**Student Noticing in Learning**

Building upon teachers’ noticing strategies, student noticing also involves attending to specific events and then making sense of these events (Sherin, Jacobs, & Phillipp, 2011). Students are able to notice when they focus to make connections, recognize, and are able to make sense of the content. Slaby & Benedict’s (2019) research study showcased student noticing using the “I Notice” method of learning poetry. The focus of the design was engaging students in noticing four levels of language through the use of notecards and a specific poem. Using the notecards, students focus on one level at a time, noticing language and making connections. Through this collaborative lesson design, students were able to notice language in its correct form, similar to how teachers create their professional vision of teaching practice. The most noteworthy finding was from the survey responses where students self-rated their competency at reading poetry. There was a statistical significance with the response “I am good at reading poetry”. This outcome inferred that students were able to respond in this manner because they were able to notice language and make connections leading them to rate themselves as “good” when reading poetry. Similarly, Nihei, Terashima, Suzuki, and Morikawa (2002) compared
student’s ability to detect proofreading errors and concluded that those who worked in groups and discussed editing concepts noticed more errors than those who performed the task independently.

Noticing in a structured learning environment allows students to focus on content, sense-making, and making connections. LeFebvre, LeFebvre, and Allen’s (2016) study relies on student noticing to improve public speaking skills. The study uses video to improve public speaking competencies during a practicing activity as it allows for “recognition” (p. 119) of what the speech looks like. Recognizing context and making connections strengthens the potential to influence noticing. Noticing concepts in video creates a professional vision for speechmakers similar to how teachers reform their practice. Research shows many studies have supported that noticing allows for acknowledgement and the ability to think critically on how to make appropriate adjustments. I hypothesize that similar to how teachers are able to reform their teaching practice by creating a professional vision, public speaking students can do the same and refine their speech making practice.

**Technology**

Technology is not a new approach to educational design. In many learning environments, it plays a central role. Technology can be used in learning environments in a number of different ways. What makes the phenomena of learning complex is that it consists of many non-instructional learning variables that are distributed throughout the learning environment. These variables include people, tools and technology, to name a few. Since the AVL&C design relies on technology, this section will focus on technology, specifically video as it is one of the primary vehicles used in the learning environment. Ensuring a successful learning environment requires a comprehensive approach in identifying the impacts of digital literacy within the actual design of
the learning environment. Supporting higher education initiatives, building 21st century learning gives students the skills needed for the future. The Partnership for 21st Century Learning identified four important skills that are needed for the future - creativity, critical thinking, communication, and collaboration (Johnson, 2009) with the focus more on making sense of information, sharing it, and using it. When designing learning environments that include use of technology, many components need to be thoughtfully considered, such as digital literacy, use of technology, design approaches, learning theories and the individual student.

Eshet (2004) discusses that digital literacy is a needed survival skill for the 21st century and is defined by the American Library Association (ALA) as the ability to use information and communication technologies to find, evaluate, create, and communicate information, requiring both cognitive and technical skills. Not everyone has access to develop these skills so a digital divide occurs within educational environments. Educators need to close this gap by incorporating technological affordances and understanding constraints that each student’s learning experience is positive. Technological affordances can consist of student autonomy, access from a single location, motivation, storage, sharing/collaboration, student ownership, and deep learning as students are building upon their existing learning. Technological constraints can consist of student distraction, cause students to disconnect from the learning, access and cost for individual families, and can create dependencies for information recall. Technology in the classroom opens more doors, introduces new experiences, and creates more opportunities for self-discovery by allowing students interaction with the learning materials and how that knowledge is learned. Rationale and understanding will always need to be communicated, it may just be in different forms (audio recorded, written, oral…). My experience is that students have various levels of comfort with technological resources and use technologies in different ways.
Video is one piece of the technological ecosystem where students are quick to click. Using technology in a learning capacity will simulate skills and tools used in the workplace; providing options of how information can be given and received. The next section will focus on the use of video and how it will benefit this learning design.

**Video**

Video learning in the form of games and gamification of concepts has been heavily researched and documented where students use simulations to problem solve or clues to build something have achieved positive results such as engagement with materials, the relatability of learning to everyday life, and increased interest for future learning (Annetta, et al 2009; Watson et al. 2011; and Hodges, et al. 2018). Traditional college-aged students have been coined as being digital natives as they have been active consumers of technology for the majority of their lives – most specifically, learning in a way that is different from how current professors of practice have learned. Both Temple (2008) and Kress (2003) make the point that “the [video] screen has replaced the books and that image, audio, and video lead to deeper meanings, structure of ideas, arrangements and one’s own knowledge” (Kress, 2003, p. 16) while Barford and Weston’s study (1997) found that there are important factors that encourage the use of video in teaching such as “bringing the outside world into the learning space, visual representation of ideas and concepts and the personification of real-life situations” (p.44). Video learning with group work develops important associated skills such as decision making, concept building, team building, and critical thinking (Annetta et al., 2009; Barford & Weston, 1997; Ben-Ari, 2001; Hayward, 2017; Hodges et al., 2018; Mitra et al., 2010; Watson et al., 2011). Video learning also supports new learning through visual representation of new concepts, content and ideas. Eick and King’s (2012) study of 242 non-science undergraduate students enrolled in a
conceptual science concepts class used embedded targeted video segments to develop a conceptual understanding. The results described how the use of video helped students better process new material versus hearing the lecture and viewing PowerPoint slides with occasional pictures, graphs, and charts. Additionally, 11% of the students cited how the video segments helped clarify content through “seeing” the topics being discussed and also hearing a different explanation for them; supporting the importance of video demonstration. Another substantial finding was that video provided students with memory cues and connections that also helped them remember conceptual ideas.

Video use is not always an effective learning tool. Ted Talks are a popular example of mediated technology where prerecorded speeches serve as a demonstration that does not always produce positive results for the student. Using TED Talks are easy and accessible but may not be authentic and realistic. Hayward (2017) points out that TED Talks appear to be unstructured in nature but are rehearsed and speakers use a monitor that displays their script. Viewing a staged speech is not an authentic experience for the learner because most likely students will not produce a staged Ted Talk at this point in their academic journey. Mitra, et al.’s study in 2010 supports that “when used appropriately, video can actively engage students and lead to deeper learning as part of an overall blended learning approach” (p. 406). Video affords meaning to be made through individually constructing learning by watching and socially constructing learning by discussing the concepts noticed in the video.

Collaboration

The educational world has been shaped by the thoughts and ideas rooted in Vygotsky’s zone of proximal development where he identifies the difference of what learners can do by themselves and what can be done with guidance and encouragement from other learners.
Vygotsky (1978) reveals that learning occurs collaboratively, through social interaction or the negotiation that transpires during the social interaction. Merriam-Webster defines collaboration as working jointly with others or together especially in an intellectual endeavor. For this design, collaboration is defined as small groups working together contributing ideas while working toward a common goal. Collaboration can be facilitated using cooperative learning groups that are composed of small, heterogeneous student teams who work interdependently to solve problems (Kivunja, 2014a). Collaborative learning yields many positive benefits, such as diversified perspectives, retention, active learning and reducing anxiety (Laal & Ghodsi, 2012). Several studies in the communication domain specifically identify benefits to collaborative learning. Liao’s (2014) study of 57 public speaking students showed that when collaborative learning was used, learning increased because students received valuable feedback from their peers that informed their learning. Glaser’s (2006) study of public speaking students found an increased understanding of subject matter when collaboration was used during a final exam. How students use collaboration to advance knowledge acquisition is the next discussion point for this study.

**Collaborative Learning**

Collaborative learning is fueled by student engagement, inquiry, and peer learning that leverages a variety of positive outcomes besides knowledge acquisition. To give students the opportunity to learn from each other through cooperative learning activities instills the power of giving and receiving. According to Johnson, et al. (1986), cooperative learning is the “instructional use of small groups so that students work together to maximize their own and each other’s learning” (p.3). For cooperative learning to be successful much time is needed in the
planning of the learning design. Consideration needs to be given to the group size, student role, assessment strategy, and how it plays into the lesson (Keyser, 2000).

Collaborative learning can exist in all learning environments ranging from spelling class in the primary grades to high school science concepts to undergraduate college level. Numerous scholarly articles support and synthesize positive themes and outcomes of cooperative learning, such as increased learning, increased quality of work, an increased development of non-content skills, and student engagement. The articles in this section were specifically chosen as they each represent a variety of age, ethnicity, gender, and subject content. Understanding a variety of studies and their outcomes provides a path forward in creating best practices for learning and informing professional practice.

A collaborative learning environment enables students to be creative, discuss, generate new ideas, change their perspective or cross-check each other through discourse. New patterns of thought are produced when peers engage in collaborative discussion (Damon, 1984). Discussion helps to promote long-term retention of information, motivation for further learning, application of information to other settings, and development of creative thinking (Bonwell & Eison, 1991). It is this back-and-forth dialogue that generates new learning. Nihei, et al.’s., (2002) study compared students who worked individually with those that worked collaboratively and found that when two individuals discussed and shared ideas, their ability to detect proofreading errors was superior to those who performed the task independently. Rojas-Drummond, Albarran, and Littleton’s (2008) study with 9-year-old students who worked on a writing activity together, found that students “reconstructed, augmented, and polished” their text (p. 183). The students were able to make connections between their own ideas and those of others, infusing their own creativity through the refinement process. This suggests that
collaboration creates a rich learning experience, allowing room for creativity while connecting students to learn via trial and error discussions. Some students learn the best when they are not paralyzed by the fear of getting something wrong. Some argue that collaboration eases fear of evaluation while instilling confidence. Cox references this point in his 2009 study of college students enrolled in an entry level English class. He noted that 22 of 56 participants (almost 40%) referred to their fear of failure and that it impacted their learning ability. Knowing that 40% of students fear failure, collaboration may lower this statistical outcome. Pitfalls to be mindful of when planning cooperative strategies is the assumption of individual student base knowledge before starting the activity, the ability for a student to accurately self-report their learning, and then to synthesize the collaborative feedback as refined learning (Madrid, et al., 2007). There are other benefits to collaborative learning that are important skills for college students to develop, such as an increase in producing quality work and non-content skills, a sense of belonging, and student engagement.

**Increased Quality of Work.** When students work together the quality of their work can be increased due to factors such as student engagement, inclusion, and understanding the expectations. Liu, et al.’s study (2016) supports that peer dialogue and argumentation increases work quality and impacts student learning without the influence of the teacher’s authoritative role instructing the student on exactly what to do or how to do it. For the student who is providing dialogue rationale, they are gaining a deeper understanding of the content because they are making connections, applying previous comprehension and feel ownership for the work (Williams, et al. 2017). Outcomes supported positive reflections on the coursework itself. Improvements were noted in overall student experience and abilities, and mimicking collaborations. Modeling how to provide quality discourse serves each student differently as
they experience this role in different settings. Williams, et al. (2017) also noted an increase in grades in those students that participated in a cooperative learning environment versus those who did not. Cooperative learning is also a learning strategy that is used at the college level. Here, the feedback from multiple peers and the instructor is more valuable and potentially more accurate than the feedback from the instructor only (Mentzer, et al., 2016). Providing quality discourse strengthens all students involved and continues the development of thoughts and ideas.

**Increase of Non-Content Skills.** There is more to school than reading, writing and arithmetic. A cooperative learning environment develops and strengthens skills such as communicating effectively, ability to ask questions, knowing how to further learn, think critically, problem solve and be a happy and caring person are not taught in individual subjects. Working with peers enables students to incorporate knowledge from other non-content areas like critical thinking skills, writing and demonstration skills. Social interaction is important as students develop empathy for peers, social concern for others and concern for oneself (Seroussi & Sharon, 2016). Cooperative learning environments encourage students to learn by trial and error, or to learn from one’s experiences. Some students learn the best when they are not paralyzed by the fear of getting something wrong. Student psychological well-being can also be an outcome of collaborative learning for college students in the areas of independence, growth, concern for others and a positive attitude towards oneself (Hanson, Trolian, Paulsen, & Pascarella, 2016). College students value strengthening non-content skills as they are employable skills that are routinely discussed during the interview process.

**Student Engagement.** Student engagement is an input that is critical to the learning process as it is important that students take an active role in the learning. Keeping the attention, interest, curiosity, and passion strong for each student ensures that all can learn. Through
cooperative learning students are able to engage through multiple learning styles with different concepts in an active, collaborative, and in a low stakes manner (Hoffman & Hennessy, 2018). Hoffman & Hennessy’s (2018) framework in a chemistry class noted the number of students answering the post activity questions correctly dramatically increased despite most students having little knowledge prior the activity. In this study, student engagement served as an output as they learned from engaging in discussion with their peers. The research supported that retention and transfer of learning was validated, when unprompted and within discussions, students were able to add the correct name of who portrayed the chemical element in the activity.

**Sense of Belonging.** The perception of whether one feels that they belong can affect their ability to learn. Cooperative learning provides all students the opportunity to learn from each other in the learning environment. Both Hoffman (2018) and Liu, et al. (2016) support the importance of creating an environment where all feel the sense of belonging so that they can increase their engagement and analytical skills while eliminating misperceptions. This design uses collaboration to encourage and inspire each other through discussions on speech making theory, concepts, and the effective use of each. Collaboration enables additional learning to occur.

**Creativity**

Amabile (1983) defines creativity as the creation of novel and valuable ideas that are open for interpretation. Robinson (2011) discusses that creativity is “the process of having original ideas that have value” (p. 118). Collaborative settings foster creativity by way of group composition, with each member bringing their prior knowledge, perspectives, experiences, and individual expertise into the setting. Diversified group composition expands the knowledge base; fueling creativity. Diversity increases creativity due to shared understanding, distributed
AN APPROACH TO TEACHING PUBLIC SPEAKING

cognition, and making use of differences. Sosa’s (2011) study on knowledge diversity at the
dyadic level is associated with the generation of creative ideas. Ocker’s (2005) study measuring
the influence on creativity for educational purposes concluded that involvement and interaction
are significant enhancers for creativity. Students are more inclined to produce creative ideas
when they collaborate with others who have diversified interests (Sosa, 2011). Thus, creativity
opens the pathways to idea generation. Amabile, Hadley, and Kramer (2002) argue that
creativity is in jeopardy when pressured by time to complete the task while Amabile (1983)
points out that creativity is reduced when individuals are burdened with specific approaches to
problem-solving. In order to cultivate creativity, twenty-first century students require a learning
environment where questioning, patience, openness to fresh ideas, a high level of trust, and
learning from mistakes and failures are welcomed (Kivunja, 2014b; Trilling & Fadel, 2009).
Thus, to promote student creativity, learning activities must motivate students to create and
combine ideas and information that changes thinking (Kim, Park, Yoo, & Kim, 2016). Providing
opportunities for elaboration, independent thought, diversified group composition, and
interaction for agreement spurs creativity.

