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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Speech communication has been taught in one form or another for many centuries to men preparing themselves for leadership in the church. Speaking of the earlier history of rhetoric, Braden says, "The Church Fathers, particularly Saint Augustine, found the subject important and consequently adapted it to preaching!" (Braden, 1961:2). This adaptation of the principles of rhetoric from the Greek and Roman rhetoricians dominated the teaching of homiletics through most of ensuing history. In recent times a slight shift in emphasis has been noted, with a number of colleges and seminaries taking an interest in the total process of human communication (Perrow, 1969:35). The relationship of speech communication education to the training of ministers and church leaders has received continuing attention over the decades since 1900 through committees of the Speech Association of America and through numerous individual studies, e.g., (Hunt, 1924:286), (McGlon, 1949:522), (Clark, 1960), (Perrow, 1969).

Homiletics (the preparation and delivery of sermons) has occupied the chief attention of those responsible for
the education of ministers and church leaders. Among these educators there is currently a growing interest in communication studies of all types, especially preparatory performance oriented speech communication courses prior to the study of homiletics, the mass media and its impact on modern society, and courses dealing with the theoretical aspects of human communication (Lawton, 1964:2), (Perrow: 35).

Two distinct approaches to the education of ministers and church workers is now followed in the United States and Canada. The first and older of these approaches involve the pattern of attending a liberal arts college with a major in liberal arts, philosophy, history, sociology, or the like, followed by a three year course in the seminary. Since 1900 what might be termed a specialized professional approach has been introduced and large numbers of colleges have grown up using this approach to ministerial training. These colleges are usually referred to as Bible colleges and strive to prepare the student for his profession in a four or five year program at the end of which he is granted a Bachelor of Arts degree, or Bachelor of Theology degree. This degree represents his professional qualifications in much the same way the Bachelor of Science degree represents the educational background of the engineer, pharmacist, chemist, etc. This study will be concerned with the colleges of the Churches of Christ and Christian Churches following the second
The term "speech communication" was used throughout this study except in the review of the literature and in other locations in which authors are cited, in which case the original author's terminology is retained. No one definition or concept of either speech or communication is agreed upon by all scholars (Dance, 1970:201-210). However, the following assumptions were made for the use of the term "speech communication" in this study.

(1) Speech has historically emphasized the teaching of public address and other performance oriented courses from the standpoint of the speaker who sought "To tell them what I know or believe, or to get them to see things as I do." (Giffin and Patton, 1971:ix). Thus, the emphasis has been primarily upon the speaker and the message he was "delivering" to an audience to inform or convince them to fulfill his purpose. Thus, it was assumed in this study that the term "speech" is more or less indicative of this conservative or traditional approach to the area.

(2) Speech Communication is a recently developed term which is variously used today, and is often used as a popular label for courses and departments that remain basically unchanged. In this study the term was used in the sense in which Keltner describes it in his model, in which human communication exists in three forms: utilitarian, aesthetic, and therapeutic, in a series of concentric circles, the
innermost being intrapersonal behavior, and extending outward through interpersonal behavior, intragroup behavior, intergroup behavior, intracultural behavior and intercultural behavior (Keltner, 1970:1-v). In this view speech communication is looked upon as involving the entire universe of vocal human interaction. As can be seen a definite reciprocal relationship is implied in all of the above terms. For the purposes of this study speech communication was assumed to include courses traditionally taught under the designations of introductory speech, public address, and the like, and also the courses involving interpersonal relationships in a dyadic or small group context, and courses in intercultural relationships.

(3) Communication is studies under many disciplines and covers the entire spectrum of human communication: verbal, oral and written, nonverbal oral, and nonverbal involving sight, touch, et cetera. As noted by Frank Dance (Dance: 201-210), no one definition or concept of communication exists. It is multi-disciplinary and many concepts of communication exist alongside one another. As noted above it involves all forms of symbolic and non-symbolic behavior by which living forms communicate within themselves and with other beings of similar or dissimilar forms. Thus, it is a much broader term than speech communication, and is usually studied from specific areas or approaches by communicologists. Recently, for instance, communication
between man and machines has received considerable attention, particularly since the advent of computer technology. For the purposes of this study it was considered to involve the entire area discussed above and further assumed to involve the latest and most liberal approaches to the study of human communication.

**Purpose of the Study**

The purpose of this study was to investigate the status of speech communication education in the Bible colleges of the Churches of Christ and Christian Churches in the United States and Canada. It attempted to answer the general question, "What training do these colleges offer the student (potential religious worker) in the field of speech communication and homiletics?" It specifically attempted to answer questions in each of the following areas: (1) What courses in speech communication and homiletics are offered in the current curriculum of the colleges? (2) What courses are required, and how do the requirements vary for the different major areas of study? (3) What is the nature, extent, and focus of the speech communication and homiletics programs in the colleges? (4) What are the anticipated changes in the programs? (5) What meaning will respondents assign to the concepts Speech Course, Speech Communication Course and Communication Course as measured by a semantic differential instrument?
Importance of the Study.

Professional and popular religious journals have carried articles over the last decade, particularly the last half of the decade, expressing concern over the communication tasks of the church and its workers. Implicit within most of these articles is a concern over the present state of speech communication education in colleges and seminaries. In "Speech Education in the Church: A Contemporary Dilemma," Douglas M. Lauchlan states, "...those of us who are committed to the truth of the Christian tradition as our 'way'... are confronted with a communications dilemma of such profound dimensions that the word 'tragedy' might not be inappropriate to describe our situation," (Lauchlan, 1968: 47). The communication crisis facing the church today (Perrow:33) has produced studies in the relationship of the mass media to the communication task of the church, and has stimulated a number of studies (considered under the review of the literature) of the curricula of the seminaries relating to communication training. These studies reveal that there is little doubt that there is need for improvements in speech communication education in the colleges and seminaries, but the question is one of deciding where to begin. Maxwell Perrow in the conclusion to a survey he conducted for the Religious Council of the National Audio Visual Association brought this out very forcefully when he said in his conclusion:
Perhaps the most interesting observation made from these returns was that religious educators are becoming increasingly concerned with the total process of human communication and how it can improve the church's mission...

Next in importance was a 'general strategy of communication.' Here is seen the need to utilize all knowledge, skills and means available in the employment of both interpersonal and mass media channels of communication to provide the local church with an effective witness of the Christian gospel to the whole man.

The third observation was that seminary faculty members placed high priority on the theoretical aspects of communication in contrast to applied communication (Perrow:35).

There appears to be a definite concern by religious educators over the present state of speech communication education in the colleges and seminaries. This study is an attempt to begin an evaluation of the speech communication curriculum of the Bible colleges of the Churches of Christ and Christian Churches. It seems that, if speech communication education in these schools is to be evaluated accurately, then it must be examined for what it is before any further evaluation is undertaken.

Information provided by this study should be of value to three distinct groups: (1) Academic deans and administrators engaged in planning courses of study designed to give students adequate preparation for the communication demands which will be placed upon church leaders in the decade of 1970 and beyond, (2) Speech communication and homiletics faculty members, and (3) Students of speech
communication.

Scope of the Study

Because of the nature of this study and the geographic distribution of the colleges to be surveyed, it was decided to use the mailed questionnaire to gather the data.

The study is limited to the four year colleges of the Christian Churches and Churches of Christ in the United States and Canada listed in, A Directory of the Ministry of Christian Churches and Churches of Christ, 1969. (McLean, 1969, F-12,13). The study will not include graduate schools or liberal arts colleges. The differences in structure, purpose, level, and requirements make comparisons across the groups of little value. The study is further limited to describing the status of speech communication and homiletics curricula of these institutions and does not consider other areas of the curriculum.

Review of the Literature

A review of the literature revealed only one article directly pertaining to the status of speech communication and homiletics curriculum in the Bible colleges. Similar studies have been undertaken in regard to the speech communication and homiletics curriculum of the seminaries, and will be considered to some extent. Direct comparison of the seminary and the Bible college curriculum is not possible due to differences in structure, organization,
and educational philosophy of the two types of institutions.