Creativity is needed when learning how to effectively speak in a public manner. Not all
students enter the course understanding how to be creative. When students need knowledge or a
skill that they are lacking, collaboration may facilitate bridging a knowledge gap. It provides a
theoretical and practical framework for students to acquire knowledge from the collaboration
experience itself and to reflect on the learning experience so that new knowledge and
understanding is created. Specifically, skills like communication, group dynamics, problem
solving and creativity aid the student in retaining the learning experience. (Beard & Wilson,
2006).
Theoretical Framework

Learning can be messy and this design will provide a sandbox approach where students can build the learning that they need. The theoretical theory used to guide the AVL&C learning design and testing of the hypotheses is grounded in individual cognitive and social constructivism. While they are fundamentally different both types will ultimately lead students to new learning (Kalina & Powell, 2009). Constructivism is a theory about how one learns and the thinking process, rather than about how a student can memorize and recite a quantity of information (Liu & Chen, 2010). The constructivist learning theory allows for students to actively construct their own knowledge rather than receive it directly from a lecture or a textbook (Ben-Ari, 2001; Hein, 1991). The work of Piaget, Vygotsky, and Freire influenced the constructivist approach in education as one in which learners actively create, interpret, and reorganize knowledge in individual ways (Shah, 2019). Jean Piaget theories express that knowledge is created cognitively through interaction between experiences and ideas. Social interaction where co-constructing knowledge or negotiating knowledge in a collaborative learning setting, influences how one acquires knowledge (Vygotsky, 1978; Kurt, 2020). One of Freire’s reflections on learning is that learners bring their own knowledge and experiences into the learning process (Freire Institute, 2021). The constructivist theory is leveraged where learners continuously build, or “construct,” their own experiences and understandings regarding the concepts of effective public speaking. The constructivism theory approach provides a learning environment that is thought-provoking, inquiry based, and relevant to the learning. Under this theory of learning, students build on knowledge that they already have acquired and look to further develop their content knowledge through challenging misperceptions they have on the topic. Collaboration involves social constructivism in which meaning is jointly
constructed with others. Learners, through social negotiation, produce new knowledge, correct previous knowledge, or confirm present knowledge (Shah, 2019).

Constructivism is used in nursing education to improve critical thinking skills and encourage the rapid adaptation to changes in evidence-based practice (Brandon & All, 2010, p. 91). Outside of specialized programs, Hakeem’s 2001 study with students in a business statistics course who were exposed to constructing their learning fostered more helping, encouraging, and assisting among students to develop critical thinking skills in statistics. The outcome of using real data and a model case produced more students receiving an A in the project, and fewer students in the project group received a grade below C (Hakeem, 2001). Constructivism theory relies on the ability of the instructor to change from a lecture based teaching style to a collaborative teaching style where the student is active and the center of the learning. Both the instructor and the student need to be ready to transition to this new role. With this transition, instructors rely on student current knowledge (Ben-Ari, 2001). Shah (2019) discusses that learning should be organized so that students continually build upon what they have already learned by adding levels of complexity. McLeod (2019) reveals that constructivist learning theory underpins a variety of student-centered teaching methods and techniques whereby students transition from passive recipients of information to an active and social participant in the learning process. Within this framework, the primary responsibility of the teacher is to create a collaborative learning environment where students become active participants in their own learning, constructing knowledge with peers rather than just consuming information from text. Finally, Wilson (1996) defines constructivist learning environments as ‘a place where learners may work together and support each other as they use a variety of tools and information resources in the pursuit of learning goals and problem-solving activities’ (p.5). For example,
individuals produce new patterns of thought when engaging in discussion with peers (Damon, 1984) or discover one or more solutions (Yager, 2000). The design builds upon these theories with Bonwell & Eison’s (1991) principle of active learning, which suggests that individuals learn better when they engage in higher-order thinking tasks while completing an instructional activity. The most popular active learning activity—discussion—helps to promote long-term retention of information, motivation for further learning, application of information to other settings, and development of thinking skills (Bonwell & Eison, 1991).

The AVL&C design will foster a connection among students where they can actively share and receive knowledge and ideas through cognitive and social constructivism related to public speaking discourse. The design enables students to value the collective group competence and to learn from one another.

**Embodied Conjecture (Theory Based Logic Model)**

The conjecture map created for this research design (Figure 2) reflects a structure that connects theory, design, and identifying learning that is expected to surface from the design (Sandoval, 2014).
The design approach uses a constructivism learning environment and asserts that authentic video followed by collaboration will provide students a conceptual understanding of concepts, negotiate a speech making vision, and creatively refine concepts. The theory of building knowledge is linked to the embodiments of authentic video, speech making conceptual theory and collaboration. In this study, the Eight Core Speech Making Concepts (Table 1) and Speech Structure and Concept Placement figure (Figure 1) represents the conceptual roadmap that is needed for speech making learning in this course.

The AVL&C design provides a structure where students, with a common interest in public speaking, can come together in a collaborative environment to increase their awareness of core speech competencies and preparation practices supporting their application of knowledge to a performance based assessment. The design approach asserts that the AVL&C design case
study will enable students to share and receive knowledge in the form of learning to ultimately assist them in creating and delivering an informative speech.

The conjecture builds upon current course resources and is reified by adding two features: authentic student video that demonstrates the speech assignment and collaboration. The AVL&C design will contain materials that support the learning objectives of the course. Those materials consist of textbook, assignment overview, lecture(s), outline template, authentic learning video, and speech assessment rubric. This design builds off of constructivism and the ability to create new knowledge. The authentic video followed by collaboration guides group argumentation and clarifying thoughts that connect the authentic video to speech making concepts, vision, examples, or ideas within the learning design. The authentic video supports student learning as it serves as a display of the knowledge to be acquired.

Independently, participants will view the video adding concept notes using PlayPosit software and then work collaboratively in groups to discuss the concepts noticed and areas of improvement. PlayPosit software will be defined in greater detail in the methodology chapter. Participants will use their inquiry methods and critical thinking skills while analyzing the video to create a speech making vision. In addition, argumentation and social negotiation allows for additional new thoughts and ideas to surface thus refining learning based on shared experiences and discussions. Collaboration and active learning provides opportunities for participants to be the center of the learning validating their “experiences now have special and unique meaning” (Boghossian, 2006, p. 715) and serve to support new learning (Boblett, 2012).

The AVL&C design is used to solve the problem of practice of creating a conceptual public speaking vision as the video itself promotes visual representation while the design promotes engagement, enabling development of creativity skills, and transforming experience
into new knowledge for their own speechmaking. The experience will consist of watching the authentic video, noticing concepts, collaboratively reflecting upon concepts and refining thinking on how to improve use of concepts.

**Embodiments**

**Authentic Video Learning.** Video will be used to visually represent a five minute informative speech assignment. For the purpose of this design, authentic video is defined as student speech from a previous term that fulfills the assignment requirements. In Barlow, Gerstenschlager, and Harmon’s (2016) study of math students, the unknown student is used to create meaningful discourse and construct arguments; enabling students to critically think about different solutions, correct inaccuracies, and introduce new ideas. The authentic video serves as the unknown student affording each student the opportunity to view learning in an authentic context with an authentic student. Students will then work in groups of three to discuss concepts, generating newly refined learning.

The use of video was selected as a method to notice speech making concepts for two reasons (1) to provide a visual representation for noticing and (2) to provide ability to stop and rewind. First, Barford & Weston’s (1997) study found that video affords visual representation of ideas and concepts along with the personification of real-life situations. Providing a visual representation allows the learner to individually draw or make connections to the concepts being learned. Bandura (1997) discusses how video serves as a reality check when intentionally analyzing video content. Using an authentic video, where the presenter is a student, allows for a sense of encouragement and provides a model. Second, Bransford, Brown, & Cocking (2000) research highlights that video affords interactivity as students are able to revisit and review material. Affording students the ability to revisit is important as the AVL&C design requires
multitasking. Participants will be watching the video while concurrently adding notes when they notice a concept. In addition, it is possible that not all students will notice at the same time and within the same manner.

Video by itself is unlikely to be effective; it is what teachers do with it that counts (Denning, 1992). Use of video was selected as a solution to enable students to notice speech making concepts and to lead them to creating a speech making vision. LeFebvre, LeFebvre, & Allen’s (2016) study of undergraduate students enrolled in a public speaking course concluded that video aids in the promotion of a “more valid interpretation of speechmaking” (p. 137). Learners need to take an active role in developing and applying their reflective skills, inferring a capacity for agency that may not be well developed in all learners (Coulson & Harvey, 2013). The AVL&C design calls for participants to evaluate the video and enter notes when concepts are noticed making participants active in their own learning. Being an active learner adds a sense of focus bringing themes to life and stimulating interest and new knowledge (O’Hagan, 2001; Mitra et al., 2010). Thus, video and active learning with adding concept notes was chosen as a solution because of the many affordances— the ability for the student to notice speech making through visual representation and to generate new ideas.

Video will be used in two different ways in the design. First, the video case itself will dismiss student distractions from non-salient discourse and will introduce and shape the start of speech conceptual knowledge with surfacing “the critical tasks that need to be completed smoothly and as quickly as possible” (Travis, 2009, p. 17). Video brings a sense of natural mapping, immediate apprendability, (Norman, 2002) and reduces complexity (Edelson & Reiser, 2006) as students have been exposed to some form of video most, if not all of their lives. In this case, video is purposefully used to understand what speechmaking is without any extra effort.
(Allen, 2004) while providing a visual representation of what a speech could look like. The second use of video provides narrative feedback (Pinkard et al., 2017) on core components that includes possible examples of what could make the speech better in each category. This allows groups to collaborate and problem solve while expanding their conceptual understanding and generating new ideas for the speaker to consider before speech day. Collaboration allows for additional meaning to be jointly and socially constructed. Narratives facilitate the “mesh among forms of knowledge” as discussed in STELLAR Model (Derry, Hmelo-Silver, Nagarajan, Chernobilsky, Feltovich, & Halfpap, 2005, p.106).

**Collaboration.** Collaboration was chosen on the basis that learning is both social and contextual. According to Anderson, Reder, and Simon (1996), learning is a social process grounded in the actions of everyday situations. Johnson, et al. (1986) defines cooperative learning as connecting small groups of students so that they can maximize their learning and the learning of others. A collaborative small group activity was identified as a means to generate and support learning because it affords students the ability to expand their learning. In contrast, if instructors are the only transmitters of information, learning perspectives are limited (Duncan-Howell, 2010).

The AVL&C design will consist of randomly assigned small groups of three or four participants. Participants will work together to develop their own and each other’s learning by discussing the authentic video and eight course speechmaking concepts of attention getter, credibility statement, audience analysis, preview statement, oral citations/research, transition sentences, summary statement, and clincher (Table 1). Smaller groups will minimize the criticisms regarding academic integrity and free-loading while random assignment will allow for diversity of perspectives. The activity and dialogue will assist students in identifying speech
making concepts and to creativity generate conceptual ideas that would make the speech better. Collaboration creates student agency by providing a vehicle for students to create new ideas and share thoughts, distributing cognition.

**Mediating Processes**

Recognizing how the learning takes place is pivotal when designing effective learning environments. Sandoval (2014) explains that there are two ways of understanding the mediating processes that emerge from a design: interactions and artifacts. Interactions will be in the form of argumentation where students discuss, question, rationalize, test, negotiate, and pose new ideas that advance their learning, both independently and in groups. For the purposes of this research, argumentation will transpire in a dedicated collaborative space similar to how Moje, Ciechanowski, Kramer, Ellis, Carrillo, & Collazo (2004) define space as where students make connections to their learning. During argumentation learners generate new ideas that promote learning as they negotiate and allow new information to form new understandings (Fosnot, 1984). Concept discussion will include those concepts that are listed in Table 1 while new ideas will include creatively crafting an appropriate attention getter or a stronger clincher.

Incorporating strong speech making concepts in a speech will lead to effective speech making. There are several mediating processes within the design— they are interaction, adding concepts noticed while watching the video, idea generation, and using public speaking words, concepts, and knowledge during collaboration. Conversations and back-and-forth dialogue justify participants taking on an active learning role where they are the center of the learning. Contributing to conversation increases the chances that they will transition this knowledge acquisition into their individual speech. The language used while creating notes will be analyzed
for depth and uniqueness. Data from these sources will be collected and will be expanded upon in the methodology section.

**Summary**

The review of literature on technology, collaboration, and creativity provided a broad approach to position my research study within the body of learning theories and strategies. The AVL&C design draws on two critical strengths—collaboration and video. When students are engaged in authentic work they have a sense of belonging and are able to stretch their minds together in a way that produces critical thinking and generates new ideas. Three principles will be leveraged that anchor this research study with current learning theories to solve the problem of practice (1) AVL&C learning space is social and meaningful, (2) knowledge is refined and constructed from watching the video and (3) collaboration allows for additional knowledge refinement and construction. Analyzing that learning is social allowed me to design an appropriate learning environment that is flexible and inclusive. Students interact within their groups, building on what each student already knows. Collaboration is strengthened by creating a conceptual vision from the authentic video. Student voice and infusion of different perspectives serves to encourage creativity, expand student agency, develop critical thinking and problem solving skills, and refine learning. Students who have agency are more likely to lead to academic success (Lin-Siegler, Dweck, & Cohen, 2016). Providing a learning environment that is meaningful to students is a critical component to the design. Authentic video learning is one way to connect learners with learning. With authenticity, connection becomes personal as the visual content has scope to educate and demonstrate concepts. Not every learning design is flawless. This design can incur some challenges, such as technical issues, attendance, and social loafing. It is important that the instructor remains present to facilitate all in the learning process.
Thus, the purpose of the study was to see if creating a conceptual vision assisted in the use of speech making concepts. Although cooperative learning and incorporating technology are not new approaches, it is the powerful combination of both that this study is researching to solve the problem of practice identified.
CHAPTER III

Methodology

The research design is built upon affordances of constructivism, use of enhanced technology, collaboration, and Public Speaking teaching strategies. The conjecture map created for this research design (Figure 2) reflects a structure that connects theory, design, and identifying learning that is expected to surface from the design (Sandoval, 2014). The purpose of the Authentic Video Learning and Collaboration (AVL&C) design was to assess how pairing authentic video with small group collaboration will provide participants a conceptual understanding of concepts, the opportunity to negotiate a speech making vision, and to creatively refine concepts. To accomplish this, I gathered data from three data sources to determine:

- Effectiveness of using authentic video
- Ability to notice eight core concepts
- Effectiveness of collaboration

Research Design

The research design of this study employed a case study approach method. Case study approach supports an extensive and in-depth description of the learning phenomenon that goes beyond reciting definitions of concepts. (Yin, 2017). Specifically for this research, it is used to understand how participants perceive concepts and their use in speech performance. Qualitative methods were used to build and describe how participants experienced the learning in this design. A qualitative design is best to use when the research is intended to help understand what is happening; specifically, how participants are experiencing the learning environment, to explore how the design assists learning, and did the design accomplish what is set out to accomplish (Creswell, Hanson, Clark Plano & Morales, 2007). Flexibility in approach and
focusing on gathering rich data was meaningful when interpreting data. The study built data through the collection of narrative qualitative data, such as individual comments, survey responses and interview responses to make sense of the experience. Examining participant’s perception and experiences with the design responded to how participants create a conceptual vision and how collaboration advanced their learning. Using a qualitative research approach captured what is going on in the free-flowing setting, keeping the how central to study and the findings. This method provided the advantage of generating rich, detailed data that left participants' perspectives intact and provided multiple contexts for understanding the phenomenon under study (Denzin and Lincoln, 2000; Merriam, 2009). Since the participant can choose to tell some particular memory or thought while ignoring others, reliability is a possible limitation. Probing techniques were used during the interview to uncover any relationships, similarities and differences, or provide an elaboration that further explains their learning. Understanding the participant’s experience through a descriptive analysis of student generated notes, survey results, and semi-structured interview questions was used to respond to the research questions and to inform educational practice.