McGlon reveals that in the early period of Baptist seminary education in the United States, a great deal of attention was devoted to speech communication education both in the classroom setting and in many extra-class activities. Toward the close of the nineteenth century a reaction had set in against speech communication courses as a result of the elocutionary movement. This resulted in a tendency to drop speech communication courses and include rhetorical principles within the study of homiletics (McGlon, 1961:125-127). Renewed interest in the study of speech communication courses saw the re-introduction of public speaking and other performance oriented subjects, with most of the development occurring following World War I. This renewed interest is reflected in the fact that most of the articles and nearly all of the research on speech communication studies in seminaries dates from that time.

In the process of reviewing the literature two distinct types of literature were found to exist: (1) Those that were primarily thought pieces based on the writer's subjective experience as a minister or educator of ministers, and (2) empirical studies which employed historical and survey methods in the main. The first type will not be reviewed here because they do not relate directly to this study.
However, it should be noted that they express a real concern for more effective speech communication and homiletics education by those most closely associated with the problems of religious communication, i.e., ministers, missionaries, religious writers, and speech communication and homiletics educators in the colleges and seminaries. Typical of these articles were those by: (Achtemeier, 1967), (Casteel, 1945), (Lawton, 1964), (LeFevre, 1969), (Patterson, 1968), (Weniger, 1957).

The survey that appeared to set the pattern for others that followed over the years was carried out by Edward Lee Hunt (1924:369-373) under the direction of the Speech Association of America's Committee on Teaching of Public Speaking in Technical and Professional Schools. Those that followed investigated much the same phenomenon in much the same manner as Hunt. Hunt's committee conducted its survey in 1922. It covered ninety seminaries enrolling 13,395 students in the United States. The report itself was based on letters and catalogs for the thirty-four institutions responding. The sample included all the seminaries affiliated with the principal universities of the country and was considered by the committee to be representative of the ninety seminaries.

The survey revealed that the seminaries all listed courses in homiletics. Two courses were usually offered (often more): one practical, one theoretical. The prac-
tical usually concentrated on the actual preparation and delivery of sermons, while the theoretical course dealt with such things as homiletic form, selection of text, methods of sermon building, relationship of sermon to the whole church service, and basic rhetorical theory. The total number of practical courses was forty-six, while theoretical courses totaled thirty-six in the thirty-four schools studied.

Hunt notes that none of the respondents seemed to think of the homiletics courses as being, even in part, courses in speech communication, but he points out that the catalog descriptions included statements that indicated rhetorical principles were taught within a given homiletics course. All the seminaries placed very high importance on homiletics as indicated by the fact that nearly all teachers of this area held full professorships and were distinguished men in the institution. Full departmental status was accorded in this area as a division of practical theology.

Fifty courses in speech communication were offered under the headings of elocution, voice culture, oral interpretation, expression, and scripture reading. Twenty-two courses were offered in a broader field than delivery. Two courses in phonetics were offered with the stated purpose of assisting foreign students in learning English and missionaries in learning a foreign tongue. Nearly all speech communication instructors held only the rank of instructor
and many were only part time with the seminary. Hunt states that speech communication courses appeared to be offered primarily for what they could contribute to more effective sermon delivery and little else. Seminaries affiliated with a university usually had the student take speech communication courses within the college of arts and sciences.

Hunt did not describe the methods used in the survey. Evidently a request was made for catalogs from the presidents of the seminaries and some sort of request for additional information and/or opinions on the course offerings in speech communication and homiletics of the school, since Hunt refers to the seminary catalogs and letters of reply from the president in his article.

Winegarden (1951), in his survey of homiletical education in the United States, traced the development of homiletical theory from 1636 to 1951. A comparative study of the relationship between the nine approaches to oratory and the theory of preaching revealed that the strongest relationship was in the area of the classical rhetorical approach. The other approaches to oratorical theory have been largely ignored by homiletics teachers and textbook writers according to Winegarden. Instead, sermon "subject matter" has been emphasized at the expense of effective communication of the truth.