**Participant Selection, Setting, and Procedures**

Students self-register for Public Speaking 04:192:380 using the university’s registration system and are able to modify their enrollment within one week of the semester starting. Public Speaking is a required course for communication majors and a popular course that fulfills a general education requirement for non-communication majors, counting towards degree credits. There are no academic prerequisites for this course. Student demographics such as age, gender, race, credits earned are not controlled for and may not be equally represented among the volunteered participants. Two professors agreed to allow their students to participate in the
study, representing three of the 30 sections being offered. One of the professors taught two sections. Since each section size was capped at 25 students, a total of 75 participants were invited to participate in the study. Seven participants enrolled in the Spring 2021 semester of Public Speaking 04:192:380 consented to participate in the study (APPENDIX C). The duration of the study was approximately one hour. Both professors offered extra credit points for those participants who agreed to participate in the study.

The study was conducted in a virtual environment due to COVID-19 global pandemic. Zoom web conferencing tool was used to facilitate the online research meeting and to facilitate breakout rooms so groups could collaborate virtually. In addition to Zoom, the university’s learning management system, Canvas, was chosen to host the study’s materials and resources. Canvas learning management system was used as a research learning site, similar to a course learning site, so that all participants have access to the researcher and the study materials during a global pandemic. Canvas (2020) defines the platform as a web-based learning management system used by learning institutions, educators, and students to access and manage online course learning materials and communicate about skill development and learning achievement. Canvas is the same platform used for all sections of Public Speaking at the university. Many students may have already developed a sense of comfort with Canvas as many other types of courses and professors within the university use this platform. The study’s site was set-up in a similar manner to other undergraduate courses. It consisted of materials needed to conduct the study, such as the authentic video and directions. Students had full access and watched an authentic recorded video speech according to the assignment directions (Appendix D). Within Canvas, PlayPosit platform was used to host the authentic video and capture comments. PlayPosit (2021) defines the platform as an interactive video tool that integrates seamlessly within Canvas.
facilitating threaded discussions, questions, prompts or comments embedded at specific intervals throughout the video for users to respond, building student agency. PlayPosit technology required creating a “bulb” allowing video interaction. For this research study, participants interacted with the authentic video by adding “notes” at user defined points in time (Figure 3). This type of interaction transforms watching video from a passive learning experience into an active learning experience. The authentic video was selected as a means to help students create a vision of concepts through video demonstration and modeling the speech making process.

Knowledge was socially created by observing the video and constructing a comprehensive vision of informative speech making. Watching the authentic video and noticing concepts required participants to stop the video when each of the eight concepts were noticed and select ‘insert note’ (Figure 3). Participants added a note calling out the concept they were noticing. PlayPosit performance reports captured each interval time stamp (in minutes: seconds) when video was stopped and the note that was entered, validating when participants noticed concepts. Reports were easily accessible via download option within the platform to identify trends of specific concepts noted and time intervals of notation.

There is no time constraint on watching the video and inserting notes. The authentic video was previewed for both content accuracy and potential usefulness in helping participants create a conceptual vision. Video selection was determined by a clear, effective use of concepts within a unique, but relatable topic for college students. Table 2 shows the study’s activities and approximate length of time. Each activity was structured with procedures that describe the specific steps used when conducting the research. (APPENDIX B).
Table 2

*Research Study Activities*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research Study Activities</th>
<th>Activity Objective</th>
<th>Approximate Length of Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Watch Authentic Video and Note Concepts</td>
<td>Notice concepts in practice</td>
<td>15-30 minutes or until all completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Create a conceptual vision</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaboration</td>
<td>Increase agency</td>
<td>20 minutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Form new learning</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

After all participants completed watching the video and noticing concepts, participants worked in small groups to discuss what they noticed. The researcher randomly assigned participants into breakout rooms using Zoom web conferencing tool. Immediately following the collaboration activity an electronic survey was distributed to collect collaboration activity feedback. A small group of five interviews were conducted after participants presented and received their informative speech grade from their professor, which was no longer than three weeks after the study was initiated.

**Data Collection Methods**

Case study evidence can come from many sources with each source being associated with an array of data (Yin, 2017). Three data sources were collected in the form of notes, survey responses, and interview responses. Noticing concepts notes were captured in PlayPosit software, collaboration survey responses were gathered using Qualtrics, and individual interviews were held virtually, using Zoom. All data remained confidential. The researcher protected data from disclosure outside the research according to the research protocol. Participant names remain confidential. Methods to reduce risk of disclosure include replacing the participant’s name with a unique numerical code, and using this code when linking and referring to the data in the data analysis. Numerical codes were assigned to each participant.
starting with one and proceeding to seven. The researcher stored the participant’s name and code key separately from the research data. In addition, the researcher used this unique code when specifically referring to a participant’s response during data analysis.

Descriptive genuine responses were gathered from the noticing concepts activity data, collaboration feedback data, and interviews. It is anticipated that the data will support using authentic video provokes thought and discussion, strengthening noticing public speaking concepts, and refining knowledge. Data were coded and synthesized in a way that allows for the research questions to be answered.

A codebook was created to synthesize and analyze the data identifying broad ideas, concepts, behaviors and phrases. Some examples are provided in each of the following sections as coding is helpful in structuring, organizing, and labeling the data. When similar meaning words were used they were coded together and in other areas, such as Playposit Note, it was coded by concept. It was important to look for metaphors, analogies and connectors that describe the experience(s). Merriam (2009) reinforces that, in order to identify and confirm emerging findings, a researcher must understand the phenomena involved by keeping an open perspective regarding data, sources, and usage methods. The research analysis started where themes and patterns were identified, looking for the most common or frequent responses that can answer or respond to the research questions. It was important to gather data from multiple sources to discover a comprehensive understanding (Yin, 2017); corroborating the same finding(s) within the same phenomenon. All three data sources were analyzed individually and then synthesized in the discussion section, providing a balanced data driven approach. The data were used to identify other areas that can be explored further or surface something that was unexpected; producing future research opportunities. The analysis will be in the form of a narrative with tables as
applicable. The design will look to provide research data on the AVL&C design, authentic video, and collaboration to answer the following research questions:

Q1: Does the AVL&C design help students notice important speech making concepts?

Q2: Does collaboration assist in idea generation and creatively refining concepts?

Noticing Concepts

The affordances of using technology to validate noticing concepts is leveraged in this study. Video was used to provide a conceptual vision of public speaking. Participants self-recorded when they noticed concepts using the ‘note’ functionality in PlayPosit. Figure 3 shows where the ‘note’ icon is displayed and how the free text appears.

Figure 3

PlayPosit Screenshot

A report of participant comments was exported and analyzed. The report consisted of the video time stamp when concept comment was noted and created. By examining the time stamp and the comments, a broader perspective concerning the entire learning experience can be developed, far beyond that which could be directly observed in the classroom (Yin, 2017).
Responses were coded to synthesize and analyze the data by surfacing broad ideas and themes around concept identification. Understanding which concepts are noticed and when they are noticed provide insight to Q1.

**Collaboration Activity**

After collaboration, participants immediately completed an electronic survey to gather data on how collaboration informed and refined learning. Electronic surveys are easy to use and allow for quick distribution. Qualtrics survey was used to gather genuine responses informing how collaboration assisted in idea generation and creatively refining concepts. Ten survey questions were designed to capture participant’s individual experience in the collaborative setting (APPENDIX E). Responses identified concepts that were discussed along with which concepts were perceived as easiest and hardest to notice, participant’s ability to notice the hardest concept prior collaboration, and discussions on refining concepts. Two open-ended questions dug deeper to gather feedback on what was learned from the collaboration process and what participants plan to do to ensure the effective use of concepts in their upcoming speech. The collaboration survey results provide insight to Q2.

**Interviews**

One of the most important sources of case study evidence is the interview (Yin, 2017). Interviews provide participants the vehicle to tell their learning story and researchers the vehicle to capture personal experiences about the learning. Interviews were used to explore the participant’s insights and experiences with the learning design; explaining the ‘how’, as well as the individual perspective (Yin, 2017). In addition, through interviews additional information is able to be obtained. A semi-structured interview was used that consists of a series of 18 predefined but open-ended questions, resembling guided conversations rather than structured
queries (Yin, 2017). Open-ended interview questions provide structure and consistency, but will allow for free-formed responses. Questions addressed the design, noticing concepts, collaboration, and refining of concepts clarifying the details on how participants' learning was impacted by the learning design. An interview protocol (Appendix F) was implemented and responses were electronically recorded. The interview protocol is a critical component to increasing the reliability of the case study and is intended to guide the researcher in carrying out the data collection (Yin, 2017). The interview protocol focused on the design, creating a conceptual vision, collaboration, and general questions regarding overall participant learning experience. Dependable qualitative results depend upon a consistently applied interview protocol that connects to the study’s research questions with a “deliberate progression toward a fully in-depth exploration of the phenomenon under study” (Galletta, 2013, p.45). Interview questions focused on the AVL&C design, noticing concepts, value of collaboration, and general feedback regarding individual impact. Following-up with probing question(s) was included in the interview protocol to get at specific reasons/examples/rationale. Asking follow-up questions allowed participants to share as much as they liked and allowed the researcher to ask any follow-up or probing questions for students to fully express their experiences and thoughts. Examples of follow-up were, *can you tell me more about that or why do you think that?* This approach provided insight to Q1 and Q2 as responses provided in-depth information pertaining to individual experiences and viewpoints of the design itself, noticing concepts, collaboration, and refining of concepts.

Creswell & Creswell (2017) cautions that a weakness with open-ended questions is the difficulty with coding the data. Interview coding was categorized into themes of design, noticing concepts, collaboration, and general. Example responses were ‘clincher is just as important as the
attention getter’, ‘The speaker included a statistic in the attention getter that was really effective’. The interview responses further identified how the design worked, such as ‘video helped me see a speech in action’ or ‘I never thought that creativity was important in public speaking’ and ‘seeing a current student perform the speech shows me that I can do it too’. A full analysis of the interview responses were further identified to see if the design responds to the problem of practice.

**Validity and Reliability**

Recruiting participants exclusively from the pool of students enrolled in the Spring 2021 semester of Public Speaking 04:192:380 ensured validity in data collection. It is important to mention that certain factors that can influence data results such as age, sex, ability level, educational background and cultural background. These factors were not collected and were not controlled for in the sample of participants. The research design incorporated strategies such as protocols that enhance the credibility of the study or to build upon this research. “By enhancing the reliability of interview protocols, researchers can increase the quality of data they obtain from research interviews” (Castillo-Montoya, 2016, p. 811). Protocols were used in this research to assist in consistently gathering data across multiple data sources. The eight core concepts in the authentic video are the same concepts discussed in the collaboration activity. In addition, questions in both the collaboration survey and the individual interviews consisted of questions that focused on the eight core concepts. Creating protocols and using a codebook provided coding consistency; minimizing faulty data analysis. Finally, Yin (2012) advocates to document all procedures so that others can follow. The AVL&C Design protocol documented the execution of the AVL&C design activity in hopes that others will use or build upon this research. (APPENDIX G)
Chapter IV

Results

The purpose of this study was to test and analyze a learning design within a public speaking course. The learning design included two key learning tools to propel deep learning beyond rote memorization of concept definitions—authentic video and collaboration. Outcomes of this research addresses the problem of practice and informs teaching practice. The results address the research questions by identifying how creating a vision of speech making concepts assists learning and how the use of collaboration refined conceptual learning. Authentic video was used to create the conceptual vision and was used during the collaboration process in refining learning. The remainder of this section will outline the results gathered from the following three sources:

1. Recorded notes in PlayPosit while watching the authentic video
2. Collaboration survey results
3. Interview responses

The remainder of this chapter will describe the findings from each data source. A discussion and interpretation of the results is offered in the next chapter that will respond to creating a conceptual vision and use of collaboration to deepen/refine conceptual learning for the purposes of delivering an effective public speech.

Recorded Notes While Watching the Authentic Video

Seven participants watched the five minute, five second authentic video, remotely on their own device. Data were recorded using PlayPosit technology from seven participants and were downloaded after the completion of the activity. The shortest length of time engaged with the authentic video was seven minutes, twenty-two seconds and the longest recorded length of
time engaged within Playposit software tool was 56 minutes, 23 seconds; with the average length of time that the participants spent watching and noting concepts was 19 minutes, 21 seconds. Table 3 represents the length of time each participant spent watching and noting concepts. The average time spent watching and noting concepts is almost 4 times greater than the length of the video, which suggests that participants took their time in noticing concepts.

**Table 3**

*Participant Viewing Time*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>Time (min:sec)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>16:38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>10:46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>10:10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>22:17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>7:22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>56:23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>9:50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Interval time stamped data was gathered and used as an indicator that participants noticed concepts. It is important to note that the action of stopping the video at the same point in time was a little different for all participants. This could be explained by the diversity of natural motor abilities, age, level of skill and the nature of the task involved (Huang & Mercer, 2001). Cognitive skills including eye-hand coordination and other motor skills may impact participants differently as they interact with the technology tool and their ability to stop the video (Huang & Mercer, 2001).
Effective public speaking theory calls for use of eight core concepts - attention getter, credibility, audience analysis, preview statement, transitions sentences, oral citations, summary statement and the clincher. Refer to Figure 1 for structure and placement of each concept. It is important to note that the use of transition sentences, which link each main point, and oral citations, which properly cites the research used to support a main or sub point are used multiple times during the authentic video while the remaining five concepts are used in the introduction or conclusion sections of the speech (Fraleigh, 2017).

Table 4 shows the time stamp recorded when each participant stopped the video to add their note. Some time stamps recorded are close in seconds which supports Huang & Mercer’s (2001) theory that motor skills impact interaction with technology and ability to multitask.
Table 4

Noticing Concept Timestamp (min: sec)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>Attention Getter</th>
<th>Credibility</th>
<th>Audience Analysis</th>
<th>Preview Statement</th>
<th>Transition Sentences</th>
<th>Oral Citations</th>
<th>Summary Statement</th>
<th>Clincher</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>:11</td>
<td>:27</td>
<td>2:54</td>
<td>:56</td>
<td>2:00 3:08 4:37</td>
<td>2:40</td>
<td>4:46</td>
<td>5:00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>:10</td>
<td>:45</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1:02</td>
<td>1:09 2:06</td>
<td>2:55</td>
<td>3:36</td>
<td>4:55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>:08</td>
<td>:26</td>
<td>:35</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1:06 2:00 3:07</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>4:56</td>
<td>4:46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>:36</td>
<td>:45</td>
<td>2:57</td>
<td>:36</td>
<td>2:26</td>
<td>2:26</td>
<td>4:45</td>
<td>5:01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Participants with multiple timestamps with the same concept demonstrates noticing the concept numerous times throughout the speech. Participant #1 noticed three different transition sentences being used at video time intervals of 2:00, 3:08, and 4:37. This indicates that the concept was noticed three times during the speech.

Time interval stamps that are clustered together show that participants noticed the concept at roughly the same time. For example, six participants (85.71%) stopped the video within 30 seconds of each other recording noticing the attention getter. The credibility statement was noticed by five of the seven participants (71.42%), three time stamped intervals were within
three seconds and two time stamped intervals were at exactly the same time stamp. The audience analysis concept was noticed by five of the seven (71.42%) participants. Three stopped the video within one second of each other and two stopped the video within 43 seconds of each other. The preview statement concept was noticed by four of the seven (57.14%) participants. Two participants’ recorded time stamp was at the exact same time and two were within 24 seconds of each other. Transition sentence concepts were noted by six of the seven (85.71%) participants, with four (57.14%) participants noticing the concept multiple times. Recording time of this concept was more dispersed because use of transition sentences are used multiple times within a speech. Oral citations were recorded by four of the seven (57.14%) participants, with all four noticing the concept multiple times. The summary statement was recorded by six of the seven (85.71%) participants, within four seconds of each other. The clincher was recorded by five (71.42%) of the seven participants, within five seconds of each other.

Using the PlayPosit software tool, six of the seven (85.7%) participants recorded noticing concepts. Two (28.5%) participants noticed all eight concepts, two (28.5%) participants noticed seven concepts, two participants (28.5%) noticed six concepts, and one (14%) participant did not note noticing any of the eight concepts while watching the video; however, did insert a note that was coded as “other”. Participant #1 also included a note regarding a thesis statement which was coded as “other”. In summary, a minimum of six concepts (75%) were noticed by six of the seven (85.7%) participants. Figure 4 represents the amount of concepts noticed, concepts that were noticed more than once, and how many notes were recorded for each of the eight concepts. In total, participants created 61 notes which identified that participants noticed concepts while watching the video. On average, participants noticed 8.71 concepts per participant. What is interesting to note is that three of the seven (42.8%) participants noticed use of transition
sentences and oral citations multiple times at different intervals within the speech. All eight concepts were not noted by each participant while watching the video, which suggests that not all participants noticed all of the concepts during the video speech performance. Participant #1 and #5 each included notes outside of the eight core concepts and were recorded as ‘other’.

**Figure 4**

*Number of Concepts Noticed*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>Amount of Notes Recorded</th>
<th>Multiple comments for same concepts</th>
<th>Attention Getter</th>
<th>Audience Analysis</th>
<th>Credibility</th>
<th>Preview</th>
<th>Transition</th>
<th>Oral Citations</th>
<th>Summary</th>
<th>Clincher</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Collaboration Survey Results**

After completing the independent portion of noticing concepts, participants were randomly distributed into two collaborative workgroups; one consisting of three participants and the second consisting of four participants. Qualtrics, an online survey tool, was used as the electronic data collection platform. After the collaboration activity, participants completed an electronic survey that consisted of 10 questions which resulted in the gathering of rich data regarding their ability to notice concepts while watching the video, their perspectives about use of concepts, and how collaboration was used to refine public speaking knowledge (Appendix E).

In reviewing the data as a comprehensive data set, it was noted that not all concepts were discussed within the groups. The attention getter and the clincher were two concepts that were discussed in every group. The next most reported topic discussed was the audience
analysis/connection with the audience and use of transition sentences/sign posts, with six
(85.7%) participants reporting that they discussed these concepts. Table 5 identifies the concepts
that were discussed during the small group collaboration. Two participants reported that the
group discussion went beyond the eight concepts that this study focused on. These notes were
coded as “other”. One participant noticed that the overall organization of the speech was
discussed. Specifically, how the internal consistency was good with the research supporting the
main points. The second participant disclosed that the influence of a story was discussed.
Specifically, it was mentioned the speaker’s use of providing a personal story throughout the
speech added credibility.

Table 5

Concept Discussions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Concepts</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>% of Participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Attention Getter</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Credibility Statement</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>71.43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audience Analysis</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>85.71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preview Statement</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>57.14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transition Sentences</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>85.71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oral</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>42.86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>71.43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clincher</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>28.57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did not discuss any of these concepts</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 6 represents concepts participants identified as the easiest to notice and which concepts were the hardest to notice. Seven participants were asked to select which concept(s) they thought were easy to notice. Participants were able to select more than one concept for this response. When classifying which of the eight concepts were easiest to notice, participants collectively reported 19 concepts as easy to notice. On average, 2.71 concepts per participant were classified as easiest to notice. The two most frequently classified as easiest to notice were the attention getter, followed by transition sentences, by five participants and four participants, respectively. The same question was asked regarding which concept(s) were the hardest to notice. A total of 11 concepts were reported as hard to notice. On average, 1.57 concepts per participant were classified as hardest to notice. Two most frequently classified as hardest by a total of three participants each were audience analysis and clincher.
Table 6

*Easiest and Hardest Concepts to Notice*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Concepts</th>
<th>Easiest Concepts to Notice</th>
<th>Hardest Concepts to Notice</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>Percentage of Participants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attention Getter</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>71.43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Credibility Statement</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14.29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audience Analysis</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>28.59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preview Statement</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14.29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transition Sentences</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>57.14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oral Citations</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>28.57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary Statement</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>28.57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clincher</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>28.57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Six of the seven (85.71%) participants responded “yes” that they were able to notice the hardest concepts on their own, prior collaboration. One participant (14.29%) responded “no” meaning that they were not able to notice the hardest concept(s) on their own, prior collaboration.
Table 7

Noticing Hardest Concept

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>85.71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14.29%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

When participants were asked if they found collaborating in small groups to be helpful in creating a conceptual vision of speech making concepts, the responses were more diversified. Four of the seven (57.12%) participants reported how collaboration assisted their learning in this learning environment. Collaboration assisted in maximizing the learning experience for these four participants as they further developed high-level thinking skills while discussing the material. Table 8 categorizes the answers and provides additional context that the participants provide in support of their response.
Table 8

How Collaboration Assisted Learning

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Example</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Yes    | 57.14% | 4     | • On my own, I focused a lot on concrete information, like did she have a specific concept or did she not have the concept. But then in groups, I was able to discuss how these concepts related to one another and whether or not they made sense/supported her overall message. In other words, I focused on the small details, whereas my group helped me see the bigger picture.  
• We were able to critique her speech. By doing that, we know what to avoid in our upcoming speech  
• I think hearing different perspectives was important to creating that conceptual vision  
• We discussed what we thought worked well in the speech and what did not. Helped open my eyes to things I may have missed. |
| Somewhat | 28.57% | 2     | • I already had a general concept of speech making, so the smaller group helped to elaborate on what I already knew before watching the video  
• I feel I had a good grasp on these before the group so talking just solidified my ideals |
| No     | 14.29% | 1     | • I was a little late to the group activity |
|        | 100%   | 7     |                                                          |

Five of the seven (71.42%) participants agreed that a collaborative discussion led to strengthening concepts and provided detailed qualitative data regarding how the group discussed suggestions to strengthen or refine a concept. Table 9 displays five participants’ insights on how collaborative discussion impacted individual learning and led to positive outcomes. The argumentation that transpired among the participants led to refined learning for five participants. One participant specifically recalled how the group discussed strengthening the clincher by
providing suggestions, such as “If the speaker clearly said something along the lines of "Book your trip today," her clincher would've been more effective because of the call to action.”

Table 9

Discussion to Refine Concepts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Participant Response Support</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Yes    | 71.43%| 5     | ● Better engagement with the audience and a better clincher. It was hard to notice what her clincher was  
|        |       |       | ● We discussed making a stronger clincher with a clear call to action. When the speaker says to "do whatever you want" with her secret, the audience is left wondering: what? If the speaker clearly said something along the lines of "Book your trip today," her clincher would've been more effective because of the call to action.  
|        |       |       | ● We all agreed there should have been more audience engagement throughout her speech.  
|        |       |       | ● Avoid using repetitive transitions like so. Credibility is important! Tone of speech is also important  
|        |       |       | ● Suggested the speaker make it more clear what type of speech it was. Were confused if it was informative or persuasive. |
| No     | 28.57%| 2     | None provided               |
| Total  | 100%  | 7     |                              |

After collaborating with classmates, six of the seven (85.7%) participants reported that using speech making concepts is extremely necessary for effective public speaking. One participant reported that it was somewhat necessary.
Six participants responded, in their own words, what they learned from the collaboration process. Two common themes emerged - noticing concepts that were missed during independent learning and collaboration afforded new or refined learning. Specifically, refined learning stemmed from being able to hear different perspectives and to see things differently, through someone else’s experience. Table 11 provides examples of how the collaboration process assisted six of the seven (85.71%) participants in refining their learning. Participants benefited from the collaboration process by receiving extra information from listening to their group members’ perspectives.
Table 11

Collaboration Process Outcomes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Collaboration Process Outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>“It helped me to notice things about the speech that I did not notice on my own”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Discussing the concepts with others helps me see them from another point of view”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“We were able to encourage idea generation and were able to give different perspectives”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“It was nice to hear other people’s thoughts on the presentation”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“It is good to hear how different people view things and to notice things that may have gone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>over your head”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Filler words are very noticeable to the audience. Everything should flow seamlessly in a speech”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Participants were asked what they would do to ensure the effective use of speech making concepts when they deliver their speech. All seven (100%) participants responded with a plan of how they will ensure the effective use of concepts in their upcoming speech. The two themes that emerged from the responses can be categorized as preparedness and taking a systemic approach. Two of the seven (28.6%) participants' action plan consisted of making sure that they are prepared by practicing and speaking with passion. Preparedness can be referred to as practicing the speech from start to finish and having the concepts, such as credibility to build trust, within the speech. One participant referred to also being prepared for unexpected events. Examples of unexpected events when publicly speaking can be external distractions and audience etiquette. The second theme of systemic approach or way to structure the overall speech is something that five of the seven (71.4%) participants mentioned in their action plan (Table 12). The outline template (Appendix A) provided includes all of the concepts in an orderly and succinct manner.
Without the outline template, speeches would lack structure in providing a systemic approach to effectively communicating the message (TABLE 12).

Table 12

Action Plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action Plan to Ensure the Effective Use of Concepts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>“I will make sure that I practice enough and prepare for unexpected events”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“I will be sure to keep the concepts in mind as I build my outline and speech”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“I will make sure that I am clear and check for consistency”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“The concepts are just the foundation. More goes into the delivery of a speech”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Be prepared, state credibility so audience gains my trust, and speak with passion”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Take a smooth, systemic approach to incorporate all concepts”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Identify intent and make sure it is clear from the beginning”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Outside of watching the authentic video and collaboration in small groups, two of the seven (28.5%) participants reported that the course’s pre-recorded lectures, the textbook, and the mandatory outline template (APPENDIX A) assisted them in noticing concepts. One participant noted that “I could literally see an outline of a speech unfold in front of me. I could dissect the pieces and see how her speech was built”. Five (71.4%) participants noted that nothing else assisted them in noticing concepts. Table 13 provides data regarding other assistance used in noticing concepts.
Table 13

Other Assistance in Noticing Concepts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Example</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>28.57%</td>
<td>Pre-recorded lectures and the textbook were helpful.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>As I was watching I could literally see the speech unfold in front of me.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>I could dissect the pieces and see how the speech was built</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>71.43%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Interview Results

A total of seven participants were invited to engage in follow-up interviews after the study. Five (71.4%) participated in the interview process conducted no more than three weeks after the study. This allowed time for the participants to complete their speech assignment and to receive a grade. All interviews were virtual, conducted at a time the participant identified, and lasted no longer than 30 minutes. To address the research questions, eighteen open-ended questions (Appendix F) focused on the areas of overall design, ability to notice concepts, and the use of collaboration. Three of the 18 questions were not about the study itself, instead participants were asked to reflect on what they thought their grade would have been without participation and to propose improvements to the learning design. Probing techniques, such as follow-up questions or prompts were used to solicit a clear description of the situation or provide an elaboration of the learning phenomenon experienced in this research study.
Overall Design: Use of Authentic Video and Collaboration

All five (100%) participants found the design of using an authentic video to notice speech making concepts and collaboration of concepts helpful in many ways. Using a Likert Scale rating of “Helpful” or “Not Helpful” participants disclosed their view of the helpfulness of the learning design, Table 14 shows how each participant rated the overall design of authentic video followed by collaboration.

Table 14

Overall Design Feedback

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>Both Helpful Learning Tools</th>
<th>Use of Video to Notice Concepts</th>
<th>Use of Collaboration to Refine Knowledge</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Helpful</td>
<td>Not Helpful</td>
<td>Helpful</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Overall Design: Use of Authentic Video

Four out of five (80%) participants stated they found the use of authentic video to notice speech making concepts in practice helpful. The learning design’s use of video provided reported affordances such as, learning at an individual pace with the ability to stop, rewind and review. Using the Playposit platform enabled students to ‘stop’ the video while they were typing their
feedback. This functionality enabled participants to not feel rushed or that they were missing watching the video. Participants shared this sentiment throughout with one participant summing it up nicely by stating “video gave me the opportunity to go back and forward throughout - very effective”. Another participant stated, “I was able to stop it and note it so I didn’t feel rushed typing fast and missing the video”.

Two themes emerged from the responses - observing an authentic video where a student is delivering the same assignment that participants are concurrently learning and the ability of noticing concepts in action and according to speech assignment. The theme of “seeing” an authentic student and seeing the format of the speech in action was helpful as it “provided confidence in the use of concepts and theory which rounded my learning”. The authentic video served as a conduit linking text, learning activities, and assignment grading expectations. A second positive impact associated with the rating of ‘helpful’ was it produced a great visual of delivering an effective speech. One participant elaborated with “it was better than just lecturing on what a good speech will look like”. A third positive impact is that it provided the visual of the outline (Appendix A) and how the different components were used. An example response was “as she was saying the speech I was able to break down the outline and “see” what boxes she was doing. This gave me a new appreciation for the outline”. Finally, the visual of the video reinforced the importance of speech purpose. One participant responded, “I really didn’t understand the importance of the speech purpose until I saw it in action”. Other responses to support the helpful rating include “so helpful it was a college student as the requirements are the same”, “definitely helpful to see a student at the same level who is delivering a speech”, “using video as a design tool gave me the opportunity to go back and forward throughout; allowing me to analyze the components that I was noticing specific to this assignment”, and “the fact that I
was watching a live speech helped me visualize what I was going to look like and demonstrated the expectations”. Using authentic video to notice speech making concepts provided participants visual options of how to use concepts that refined learning.

It is important to note that one of five (20%) participants did share that use of video to notice concepts was ‘not super helpful’ and therefore coded as ‘not helpful’. Specifically, this participant shared that it was the lectures and prior class activities that helped. When asked to elaborate, participants responded with “although the video did help me “see” things better”, despite the rating of ‘not super helpful’. For example, “I saw that the same transition sentence was used each time so now I know what not to do.” This participant’s elaboration conflicts with the rating of “not super helpful”. Table 15 displays responses in the themes of authentic video, seeing speech in action, use of video, and collaboration.
### Table 15

**Themed Responses**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Authentic Video</th>
<th>Seeing Speech in Action</th>
<th>Use of Video</th>
<th>Collaboration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>“UG student delivering same speech assignment”</td>
<td>“Ability to notice concepts in action and not through reading text”</td>
<td>“Video gave me the opportunity to go back and forward throughout - very effective”</td>
<td>“Talking provided a better understanding and I was able to notice certain aspects”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“So helpful it was a college student in this course as the requirements are the same”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Student at the same level as me”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“I was able to notice the overall flow of the speech and realized how important it really was. Gave me a new appreciation of the outline”</td>
<td>“As she was delivering the speech, I was able to break down the outline and “see” what boxes [from the outline template] she was doing.”</td>
<td>“I was able to stop it and note it so I didn’t feel rushed with typing fast”</td>
<td>“Some things I didn’t notice but hearing the perspective enables me to deepen my understanding of concepts used in video”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Helped me visualize what I was going to look like”</td>
<td>“Seeing the speech in action also helped reinforce the importance of speech purpose. I really didn’t understand it until I saw it in action”</td>
<td></td>
<td>“Able to talk it through”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Being authentic helped me relate to it more with similar experience and age - relatability”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Showed me what I need to work on”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Overall Design: Use of Collaboration

All five (100%) participants found collaboration a helpful component within the design. Interview responses produced the outcomes of creating a sense of confidence, solidifying a common understanding, and listening to diversified perspectives. Participants reported that collaboration provided a sense of confidence in that it solidified and supported individual reflections of their learning. It validated that they were able to notice the concepts and the overall speech structure that is being used in this course. One participant stated, “I was paying attention to the ‘way’ she was proceeding”. It also allowed time for analyzing the concepts and to think about approaches that can be used in speech making. This strengthened understanding of speech making concepts as participants were able to ‘talk it through’ building their knowledge and strengthening confidence. Participants noted collaboration outcomes provided a sense of confidence and exposure to a variety of perspectives. One participant explained that “some things I didn’t notice but hearing other perspectives enables me to deepen my understanding of concepts used in the video”. Another participant noted, “Talking provided a better understanding and I was able to notice certain aspects”. Collaboration surfaced a variety of perspectives and thoughts that participants would not have obtained on their own. Collaboration produced a refined new learning. It is important to note that one (20%) participant noted that collaboration was helpful but did not disclose anything about watching the video and having the ability to notice concepts within a speech.