A historical survey-analysis of speech communication.
and homiletical education in Baptist seminaries revealed that both in the early (1819-1879) and the modern (1880-1943) period much of the education in public speaking occurred outside of the formal classroom situation (McGlone, 1961:125-132). The extra-class activities consisted of delivery of speeches as part of public exhibitions, orations, and speech contests, religious services on the campus, memorial services, and student preaching. The frequency and importance of the first three items waned in the modern period while the others continued, student preaching gained in importance, and radio programs and drama productions were added. McGlon concludes that "some of the most profitable training which ministerial students received...was afforded by practical activities outside the classroom" (McGlone:132).

One of the most recent surveys of communication training in the seminaries was conducted by Maxwell V. Perrow in 1969. Perrow's study was based on data obtained from the responses to a questionnaire mailed to 120 seminaries, twenty-two of which were returned. The questionnaire listed twenty-two kinds of communication content which might be included in the seminary curriculum. Respondents were asked to rank them in the order of importance in which they would place them. Perrow included in his list: mass media, group sensitivity and content areas that appeared to this writer to be based on some of the more recent
approaches to communication (e.g., process-orientation, behavior approach, etc.). According to Perrow his data led to the following conclusions: "(1) religious educators are becoming increasingly concerned with the total process of human communication and how it can improve the effectiveness of the church's mission; (2) the need to utilize all knowledge, skills and means available in the employment of both interpersonal and mass media channels of communication to provide the local church with an effective witness of the Christian gospel to the whole man; (3) seminary faculty members placed high priority on the theoretical aspects of communication, in contrast to applied communication." This last item may portend a shift in emphasis in speech communication and homiletical education. Most of the earlier studies reviewed found the emphasis placed on message content (Bible) and the development of the skills associated with the preparation and delivery of sermons with a strong emphasis on performance both in and out of the classroom (Perrow: 33-36).

The most important work consulted in relation to this study was the doctoral dissertation of L.E. Wilson (Wilson, 1958). As far as could be determined, this is the only study made on the status of speech education in Bible colleges. It should be noted that this study was based on data obtained at least 12 years ago.

Wilson mailed a questionnaire to 129 Bible colleges
and institutions. Seventy-two replies were received, of which sixty-nine were usable. The following information was sought by Wilson: "(1) the status of faculty members responsible for speech and homiletics instruction; (2) the course offerings in speech and homiletics; (3) classroom procedure; and (4) observable trends in speech and homiletics education on the institute level within the past ten or fifteen years." (Wilson:78).

Under faculty, Wilson reported thirty-three full time and fifty-four part time speech teachers. Fifty-six of the respondents reported holding various undergraduate degrees, while sixty advanced degrees were reported, one of which was a doctoral degree.

He found that the hours offered in beginning speech ranged from two to nine hours. Twenty-two different textbooks were being used by the schools at that time. Sarret and Foster's *Basic Principles of Speech* was the most popular text, followed by Alan H. Monroe's *Principles and Types of Speech*, and Crocker's *Public Speaking for College Students*.

Advanced speech offerings ranged from two hours to forty-six hours. The school offering forty-six hours was a Bible college listing fourteen courses in advanced speech and granting an A.B. or B.S. degree in speech.

Responses to classroom procedure indicated that 18 percent of the schools spent less than one-third of the classroom time in speech delivery, 39 percent used one-third
to one-half of the time for delivery, and 46 per cent reported spending one-half to two-thirds of the time in speech delivery. Methods of criticism of speeches, prevalence of individual counseling with students, and the frequency and form of examinations were also investigated under classroom procedures.

The question, "What trends in speech communication training are observable over the last fifteen years?" was included to determine trends in speech education in the Bible colleges and institutes. The results were summarized as follows: "(1) More speech training, (2) Smaller classes, (3) More debate, (4) Move from oratorical type speaking to conversational type, (5) Offer courses that are fully transferrable to state universities" (Wilson:96). The questions on homiletics were nearly identical with similar results and only minor differences.