Overall Design: Most Valuable

Although all participants responded that they liked viewing the video, four out of five (80%) participants responded that of the two components (video and collaboration), collaboration was more valuable. Table 16 shows the most valuable component by participant.
Three out of five (75%) participants who stated that collaboration was more valuable included the use of video in their response. When asked if there were any other tools used during this study, all five participants (100%) reported that prior knowledge with text materials and other previous assignments were used in this design. This suggests that the timing of the noticing video concepts activity was appropriate and led to new, deeper learning as participants were able to build upon prior learning.

Table 16

*Most Valuable Component*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>Use of Video</th>
<th>Use of Collaboration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Noticing Concepts (Creating a Conceptual Vision).** The tally marks in Table 17 note the difficulty level how each participant perceived the eight concepts (attention getter, credibility, audience analysis, preview statement, transition sentences, oral citations, summary statement, or clincher) and which provided a deeper and refined understanding while using the authentic video to create a conceptual vision of the concept.
Table 17

Noticing Concepts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Concept</th>
<th>Easiest</th>
<th>Most Difficult</th>
<th>Noticing which concept(s) provided a deeper understanding of public speaking?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Attention Getter</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audience Analysis</td>
<td></td>
<td>I</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Credibility</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preview Statement</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transition Sentences</td>
<td></td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oral Citations</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clincher</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>I</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Five participants reported that five of the eight (62.5%) concepts were easy to notice as certain keywords were used to identify the concept, such as the preview statement being a rundown of main points, summary statement also list a main points, speaker using ‘all in all’, and asking a question for a reaction. Both the attention getter and preview statement were noted by three (60%) participants as the easiest concepts to notice. Credibility statement, transition sentences, and oral citations were also noted once as easy to notice. Three concepts (37.5%) that were the most difficult to notice were the credibility statement and the use of oral citations (quality of research). One participant (20%) noted it was hard to decipher the quality of the research evidence used and how it connected to the main points. Two (40%) reported that the credibility statement was most difficult and was confusing due to the context of information being presented. It was interesting to see that even though some concepts are hard to notice, it still was a learning opportunity as it presented a learning struggle for how to use this concept.
effectively in individual speech. Similar to Edelson’s Learning for Use (2001) model, this learning design engaged the learner to struggle with learning; thinking more deeply. Specifically, one participant stated, “it gave me something to think about”. Outside of the eight core concepts that this study focused on, participants also mentioned that other difficult concepts to notice are use of pathos and organizational patterns used to effectively communicate the message.

When analyzing the data on which of the eight concepts provided a refined understanding of public speaking, participant’s responses were diverse. The common undertone of the responses is that focusing on noticing all of the concepts puts the speech making process in a new perspective by making the connection that it is not only having the concept present in the speech but it is the quality of how the concept is being used to support the message. Creating a speech making vision contributed to deeper learning. One participant explained it as creating a “visual posture where the individual speech components represent puzzle pieces that connect together”.

No one reported major challenges were encountered when noticing speech making concepts. Two concerns that participants surfaced as minor challenges included multi-tasking and remembering all eight concepts while watching the video. One participant felt that the need to multitask, defined as watching the video and creating a note when the concept was noticed, “took away from watching the speech in a quality manner”. Another participant responded that “it was hard to remember all eight concepts while watching the video” contributing it to “still in the learning phase” of understanding concepts. Positive responses included being able to “pick everything out” and “seeing the outline template unfold in my mind”. (Appendix A)

Use of Collaboration. During the collaboration process a variety of concepts and dialogue transpired that proved to be positive discourse; advancing learning. Table 18 represents
a summary of the collaboration results from the participant's perspective, the context of the discussion, along with how noticing was impacted by collaboration.

**Table 18**

**Summary of Collaboration Results**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>Equal Participation</th>
<th>Context of Group Collaboration</th>
<th>Able to Notice More After Collaboration</th>
<th>New Learning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Clincher</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>&quot;Hearing other’s point of view puts new ideas into my mind. I also enjoy providing my point of view so others can deepen their learning&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Noticing Concepts</td>
<td>Importance of purpose</td>
<td>&quot;Hearing and sharing different perspectives and ideas is helpful&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Negatives</td>
<td>Analyze the effectiveness of each concept with my classmates</td>
<td>&quot;In the group I was able to dive deeper and analyze the effectiveness of each concept&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Not sure; hard to say</td>
<td>Improvements</td>
<td>Much wider span of knowledge to assist in implementing new ideas</td>
<td>&quot;Other perspectives helped me&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Step by step structure</td>
<td>Speech pattern</td>
<td>&quot;Hearing new perspectives on concepts&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Using interview probing techniques, participants explained that everyone participated just not equally due to time constraints, but everyone did say something. One participant reported that everyone did not participate equally and one other participant replied that they were not sure. Probing further on this response explained that limited time impacted quality participation.

While all five participants shared that they noticed concepts on their own, the collaboration process provided a structure to dive deeper and analyze the effectiveness of each concept. One participant stated that they were unable to notice the speaker’s pattern so used the collaboration process to ask ‘*what pattern was used?*’ so that they could deepen their learning. Diversified perspectives is the largest theme that emerged from the responses that the participants valued and noted that it advanced their learning. The discussion topics included the effectiveness of the clincher, what could have been done to strengthen concepts by providing ideas to make it better,
use of emotion, and the overall structure. An example of a concept that was discussed was the clincher. One participant noted,

“We debated the strength of the clincher. We discussed ending with a strong clincher and ideas on how to improve this clincher. Agreed that we saw the concepts. Everyone liked the speech and how it was set up - incorporating creativity that supports the overall message”.

Four of the five participants (80%) that engaged in the interview process noted that while discussing concepts, they also discussed how to make them better. These interview responses included, “we ran through the concepts and then trickled through what could have been better and provided ideas to make it better”, “ideas on how to improve and incorporating creativity”, and “we discussed what went wrong - the negatives...how to use logical sense when being creative with concepts”. Interview results also mentioned that the collaboration process enabled participants to refine or deepen their learning. Specifically, two participants mentioned that they did not glean this exact understanding from the text materials alone by stating “collaboration sifted it out for me”

Four out of five (80%) participants noted that because of collaboration they were able to notice additional concepts outside of the eight core concepts that this research learning design focuses on. All five (100%) participants responded that collaborating provided them new, refined learning. The additional learning included discussing the speech pattern used, further analyzing conceptual use, and learning from a diversified group. The repeated theme of different perspectives proved to be valuable in deepening individual student learning. Table 19 lists how each participant perceived the value of collaboration in this design.
Table 19

Collaboration Value Statement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>Collaboration Value Statement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>“I like working in groups and discussing what is transpiring. Hearing other’s point of view puts new ideas into my mind. I also enjoy providing my point of view so others can deepen their learning”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>“Hearing and sharing different perspectives and ideas is helpful”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>“In the group I was able to dive deeper and analyze the effectiveness of each concept with my classmates”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>“I usually have a very narrow focus on things but after collaboration have a much wider span of knowledge to assist in implementing new ideas”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>“Hearing new perspectives on the structure of main points and how different supporting points can support the main point really deepened my learning of the overall purpose and end goal”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Other Feedback. Five general questions were asked at the end of the interview in an effort to gather data from a larger perspective. The questions focused on learning how the design prepared the participant for their next speech, the impact on their grade, and any suggestions to improve the design. Outside of noticing speech making concepts and refining them effectively, participants were asked, “What was your biggest ‘ah-ha’ learning moment through this experience?”. All five participants responded positively sharing their individual learning experiences (Table 20). Two participants mentioned the value of looking at a singular speech and discussing the components, in that they didn't realize how everything was connected and connected it to now, having a ‘total picture’ or seeing the ‘big picture’. Two participants mentioned that the quality and effectiveness of concepts mattered and linked the learning design to pulling it all together. For example, “seeing the outline unfold during the speech and use of concepts to support the message.” Individual comments included realizing the importance of
personality when giving a speech. Showing personality makes a difference and without personality, the speech is monotone and people zone out. Another participant’s learning comment validated the importance of format (outline) and reinforced my ability to look at my speeches in this format. Overall, the Ah-HA learning moments reported that participants applied a broader perspective and were able to see all of the components in action. Table 20 also displays positive data on how the design prepared participants for their upcoming speech. All five participants responded positively that the use of the authentic video was helpful as it provided the opportunity to analyze an example of the actual assignment. In addition, all five participants mentioned that seeing the concepts in action assisted in understanding the purpose of the concepts and how to use them in the speech. The use of video allowed all five participants to see how and where they can incorporate improvements to their learning. For example, one participant stated, “seeing the different components that I was struggling with, such as transitions and use of sign posts, provided me ideas on how to improve these concepts in my speech”. Another participant mentioned, “I was able to learn from the mistakes and the strengths of the video”. Collaboration provided alternative examples and ideas that participants were able to use to refine their own speech. One participant stated, “Our discussion around the visuals enabled me to see that I needed to make my visuals more appealing”.

Table 20

**Overall Learning Experience**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>AH-HA Learning Moment</th>
<th>How Did the Design Prepare You?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>“Good example of speech. Helped me look at speeches in that format”</td>
<td>“Allowed me to take my basic bones outline and turn it into the creative speech that it needed to be. Did not have concepts set up in the way I wanted it to be. Helped me see that I need to invest more time.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>“Importance of personality when giving a speech. Without personality it becomes monotone and the audience zones out. Visual aids were really helpful. I now have a total picture of what to do.”</td>
<td>“Helps my understanding of what all the concepts mean and do in the speech. Better understanding of concepts in action and not just on paper.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>“After hearing other perspectives and thoughts I realized that quality/effectiveness mattered. I now see the bigger picture.”</td>
<td>“Seeing different parts I was struggling with, like transitions, I was able to fix it. Group provided alternative examples that informed my new learning.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>“The full circle aspect of learning stood out from the outline to delivering the speech. I see the bigger picture now that includes using the concepts.”</td>
<td>“Implementing the structure and concepts was helpful”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>“Implementation of concepts - now I see why this is so important. Structure of the speech was also good because concepts were effectively implemented.”</td>
<td>“Seeing the video I was able to learn from strengths and mistakes. Our discussion around the visuals made me see that I needed to make my visuals more appealing.”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Participants self-disclosed their informative speech grade and were asked to reflect on what grade they think they would have earned had they not participated in the study. Table 21 displays disclosed grade and a ‘what-if scenario’ grade had the participant not engaged with the
study. Participants self-disclosed their speech grade prior to participating in the study. The average grade received on the informative speech was 87.6%. Participants felt that their grades would have been lower had they not participated in this study. The what-if scenario produced an average grade of 80.6%; a decrease of seven points or 8%. Participation in the study enabled participants to refine learning speech structure, incorporating personality, use of transitions, and effective use of introduction and conclusion.

**Table 21**

*“What-If” Grades Comparison*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>Informative Speech Earned Grade</th>
<th>“What-If Scenario” Grade</th>
<th>Additional Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>“I was happy. I was harder on myself because it wasn’t what I wanted it to be”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>“I was encouraged to be myself and smile”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>“Better use of transitions”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>“I would have used what I noticed in the speech that I was lacking”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>“Citing sources went over my head but now I understand from how she did it”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>87.6</td>
<td>80.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

When asked about what improvements to the design that they could offer, all five (100%) participants responded with the following ideas to possibly improve this learning design:

- Timing of activity should be appropriate. Need time to have familiarity with concepts from prior readings and class activities
● In the collaboration portion, use improv as a source of inspiration to generate options and enhance concept discussions.

● Have a lead facilitator in each group

● Watch the video in a group setting and discussion along the way

● Adding a step where instructor comes in to synthesize and fill in any holes
Chapter V

Discussion

In this chapter I will discuss the study findings and within the posture of the research questions. First, I address the importance of using authentic video as the lens to create a conceptual vision for public speaking learning in higher education. Then, I will discuss how the learning design influenced idea creation and the creative refinement of concepts. In closing, I will address the importance of this study to higher education educators, suggest recommendations that may enhance the design, identify any limitations that impacted or influenced this discussion, and surface suggestions for further research advancing this discussion. In addition, I am hopeful that this study sparks additional thoughts and needed research to further inform professional practice in performance-based theory courses, such as, but not limited to public speaking.

Public speaking is a sought after skill that not everyone possesses, and those that do it well, are perceived as being highly employable. Oral communication skills, such as public speaking, were the number one skill that college graduates found useful in the business world (Zekeri, 2004). Public Speaking 04:192:380 is a live, performance based course where many college students are fearful (Raja, 2017) or anxious to speak publicly; however, they enroll in the course with the hopes that developing this skill will lead to employment. The AVL&C design study restructures the current learning environment of a higher education public speaking course. The research problem of this study addresses that a lack of speech making conceptual vision impacts learning. The purpose of this research is to assess how pairing authentic video with small group collaboration can provide participants a conceptual understanding of concepts, negotiate a speech making vision, and creatively refine or acquire new learning. This study was
designed to test if the design improved participant’s knowledge of effectively incorporating speech making concepts when speaking publicly. Specifically, the hypothesis proposed that incorporating authentic video learning would provide participants a conceptual vision of speech making and collaboration would encourage use concepts in an effective and creative manner. The use of authentic video learning was employed to provide visual representation, a sense of encouragement, and a model of public speaking, specific to this course. Although creating a conceptual vision is not measured as a course competency for this course, I argue that creating a conceptual vision is needed for effective speechmaking learning.

The study exercised a case study approach with qualitative data collected from three sources that were used to build and describe how participants experienced learning in this design. A qualitative design is best to use when the research is intended to help understand what is happening; specifically, how participants are experiencing the learning environment, to explore how the design assists learning, and did the design accomplish what is set out to accomplish (Creswell, Hanson, Clark Plano & Morales, 2007). The collection of descriptive qualitative data, such as self-generated participant noticing notes, collaboration feedback survey responses and follow-up interviews provided rich data dedicated to address the following research questions:

Q1: Does the design help students notice important speech making concepts?

Q2: Does collaboration assist in idea generation and creatively refining concepts?

The upcoming sections will synthesize the descriptive data from three data sources— noticing concepts, collaboration feedback, and individual interviews to produce findings that address creating a conceptual vision and refining concepts.
Authentic Video as the Lens to Create A Conceptual Vision

The use of authentic video provided noteworthy findings that highlight connection, vision, and knowledge refinement. The video itself was authentic from two perspectives—representing the identical assignment of an informative speech and it was performed by a college student in the previous semester. Authentic video resonated a social connection with the participants evidenced by one student’s comment, “I could see myself through this student”. Creating social connection within the context of the video increased confidence among the participants. Seeing oneself in the place of the student making the speech is not only impactful, but encouraging, as participants gained confidence watching a fellow college student perform a speech identical to the speech being mastered. This supports Eick and King’s (2012) finding that video helped clarify content through “seeing” the topics being discussed and also hearing a different explanation for them. Seeing these connections further developed initial understanding of speech making concepts supporting Mitra et al.’s (2010) past studies regarding favorable preferences for learning from video. The use of authentic video sparked participants to see themselves implementing concepts, replicating concepts, and using the newly created conceptual vision. This is aligned with Goodwin’s research on viewing situations in different ways and in this case, influences speech making learning through interpretation and highlighting connections. The authenticity of the video was a catalyst for learning opportunities to build concrete conceptual information and focus on small details.

Video provided the functionality to stop, rewind, and review but this case study did not produce results to support or challenge this functionality. The average time spent engaged with the video was 19 minutes, 12 seconds; four times greater than the length of the video suggesting that there was enough time to notice concepts and create a vision, without feeling rushed.
Concepts were noticed at different time intervals but they were within seconds of each other. This could be explained by the diversity of natural motor abilities, age, level of skill and the nature of the task involved (Huang & Mercer, 2001) and the ability to multitask by stopping the video, noting the concept and then returning to watching the video. A consistent theme of stopping and rewinding the video did not surface; however, one participant did mention it but did not stress its importance to learning.

Many times, professors teach in broad themes requiring students to fill in the learning gaps or connect the learning on their own. This study supported that participants liked seeing the whole speech at once rather than learning by individual concept. The design afforded participants the learning luxury of noticing all eight concepts within the same speech. Participants validated identifying concepts when they were noticed and created new learning by realizing the relationship between concept use and its effectiveness in practice. The placement of the video aligns with Shah’s research in that curriculum should be organized in a spiral manner so that the student continually builds upon what they have already learned (2019).

The concepts labeled as easiest to notice, such as summary statement, were accurately noticed within four seconds of each other. The attention getter and preview statement were also labeled as easy to notice and were also noticed within short time intervals of each other. This may suggest that participants had prior knowledge of these concepts from previous learning environments, such as a writing course. Concepts labeled as easiest were also refined by creating conceptual vision. This suggests refined learning continues after self-identified competency is established. Participants frequently claimed to be visual learners and discussed how the use of video assisted in hearing of different perspectives that they did not obtain from the text and class lectures. Vision refinement was enhanced by the struggle of noticing concepts. The concepts
labeled as hardest to notice, such as audience analysis, credibility, and clincher presented a learning struggle for how to use concepts effectively in individual speech. Specifically, one participant stated, “Seeing different parts I was struggling with...I was able to fix it”. This supports Edelson’s Learning for Use (2001) theory that a learner must struggle with content for learning to occur. The results indicated that effective use of concepts requires interpretation and creative thinking in order to connect with the audience. Here, interpretation and thinking creatively are examples of the learning struggle that Edelson discusses. Noticing concepts added ‘new ideas’ into the minds of participants. Learning was enhanced by creating a vision and seeing a speech in action.

Concepts that were more largely dispersed in time intervals, could be rationalized by the need for individual interpretation when noticing the effectiveness of the concept. The results of the study called out the clincher and the audience analysis as concepts that require interpretation within the context of speech topic and purpose. This supports that without interpretation it is hard to make sense of effectiveness (Oyserman, Elmore, Novin, Fisher, & Smith, 2018). Contrast is the transition sentence concept, which is signaled multiple times throughout the speech with key words and phrases, such as “next, I will”...or “now, I will move to my third point”.

An outlier to the noticing concepts results is Participant 5. It is unclear if Participant 5 was not able to use PlayPosit accurately or if the directions were misunderstood as the noticing concepts data does not align with the other data sources. During the interview, Participant #5 responded that no issues were encountered while noticing concepts yet this is inconsistent with the noticing data exported from Playposit. Participant 5 did notice something and created one note, suggesting that there were no issues.
The authentic video provided more than a conceptual vision. It also provided a visual structural foundation of speech making. The value of the outline template (APPENDIX A) surfaced as a positive, byproduct of creating a conceptual vision. Multiple participants specifically mentioned the relationship of the outline template to the full speech structure. The connection to the outline template developed a greater understanding and value to the planning process of speech making by “seeing the outline unfold in front of my eyes”. The outline template assisted in creating a conceptual vision, but was something that was not realized prior to authentic video engagement. Through watching the outline unfold, participants were able to see all concepts in a consistent manner, including multiple use concepts, such as transition sentences and oral citations. Participants’ perception of the outline template changed after viewing the video from “busy work” to being a necessary foundation. One participant compared the outline template to a road map.

Creating a conceptual vision allowed participants to see the larger picture of how and why concepts are critical to speech effectiveness. Creating a vision assists in knowledge change (Goodwin, 2015), thus creating buy-in on effective use of concepts. Seeing concepts in motion provided intrinsic motivation needed to transfer the created conceptual vision into practice. Dedicating time to noticing speech making concepts in practice provided participants time to notice and analyze each concept throughout the length of a single five minute video. Participants felt that this learning environment not only would increase their grade by an average of seven points but also provided real purpose to speech making concepts.

Collaboration, Idea creation and Creatively Refining Concepts

Collaboration. Collaboration promotes sharing of ideas and the ability to construct knowledge with the assistance of others. Small group collaboration proved that argumentation
and student agency connected participants to each other and to fulfilling learning needs. Collaboration enabled participants to refine their learning by receiving additional perspectives and to notice concepts missed when individually watching the authentic video.

Self-governing collaborative groups provided a level of autonomy and voice in how learning transpired after noticing concepts. The authenticity of the video resonated with participants, providing a sense of belonging where participants felt included and accepted by their group when contributing ideas and perspectives to the social learning experience of collaboration. Collaborative discourse included discussion on concept use and examples of improvements which afforded “personalizing” (Reeve & Tseng, 2011, 258) the learning. The student agency produced in this study supports Reeve and Tseng’s research (2011) that students not only react to learning activities but they also act on them, contributing constructively to modifying and enriching them through creating something more interesting and personable. Dialogue flowed continually, with sharing different perspectives and new ideas supporting refinement of concepts. This exchange provided encouragement to think differently on how to use concepts to support the overall message. This deepened learning was similar to Williams, et al. (2017) study that discussed how making connections and applying previous comprehension provides a sense of ownership for the learning. The value of hearing different perspectives was a frequent theme in the data collected. One example that demonstrates this point is “after hearing others’ thoughts, I realized that quality mattered”.

Collaborative discourse provided a learning environment for all participants, regardless if everyone did not speak. This supports the work of Remedios, Clarke and Hawthorne (2008) where a person’s lack of conversation should not be mistaken as a lack of learning. Listening to different perspectives allowed for reflection on the video and discussions on what was noticed,
contributing to a refined conceptual vision. It was the collaboration that was most valuable as discussions pointed to concepts that may have not been individually noticed. This supports why participants rated the collaboration more valuable than the video; although, all participants mentioned that they liked the authentic video.

Comparing data on idea creation and refining concepts led to an interesting observation. The two concepts that were discussed most, clincher and audience analysis, were labeled as most difficult. Dialogue supported various perspectives of how the clincher was interpreted and how the overall speech connected to the audience. Dialogue included the importance of meeting the needs of audience members, who could possibly interpret use of concepts differently. One example that supports this finding was the data collected on the clincher concept. The discussion was that the clincher was more about interpretation and everyone interprets everything a little differently. The conversation strengthened the importance of thinking about who the audience is and their needs. Individual interpretation may explain why participants classified this concept as most difficult. Generally, the collaboration process served as a catalyst for deeper learning of speech making concepts.

**Creatively Refining Concepts.** Refinement of the newly created conceptual vision of public speaking occurred individually, while watching the authentic video, and socially, followed by the collaboration process. Individually, dedicated time to notice concepts provided learning to be identified and developed using the contextual cues and peripheral ideas in the authentic video in a way that is consistent with knowledge acquisition. Refinement was based on authentic video, sharing various perspectives, and collaboration where knowledge acquisition was further developed. This is consistent with Shah’s (2019) research that supports that the learner is not a blank slate but brings past experiences and cultural factors to construct new knowledge in a
given situation. This also supports Kim et al.’s., (2016) research that calls to promote student creativity, learning activities must motivate students to create and combine ideas and information that changes thinking. A blended discussion of authentic video and collaboration is needed when interpreting the data.

Creating a conceptual vision using authentic video provided not only an informative speech example but also provided the effective use of concepts. Knowledge refinement and idea creation occurred in multiple ways. First, noticing the concepts caused participants to think, reason, and analyze what was transpiring in the video. It caused a reflection on each concept where participants needed to make a rational decision if and when the concept was present and what was being noticed. The decision making of deciding when a concept was noticed caused the learner to recall prior learning and to extract meaning and use it forward for a new cause. The learning design provided knowledge creation beyond the eight concepts noticed when areas of improvements were discussed during collaboration. This was supported by discussions on concepts that are used multiple times throughout the speech, such as use of transition sentences and oral citations. This outcome was not expected but added value describing how the learning occurred. Second, creating a conceptual vision early provided context for reflection and creating a learning plan. The design supported a student centered approach to learning by creating opportunities for students to generate new learning opportunities (Lee & Hannafin, 2016). A self-created learning action plan enabled learners to further commit to their learning process. Participants were able to set actionable goals such as practice, prepare for unexpected events, add concepts to outline, and take a systemic approach to incorporate all concepts. This supports Wilson’s (1996) theory that a constructivist learning environment is where learners work together, supporting each other in pursuing desired learning goals. Third, collaboration promotes
knowledge acquisition by listening to other perspectives and hearing their points of view, specifically on use of concepts that require creativity so that they are effective. Collaboration was most helpful on concepts that were less obvious and could be interpreted differently by others.

Collaboration further refined concepts previously noticed from the authentic video. One interesting outcome to point out is that the participants were able to notice what they labeled as the hardest concepts on their own, prior collaboration. It was the collaboration that refined learning with hearing other perspectives and thoughts about the concepts that were noticed. An example that supports refinement includes a discussion of ideas on how to improve the clincher as noticed from the authentic video. Collaboration provided the participants alternative perspectives used to settle the learning struggle, refining learning.

Refinement of previous learning occurred with additional dialogue that expanded beyond the eight core speechmaking concepts included in this research study. This was an added benefit that was leveraged from the study. One group discussed the use of pathos and creating a good emotional connection to pull in the audience. The unintentional learning that surfaced was that without pathos, connection would have been lost. This supports that collaboration allowed learning refinement of other speech making concepts to transpire.

**Overall design.** The authentic video served as a visualization of a future state that students debated during group argumentation; creating greater discourse. When asked to choose, the data supported that collaboration was more valuable; however, each participant immediately followed with “seeing” or “watching the authentic video was also helpful”. This reinforces that video was a good learning tool to create a conceptual vision. The research study was conducted during the COVID-19 pandemic, when the academic learning environment was virtual. Students
were not attending in-person classes on campus which may have contributed to valuing collaboration more as students may have felt isolated from their peers and professors. The collaboration in this study simulated in-class learning and discussions that provided shared dialogue where participants were able to expand their conceptual vision of speechmaking by discussing concepts and ideas in different contexts. Allowing for discussion infuses a variety of perspectives and encourages knowledge refinement. Some also discussed ideas or alternative ways to improve the concept better. Interview data described the learning design as “pulling it all together” as supported by “helped me to understand speechmaking” and “seeing the video allowed me to see mistakes also”, supporting similar findings Eick and King’s (2012) study on how non-science major students used video to clarify scientific concepts, processes, and principles.

Participants were asked to share any “Ah-Ha” learning moments while participating in this research. Pilcher (2015) engaged 10 educational experts who defined “Ah-Ha” learning moments as the moment in learning when the learner understands something or realizes something that can be applied to real situations. The compelling “Ah-Ha’ moments from this study can be summarized as seeing the authentic video provided a conceptual example. This supports that the learning design accomplished what it set out to accomplish; a conceptual vision for speech making learning is needed.

The authentic video and collaboration learning design afforded participants to learn through a meaningful activity, such as watching an authentic speech, which is relevant to their immediate learning and driven by their interest in becoming effective public speakers. The design creates a visionary conceptual model of public speaking specific for this course and encourages creative use of concepts, and incorporating personality. Participation in the learning
environment enabled participants to create a speech making vision so that they can effectively use concepts in practice.

**Importance of Results**

Learning how to become an effective public speaker can be nerve-racking as it involves a public performance. Communicating publicly can cause fear and anxiety in most undergraduate students. Four out of ten people rank public speaking fear as one of their top three fears (Raja, 2017). The results of this study suggest that creating a conceptual vision of public speaking skills provides a sense of confidence to overcome this fear. The learning environment accomplished this goal with the arrangement of authentic video followed by collaboration; however, all factors should be taken into consideration. At a high level, the use of authentic video provided focused content for the group discussions that led to refinement of conceptual speech making vision. The findings do not suggest to excuse students from learning theory via textbook and other resources. Rather, it explores the un-scripted learning opportunities produced when students first create a conceptual vision to solidify understanding, then collaborate to refine their learning.

Creating new learning environments plays an important role in keeping educators connected with evolving teaching strategies and technology tools that can leverage learning. This research underscores the validity of designing effective learning environments, such as adding authentic video and collaboration without increasing course content. The results, furthermore, should encourage instructors of practice to consider the value of creating a conceptual vision by providing authentic examples of how theory looks in practice and to consider the importance of infusing student voice to the learning environment.
Limitations and Suggestions. A research best practice is to seek out limitations that could hinder this approach. Participants embraced the study in an acceptable manner. However, the limitations of technology would warrant a change to the learning design. Although all participants were college students, it was assumed that the PlayPosit learning software would be easily adapted. That may not have been the reality of this study. Results from Participant 5 suggest scaffolding the use of PlayPosit earlier in the course so that participants are not challenged with non-salient tasks, such as the functionality of adding a note to the authentic video. If time is scarce, then providing a pre-recorded tutorial or a demonstration of using PlayPosit tailored for this purpose would be helpful. Another limitation to note is the size of the study was limited with seven participants. This was not the intent at the onset of the study but COVID-19 pandemic provided a challenging time to recruit participants. Despite this limitation and months of isolation, participants displayed positive attitudes towards collaborating. With all feedback being positive, it is enticing to generalize these results to public speaking learning in general, but to do so without further research would be bold.

Suggestions for Further Research. A performance based course, such as public speaking would benefit more by increasing the connection from learning to practice. Adding other collaborative learning opportunities such as use of peer coaches or the use of practice partners could also refine the conceptual vision and increase understanding while boosting communication competency and confidence. Implications of these findings will strengthen professional knowledge and teaching practices for public speaking educators. In addition, examining instructional strategies in an online environment and an in-person environment will further develop the field of education. Implementing new teaching practices is not easy and may require professional development. An additional follow-up study that may be of interest is to
expand the impact of this study by including speech grades compared with those engaged in other sections of the course or nonuse of the AVL&C design. This research opens the door to future work that seeks to more fully understand how to better appreciate student perspectives and contributions in the learning environment or using authentic video for other learning purposes. Instructors of practice would benefit from this research and may seek professional development opportunities on using authentic video learning.

Final Summary

The focus of this study was to discover if creating a conceptual vision was a positive method to learn public speaking concepts in a college level course. Using authentic video and collaboration design afforded learning outcomes that were not achievable through textbook material alone. The learning design produced a number of benefits:

- Video Authenticity was a catalyst for learning opportunities
- Authentic video served as an inspiration providing confidence as participants could imagine themselves delivering the speech.
- Authentic Video was an effective tool to create a vision
- The video served as a framework of delivering an effective informative speech that encouraged learning by watching, connecting, recalling, and refining concepts
- Authentic video and collaboration allowed for the refinement of conceptual knowledge and for new learning to transpire.
- Collaboration enabled students to notice concepts in ways that were different from reading the textbook.
- Collaboration welcomed voice and created agency; hearing others points of view was valuable to learning.
● Collaboration allowed for validation of concepts that were noticed and the opportunity to fill in any gaps of what was missed or something that was not thought about.

● Participants felt that their grades were better by an average of 7.6 points because of this learning design.

● Creating a conceptual vision provided participants a theoretical structure, purpose, and meaning to effective speech making.

● After collaboration, all eight concepts took on a refined meaning.

● The learning environment encouraged being the best public speaker possible and not just do what it takes to get the desired grade.
Conclusion

Effective public speaking is a skill that is built on theoretical speech making concepts in order to inform or persuade your audience on a specific topic or cause. Good speech making requires research, planning, practice, and creativity tailoring the message to the audience’s needs while serving the speaker’s objective. Communication skills, such as public speaking, is a sought after skill in today’s employment hiring practices. College students use their college experience to be employment ready. The AVL&C design provides an understanding of how students use authentic video as a visual representation and collaboration to create a conceptual vision of public speaking theory and concepts. Video use inspires creating a conceptual vision. Creating notes while noticing concepts centers the learner within the learning while collaboration provides provoking discussion leading to refining conceptual concepts needed for effective speechmaking. Using authentic video allows the student to make connections and see themselves; providing encouragement that they too can do this. Collaboration affords diversity of ideas and sharing of different perspectives; leading to a deeper, learning experience. The data supported that authentic video facilitated noticing concepts, creating a vision, and generating meaningful thought and discussion that advanced public speaking competencies. The AVL&C design provides a supported learning environment for undergraduate students who want to increase their public speaking skills and employability. Pairing creating a conceptual vision with collaboration provides an alternative approach to teaching public speaking and an alternative approach to learning the theory of public speaking.
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Appendix A
Outline Template
Informative Speech Outline (Template)
COM380 Public Speaking

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Planning for the Informative Speech with Analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Speech Topic:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rhetorical Purpose:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To inform my audience about . . .</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Audience Analysis:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Refer to chapter on Audience Analysis)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summarize Audience demographics, prior exposure/knowledge, common ground/interest, disposition/attitude, and situational characteristics. Incorporate results of Audience Analysis Survey about classmates from the Audience Analysis Activity/Discussion in Unit 3.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Informative Technique(s):</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(refer to chapter on Informative Speaking)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Definition, explanation, description, demonstration, and/or narrative? Please explain.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Organizational Pattern:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(refer to chapters on Organizing Your Speech &amp; Informative Speaking)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spatial, chronological, causal, comparison, criteria-application, narrative, or topical? Please explain.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Message:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(refer to chapter on Informative Speaking)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How do you plan to simplify and/or clarify your message? (e.g., general to specific, reduce quantity of information, draw analogies, reiterate message, repeat message)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Complete all parts of the Informative Speech Outline. Review relevant readings and lectures on Audience Analysis, Researching Your Speech, Supporting Materials for Your Speech, Organizing Your Speech, Outlining Your Speech, and Informative Speaking. Also, refer to the “Sample Informative Speech Outline” as an example of an outline that meets the requirements.
Types of Supporting Materials:
(refer to chapter on Supporting Materials)

What types of supporting materials do you plan to include? (e.g., examples, definitions, testimony, statistics, narratives, analogies)

Types of Research Sources:
(review “Background Information” for the Speech Research Activity)

What types of research sources (e.g., primary, secondary, and/or tertiary) do you plan to use to support the thesis statement and main points? Please explain. Note: 5 credible and relevant sources are required including at least 1 source must be scholarly.

Informative Speech “Working Outline”

**Introduction**
Write in complete sentences. Refer to chapter on Outlining Your Speech.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I.</th>
<th>Attention Getter:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>II.</td>
<td>Thesis Statement:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III.</td>
<td>Connection with Audience:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV.</td>
<td>Speaker’s Credibility:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V.</td>
<td>Preview of Main Points:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Informative Speech “Working Outline” (contd.)

**Body**
Write in complete sentences. Important: Include evidence in sub-points, as applicable (i.e., refer to source in each sub-point by paraphrasing, quoting, or summarizing with a citation following APA format – 6th edition), and insert transitions between main points. Refer to chapters on Researching Your Speech and Outlining Your Speech.

<p>| I.   | Main Point One: |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub-point A: (w/source citation, if applicable)</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sub-point B: (w/source citation, if applicable)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-point C: (w/source citation, if applicable)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transition:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

II. Main Point Two:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub-point A: (w/source citation, if applicable)</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sub-point B: (w/source citation, if applicable)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-point C: (w/source citation, if applicable)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transition:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

III. Main Point Three:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub-point A: (w/source citation, if applicable)</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sub-point B: (w/source citation, if applicable)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Sub-point C:
(w/source citation, if applicable)

### Transition:

### Informative Speech “Working Outline”

**Conclusion**
Write in complete sentences. Refer to chapter on Outlining Your Speech.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I.</th>
<th>Summary of Main Points:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>II.</td>
<td>Clincher:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Reference List**
Include a complete Reference List (i.e., Bibliography) for five (5) research sources including at least 1 source must be scholarly that were referenced in the Main Points (sub-points). All sources are to meet the 6 criteria: expertise, objectivity, accuracy, currency, origin, and relevancy. The Reference List is to follow APA format style guidelines (6th edition). Refer to the chapter on Researching Your Speech, and also the APA Resources at the end of this document.

| Full Citation I: |
| Full Citation II: |
| Full Citation III: |
| Full Citation IV: |
| Full Citation V: |
APA Resources

Research sources that will be referenced in your speeches (and cited in the “Speech Outline” and the Reference List) are to follow APA style format (6th edition). The following resources can assist you in citing your sources and creating the Reference List (bibliography) following APA guidelines:

- Rutgers University Libraries - LibGuide: Writing and Citation Formatting Electronic Reference Sources – See: [link]
- The OWL at Purdue Online Writing Lab: Quoting, Paraphrasing, and Summarizing (for sub-points) – See: [link]
- The OWL at Purdue Online Writing Lab: In-Text Citations (for sub-points) – See: [link]
- The OWL at Purdue Online Writing Lab: APA Formatting and Style Guide – Reference List – See: [link]
- The OWL at Purdue Online Writing Lab: APA Formatting and Style Guide – See: [link]
- Hackerhandbooks.com: Research and Documentation Online: APA List of References – See: [link]
- Trinity University: Citing Sources (select APA Style and content type from drop-down menu) – See: [link]
- Cornell University Library: APA Citation Style – See: [link]
- University of Maryland University Libraries: Primary, Secondary and Tertiary Sources – See: [link]
- Ref Works is Web-based citation management software that can help you to create your own research database and generate bibliographies or works cited lists in a specified style such as APA. All of the sources listed under the Finding Journals tab will allow you to export references. See: [link]
## Appendix B

### Informative Speech Rubric

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Deficient</th>
<th>Minimal</th>
<th>Basic</th>
<th>Preferential</th>
<th>Advanced</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Introductions</strong></td>
<td>No opening technique; no credibility statement; no background on topic; no thesis; no preview of points</td>
<td>0-1 pts</td>
<td>2 pts</td>
<td>3 pts</td>
<td>4 pts</td>
<td>5 pts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Organization</strong></td>
<td>No organizational pattern; no transitions; source of information was randomly presented</td>
<td>0-1 pts</td>
<td>2-4 pts</td>
<td>5-6 pts</td>
<td>7-8 pts</td>
<td>9-10 pts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Supporting Materials</strong></td>
<td>Supporting materials are non-existent or are not cited</td>
<td>0-3 pts</td>
<td>4-6 pts</td>
<td>7-9 pts</td>
<td>10-12 pts</td>
<td>13-15 pts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Content</strong></td>
<td>The information presented is trivial and does not fulfill the purpose of informative speaking</td>
<td>0-4 pts</td>
<td>5-8 pts</td>
<td>9-12 pts</td>
<td>13-16 pts</td>
<td>17-20 pts</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Points awarded for: completeness of content, accuracy, clarity, organization, and use of supporting materials.
- Full points awarded for: excellent organization, clear and concise presentation, and effective use of supporting materials.
- Points deducted for: irrelevant opening, lack of transitions, or non-existent supporting materials.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>0-1 pts</th>
<th>1-2 pts</th>
<th>3-4 pts</th>
<th>5-6 pts</th>
<th>7-8 pts</th>
<th>9-10 pts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Audience Consideration</td>
<td>Successful adaptation to the audience.</td>
<td>Successful adaptation to the audience with minor adjustments.</td>
<td>Demonstrates clear understanding of the audience's needs.</td>
<td>Speaker makes clear adaptations to the audience.</td>
<td>Speaker shows evidence of thorough understanding of the audience's needs.</td>
<td>Excellent adaptation to the audience.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocal Expression</td>
<td>Effective use of vocal expression and paralanguage to engage the audience.</td>
<td>Effective use of vocal expression and paralanguage to engage the audience.</td>
<td>Demonstrates appropriate use of vocal expression and paralanguage.</td>
<td>Good use of vocal expression and paralanguage to engage the audience.</td>
<td>Excellent use of vocal expression and paralanguage to engage the audience.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Verbal Communication</td>
<td>Demonstrates nonverbal behavior that supports the verbal message.</td>
<td>Appropriate use of body language to support the verbal message.</td>
<td>Use of body language is complementary to the verbal message.</td>
<td>Excellent use of body language to support the verbal message.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conclusion</td>
<td>No conclusion; speech ends abruptly without closure.</td>
<td>Conclusion is clear and complete.</td>
<td>Conclusion is clear and well-structured.</td>
<td>Excellent conclusion that summarizes the key points.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time Limit</td>
<td>Speech exceeds the time limit.</td>
<td>Speech is within the time limit.</td>
<td>Speech is within the time limit.</td>
<td>Speech is within the time limit.</td>
<td>Speech is within the time limit.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Overall Comments/Suggestions for Future Presentations:

Nick L., Public-Speaking Course Coordinator & Instructional Design and Technology Services (IDTS) based on Schreiber (2010), 8/20/15
Appendix C

CONSENT TO TAKE PART IN A RESEARCH STUDY

Title of Study: Creating a Conceptual Vision for Public Speaking Learning
Principal Investigator: Barbara Rusen, M.Ed.

The information in this consent form will provide more details about the research study and what will be asked of you if you choose to take part in it. If you have any questions now or during the study, if you choose to take part, you should feel free to ask them and should expect to be given answers you completely understand. After your questions have been answered and you wish to take part in the research study, you will be asked to sign this consent form. You are not giving up any of your legal rights by agreeing to take part in this research or by signing this consent form.

Who is conducting this study?
Barbara Rusen is the Principal Investigator of this research study. A Principal Investigator has the overall responsibility for the research and all research activities. Barbara Rusen may be reached at 3 Rutgers Plaza, New Brunswick, NJ 08901, 848-932-4712, brusen@rutgers.edu.

The Principal investigator will also be asked to sign this informed consent. You will be given a copy of the signed consent form to keep.

Why is this study being done?
Students enrolled in a three credit undergraduate public speaking course are able to recall the definition of core speech making concepts but are challenged with effectively implementing concepts. This study hypothesizes that a speech making conceptual vision is needed to afford students the learning of speech making concepts in practice. The study will focus on noticing speech making concepts using an undergraduate’s pre-recorded informative speech video and collaboration to create a conceptual vision within the context of public speaking.

Who may take part in this study and who may not?
All students enrolled in the Spring 2021 section offering of 04:192:380 are invited to participate in this study.

Why have I been asked to take part in this study?
You have been asked to participate in this study because you are enrolled in the Spring 2021 offering of 04:192:380.

How long will the study take and how many subjects will take part?
No more than 25 students will take part in this study. The length of the study will last no more than six weeks; however, your active participation in the study will be approximately 60 minutes.

What will I be asked to do if I take part in this study?
All participants will participate in the following research activities: watching a five minute video, noting speech making concepts, and small group collaboration. After the collaboration process, participants will be asked to complete a short survey sharing their experiences with the collaboration process. Participants will also have the opportunity to participate in a short interview with the researcher so that insights and experiences with the learning design can be gathered.

What are the risks of harm or discomforts I might experience if I take part in this study?
There is a minimal risk of you recognizing the undergraduate student video used in this study.

Are There Any Benefits To Me If I Choose To Take Part In This Study?
The benefits of taking part in this study will be a $5.00 Amazon e-gift card. All activities need to be completed in order to receive the benefit. Benefit will not be prorated in the event that all activities are not completed.

**What Are My Alternatives If I Do Not Want To Take Part In This Study?**
If you choose not to take part in this study there are no alternatives available. Your alternative is not to take part in this study.

**How Will I Know If New Information Is Learned That May Affect Whether I Am Willing To Stay In The Study?**
During the study, you will be updated about any new information that may affect whether you are willing to continue taking part in the study. If new information is learned that may affect you, or if additional follow-up is needed, you will be contacted.

**Will There Be Any Cost To Me To Take Part In This Study?**
There is no cost to participate in this study.

**Will I Be Paid To Take Part In This Study?**
You will not be paid to take part in this study.

**How Will Information About Me Be Kept Private Or Confidential?**
All efforts will be made to keep your identity as a participant confidential during and after the study, but total confidentiality cannot be guaranteed. Student names will not be published in the results of the study. For confidentiality purposes, a random numbering scheme will be applied so that participant names are protected. Identifiable information will be kept in a separate location and will only be accessible to the researcher. The researcher will have all antivirus protection software up to date protecting data from outside threats. All data collection and storage devices will be password protected with a strong password that requires a level of complexity and unique characteristics.

**What Will Happen If I Do Not Wish To Take Part In The Study Or If I Later Decide Not To Stay In The Study?**
It is your choice whether to take part in the research. You may choose to take part, not to take part or you may change your mind and withdraw from the study at any time.

If you do not want to enter the study or decide to stop taking part, your relationship with the researcher staff will not change, and you may do so without penalty and without loss of benefits to which you are otherwise entitled.

You may also withdraw your consent for the use of data already collected about you, but you must do this in writing to Barbara Rusen at brusen@rutgers.edu or 3 Rutgers Plaza New Brunswick, NJ 08901.

**Who Can I Contact If I Have Questions?**
If you have questions about taking part in this study, you can contact the Principal Investigator: Barbara Rusen at brusen@rutgers.edu or by mail at 3 Rutgers Plaza, New Brunswick, NJ 08901, 848-932-4712
You can also contact my faculty advisor, Dr. Angela O'Donnell at angela.odonnell@gse.rutgers.edu or by mail at 10 Seminary Place, New Brunswick, NJ 08901-1183, (848) 932-0830.

If you have questions about your rights as a research subject, you can contact the Rutgers IRB Director at: Arts and Sciences IRB, 335 George St., Liberty Plaza Ste. 3200, New Brunswick, NJ 08901 (732) 235-2866 or the Rutgers Human Subjects Protection Program at (973) 972-1149, email at humansubjects@ored.rutgers.edu or write us at 65 Bergen St., Suite 507, Newark, NJ 07107.
AGREEMENT TO PARTICIPATE

Subject Consent:

I have read this entire consent form, or it has been read to me, and I believe that I understand what has been discussed. All of my questions about this form and this study have been answered. I agree to take part in this study.

Subject Name (Print): ____________________________

Subject Signature: ____________________________ Date: ____________

Signature of Investigator/Individual Obtaining Consent:

To the best of my ability, I have explained and discussed all the important details about the study including all of the information contained in this consent form.

Investigator/Person Obtaining Consent Name (Print): ____________________________

Signature: ____________________________ Date: ____________
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Study Instructions

Noticing Concepts Activity Instructions

**Purpose:** To provide students the ability to notice speech making concepts in practice, creating a speech making vision. Students will be able to identify concepts, so that they have a deeper understanding on how to incorporate each concept into their speech.

**Noticing Concepts Activity Overview:** Students will access the authentic speech video case in the Assignment module in the course learning management system, Canvas. The activity will use PlayPosit technology platform within Canvas. Using PlayPosit, students will create notes, when they notice each speech making concept as they watch the video. Activity is self-paced. Time allotment is 30 minutes, but may take shorter.

Through our readings and learning, we have been focusing on 8 concepts:

- Attention Getter
- Credibility Statement
- Audience Analysis/Connection to the audience
- Preview statement
- Transition sentences/use of sign posts
- Research/Oral citations
- Summary Statement
- Clincher

Watch the video. Using the "Notes" tab, document the specific point in the speech where you notice each speech making concept. In your note, identify what the speaker says that tells you it is that specific concept and what you think about it.

Before you click on the video, does anyone have any questions? [resolve all questions surfaced]. We will meet back in our main virtual class in 30 minutes.

Collaboration Activity Instructions

**Purpose:** To provide a collaborative opportunity for students to deepen their understanding of speech concepts by discussing the concepts that they noticed in the previously watched authentic student video speech example.

**Collaboration Activity Overview:** Students will meet in small groups (3 per group) to discuss the noticing concepts activity. Students will be provided guided questions to facilitate conversation and new learning. Groups will meet for 20 minutes and then join the main session. The instructor will randomly join groups to support learning.

You will be prompted to join a room, when you see the prompt to join, please accept it and start your discussions. The 20 minute timer will start automatically. Are there any questions? [When all questions are answered, start the breakout rooms]
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Survey Questions

1. Select the concepts that your group discussed during the small group collaboration activity (select all that apply)
   - Attention Getter
   - Credibility Statement
   - Audience Analysis/Connection to the audience
   - Preview statement
   - Transition sentences/use of sign posts
   - Research/Oral citations
   - Summary Statement
   - Clincher
   - Other
   - Did not discuss any of these concepts

2. Which concept did the group think was easiest to notice?
   - Attention Getter
   - Credibility Statement
   - Audience Analysis/Connection to the audience
   - Preview statement
   - Transition sentences/use of sign posts
   - Research/Oral citations
   - Summary Statement
   - Clincher
   - Other

3. Which concept did the group think was the hardest to notice?
   - Attention Getter
   - Credibility Statement
   - Audience Analysis/Connection to the audience
   - Preview statement
   - Transition sentences/use of sign posts
   - Research/Oral citations
   - Summary Statement
   - Clincher
   - Other
4. Were you able to notice the hardest concept you identified on your own (prior collaboration)?
   o Yes
   o No

5. Did you find collaborating in small groups to be helpful in creating a conceptual vision of speech making concepts?
   o Yes
   o No

6. Did the group discuss any suggestions to strengthen a concept?
   o Yes
   o No

7. After collaborating with classmates, how do you view the purpose of effectively using speech making concepts?
   o Extremely Necessary
   o Somewhat Necessary
   o Neutral
   o Somewhat Not Necessary (Optional Use)
   o Not Necessary at all

8. What did you learn from the collaboration process? (Open Ended)

9. What will you do to ensure the effective use of these concepts in your upcoming informative speech? (open ended)

10. Was there anything else besides watching the video and collaborating that assisted you in noticing concepts?
    o Yes, (if yes add open comment field for student to elaborate)
    o No

11. Feel free to provide any other comments that you wish to share. (open ended)
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Interview Protocol and Questions

Introduction/Background: Thank you for agreeing to meet with me today. My name is Barbara Rusen. I am conducting this interview study to learn about your experiences with using authentic video and collaboration to notice speech making concepts. I will be asking some questions about the design itself to notice speech making concepts, the collaboration process, and some general questions about your learning experiences. The questions will require you to reflect on your learning experience with the design and you have the freedom to express your views in your terms. Your answers will provide insight on how the design impacted your learning of speech making concepts before you presented your informative speech. If we go through the interview and you have any questions about why you are being asked something, or you would like to ask for clarification, just let me know. Before I begin, I need to mention that I would like to audio record your responses. May I do so? (Once they say yes, turn on recording device; if they say no, then don’t turn on recording device)

Design Questions

1. Did you find the use of the authentic video to notice speech making concepts and collaboration helpful learning tools? Yes No Not Sure
   NOTE: If yes, probe with: How was it most helpful to you?
   If no, probe with: Why not?

2. Did you find the use of authentic video to notice speech making concepts in practice helpful or not helpful in deepening your understanding of speech making concepts prior to your informative speech?
   NOTE: If 'helpful', probe with: How was it helpful?
   If 'not helpful', probe with: Why not?

3. Did you find the use of collaboration helpful or not helpful in deepening your understanding of speech making concepts prior to your informative speech?
   NOTE: If “helpful”, probe with: How was it helpful?
   If “not helpful”, probe with: Why not?

4. Which did you find more valuable to your learning?
   NOTE: Probe with: Why? Can you tell me more about that?

5. Were there any other learning tools that were helpful?
   NOTE: Probe with: If so, what were they?

Questions to address noticing concepts (creating a conceptual vision) (concepts are attention getter, credibility, audience analysis, preview statement, transition sentences, oral citations, summary statement, or clincher)

6. When watching the video, which concept was the easiest to notice?
   NOTE: Probe with: Why do you think that?

7. When watching the video, which concept was the most difficult to notice?
NOTE: *Probe with:* Why do you think that?
8. Noticing which concept(s) (of the 8 concepts) provided you a deeper understanding of public speaking?
9. Were there any challenges to noticing speech making concepts?
   NOTE: *Probe with:* If so, what were they?

**Questions to address collaboration**
10. Would you say that all members participated equally? Yes No Not Sure
11. Can you provide an example of what the group discussed during the collaboration process?
12. Was there a concept(s) that you did not notice on your own but was able to notice it after collaboration? Yes No Not Sure
   NOTE: *If yes, probe with:* Which one(s)?

   What did your classmate(s) say that assisted you in noticing the concept?
13. Did collaborating provide you new learning? Yes No Not Sure
   NOTE: *If yes, probe with:* How?

**General Questions**
14. What was your biggest ‘ah-ha’ learning moment through this experience?
15. How did this authentic video and collaboration design prepare you for your informative speech?
16. What grade did you receive in your informative speech?
17. What do you think your grade would have been if you did not participate in these two activities?
18. Can you think of any improvements to this design that could assist speech making concept learning?
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Research Design Protocol

**Purpose:** The purpose of the authentic video and collaboration design is to assist students in creating a speech making vision so that they have an understanding of speech making concepts in practice. The design consists of watching an authentic speech video while noticing concepts followed by small group collaboration.

**Materials Needed:**
- Computer with audio and video streaming capabilities
- Access to internet
- Access to course learning management system - Canvas to access directions and video.

1. **Noticing Concepts Purpose & Procedures**

**Purpose:** To provide students the ability to notice speech making concepts in practice, creating a speech making vision. Students will be able to identify concepts, so that they have a deeper understanding on how to incorporate each concept into their speech.

**Duration:** Approximately 30 minutes. Review of concepts is no longer than four minutes. Speech video is five minutes in length.

**Noticing Concepts Activity Overview:** Students will access the authentic speech video case in the Assignment module in the course learning management system, Canvas. The activity will use PlayPosit technology platform within Canvas. Using PlayPosit, students will create notes, when they notice each speech making concept as they watch the video.

**Instructor Directions:** This assignment is self-paced. Create Noticing Concept Activity Assignment in the Canvas course shell. When creating the assignment, you will need to add a new assignment, name it “Noticing Concepts Activity”, and complete the requirements.

1. **Add Assignment**

2. **Name the assignment “Noticing Concepts Activity” and add the following directions:**
3. For the Submission Type, select External Tool and then you need to search for the external link for PlayPosit so that it is integrated into this assignment. Select link to video bulb in PlayPosit.

4. Select the “Save” button when finished.

**Script:** Let’s review the tasks for the study. Over the next 60-90 minutes we will:

1. Watch a video and create notes in the video
2. Small group work. We will come back together as a group so that we can break out in small groups of three to collaborate about our learning.
3. Complete collaboration survey. After collaboration, we will come back together as one virtual group and I will provide everyone a link to the collaboration survey so that it can be completed.

4. After you deliver your informative speech in your class, I will reach out to see who would like to participate in a short interview about your experiences with how this design impacted your speech making learning.

In total, the study will take about 60-90 minutes in length. Does anyone have any questions? [respond to all questions]

Let’s get started. [Researcher will provide a demonstration of instructions while speaking] Log into Canvas and select the Assignment tab. From there, select “Noticing Concepts Activity”. You can see the instructions. [Read the instructions]. Before you click on the video, does anyone have any questions? [resolve all questions surfaced]. We will meet back in our main virtual class in 30 minutes. To get back into our virtual class, you will need to launch today’s Zoom link again. You can now access the video.

2. **Collaboration Activity Purpose & Procedures**

**Purpose**: To provide a collaborative opportunity for students to deepen their understanding of speech concepts by discussing the concepts that they noticed in the previously watched authentic student video speech example.

**Duration**: approximately 20 minutes.

**Collaboration Activity Overview**: Students will meet in small groups (3 per group) to discuss the noticing concepts activity. Students will be provided guided questions to facilitate conversation and new learning. Groups will meet for 20 minutes and then join the main session. Instructor will randomly join groups to support learning.

**Creating Breakout Rooms in Zoom**:

Split students into smaller groups of 3 per group so that they can collaborate on the noticing concepts activity.

a. Click Breakout Rooms

b. Select the number of rooms you would like to create. Select “Manually” so that you can choose which participants you would like in each room.

c. Select “Create Rooms” button. Rooms will be created but will not start automatically.

d. After creating the breakout rooms, click “Options” and select:
i. Move all participants into breakout rooms automatically. Checking this option will move all participants into the breakout rooms automatically. If this option is unchecked, the participants will need to click “Join” to be added to the breakout room.

ii. Auto close breakout rooms after () minutes: If this option is checked, the breakout rooms will automatically end after the configured time. Enter \textbf{20} minutes.
   - Notify me when the time is up: If this option is checked, the host will be notified when the breakout room time is up. \textbf{Check this option}.

iii. Set Countdown timer: If this option is checked, the participants will be given a countdown of how much time they have left before being returned to the main room. Set countdown timer to 60 seconds so students know their is one minute left.

\textbf{e. Assigning participants to rooms}

i. To assign participants to your rooms, select Assign next to the room you wish to assign participants to and select the participants you want to assign to that room. Repeat this for each room.

\begin{figure}[h]
\centering
\includegraphics[width=\textwidth]{breakout_room_assign.png}
\caption{Assigning participants to breakout rooms.}
\end{figure}

ii. Once a participant has been assigned (manually or automatically), the number of participants will show in place of the Assign button.

\begin{figure}[h]
\centering
\includegraphics[width=\textwidth]{breakout_room_assigned.png}
\caption{Participants assigned to breakout room.}
\end{figure}

\textbf{f. Open All Rooms:} Start the rooms. All assigned participants will be moved to their respective rooms after confirming the prompt to join the breakout room. The host will be left in the main meeting until manually joining one of the rooms. Additional support can be found at \url{https://support.zoom.us/hc/en-us/articles/206476313-Managing-Breakout-Rooms}

\textbf{Researcher Script:} Now that we watched and noted speechmaking concepts using Playposit, we will break out into small groups so that we can further discuss the use of concepts and their effectiveness. The eight concepts that we are focusing on are attention getter, credibility statement, audience analysis/connection to the audience, preview statement, transition sentences/use of sign posts, research/oral citations, summary statement, and clincher. I will randomly create small groups of 3 students per group so that you can have a rich discussion. I will provide some guided questions for you to discuss while in your breakout room. We will be in small groups for 20 minutes and then I will pull everyone back into the general class session. Note taking is encouraged. Does anyone have any questions? I will create the breakout rooms.
now. You will be prompted to join a room, when you see the prompt to join, please accept it and start your discussions. The 20 minute timer will start automatically. Are there any questions? [When all questions are answered, start the breakout rooms]

Provide the following guided questions to the breakout rooms as discussion points for the collaboration process:

- Discuss concepts and how they were used to strengthen the message
- Did everyone notice all of the concepts in the correct context?
- Which concept was easiest to notice? Why?
- Which concept was hardest to notice? Why do you think that?
- What concept surprisingly made a difference in the quality of the speech?
- How did the use of concepts impact the effectiveness of the speech?
- What concept needed to be strengthened? How would you strengthen it to make it more effective?

[students join main session after 20 minutes]

Script: Now that everyone is back in the main session, our last item for today is to complete a survey about the collaboration activity that you just experienced. The survey is 10 questions long and should take about 10 minutes to complete, although there is no time limit so you can take as long as you like so that your responses are complete. Are there any questions that anyone has at this point in time? [respond to all questions]. I have placed the link to the survey in the chat. You can all go there now and complete the survey.

3. Interview Purpose and Procedure

Purpose: To provide students the ability and freedom to express their views about the design in their own terms.

Overview: Student interviews of five to seven students (approx. 20-30 minutes per interview) will occur in week eight and nine of the semester. This allows time for participants to receive graded feedback from their speech assignment. The procedures of the interview will consist of an introduction so that participants know what to expect followed by 18 questions. The introduction will allow the researcher time to re-introduce themselves and to provide some background regarding the interview process.

Duration: Approximately 20-30 minutes per interview.
Procedures:
1. Researcher will send a Canvas announcement to all participants asking for volunteers to participate in an exit interview with the researcher. Announcement to be sent during the seventh week of the course.
2. The research will set interview times that are mutually agreed upon by both parties.
3. The researcher will send a Zoom link to those who volunteer with the interview date and time they mutually agreed upon for the virtual interview.
4. The researcher conducts each interview according to the interview protocol.

Canvas Announcement:  Thank you for everyone participating in the first 2 research activities. I am seeking volunteers to participate in a short interview so that I can gather your views about the design in your own terms. The interview consists of 18 questions, so I suspect that the interview will take approximately 20-30 minutes. Interview will be held virtually and will be at a time that fits your schedule. Respond to this announcement if you would be willing to share your experiences and I will look to set up a time. Thank you.