It may be possible to make some direct comparisons between the study by Wilson and the present study. Areas of comparison may prove to be quite limited, however, due to differences in the questionnaire. Wilson's was quite general in nature in regard to courses, while this study is rather detailed in this area.
CHAPTER II

METHODS AND PROCEDURES

Development of the Questionnaire

In order to secure a questionnaire that would be relatively easy to answer, and therefore call for less time on the part of the respondents, it was decided to use a format in which most of the questions follow the closed form. Several open form questions were used as well.

Questions were selected on the basis of course offerings and statements of requirements in the most recent catalogs of a representative sample of the schools to be surveyed. To assist in the area of trends and to give some basis for selecting questions in this area, a comparison was made with older catalogs from the same schools (1962-1965). Reference was made to other studies of this nature to find the types of questions used. Particularly helpful in this regard was Wilson's dissertation on the Status of Speech and Homiletics in Bible Schools. From this background the questions were developed that, hopefully, provide a fairly accurate assessment of the area under investigation.

The questionnaire (see Appendix) sought information
in the following areas:

(1) Information on teachers.

(2) Information on course offerings in Speech Communication and Homiletics.

(3) Information on requirements for graduation in Speech Communication and Homiletics.

(4) Information on textbooks, class procedure, approach, trends, and projections.

(5) The meaning assigned to the concepts Speech Course, Speech Communication Course, and Communication Course as measured by a semantic differential.

The following section states the items selected for the questionnaire (see Appendix) and the rationale for including the questions (items). The initial sheet of the questionnaire asked for the name of the college, location, plan of operation, and the name and position of the person responding to the questionnaire. It then asked for the number of instructors in speech, the number in homiletics and whether they desired a copy of the abstract of the findings upon completion of the work. Following this, general instructions for responding to the questions were given. This sheet was introductory and served the function of identifying the school and providing some information about the faculty.

The first main section of the questionnaire, including
items 1-7, sought information on course offerings. Items 8-15 dealt with requirements for graduation. Item 16, sought information on classroom procedure; specifically on the amount of time used for student performance or delivery. Item 17 asked for information on the textbook used for the course. Item 18 was an open form question asking the respondent to state his objective for the course. It was stated as follows: "What do you view as the main objective of the course?"

The final section of the questionnaire contained four open form questions which sought to reveal the opinions that are shaping speech communication and homiletics education in these colleges. The questions were:

19. What trends in speech communication education at the undergraduate Bible college level have been observed since 1960?

20. What trends in homiletics education at the undergraduate Bible college level have you observed since 1960?

21. What developments in speech communication education at this level do you anticipate in the next ten years?

22. What developments in homiletics education at this level do you anticipate in the next ten years?

These questions were included to find what the opinions and thinking of the speech communication and homiletics
instructors were regarding trends over the past ten years and projections for the next ten years. Since the instructors and academic deans to whom the questionnaires were sent are also responsible for the curriculum offered at these institutions, it was felt that these opinions might provide a rather accurate forecast of things to come in the area of speech communication and homiletics education within these colleges.

The final section of the questionnaire sought to determine the meaning that the respondents would assign to the terms or concepts Speech Course, Speech Communication Course, and Communication Course, as measured by a semantic differential instrument. Information was sought on the "set" or frame of reference from which the respondents were replying to the entire questionnaire. The three terms (above) were arbitrarily selected as representative of labels for courses in the area commonly termed "speech" or "speech communication." It was assumed that a preference for the term Speech Course would indicate a conservative approach to the area, whereas a preference for the term Speech Communication Course might indicate a moderate approach to the area combining elements of classical and/or modern rhetorical approach with modern communication theories. It was assumed that a preference for the term Communication Course would indicate that the "set" or approach to the area would primarily embrace modern communication theories. Minter,
for example, found, in a study of the meaning of the term "Communication" among the members of the National Society for the Study of Communication (now International Communication Association), a decided preference for the concept "Communication" over the concepts "Speech" and "Persuasion" as a label for the process of interpersonal "communication" (Minter, 1968:26-36). Since this association numbers among its members a fairly high proportion of individuals who make a multi-disciplinary approach to the study of "communication" and theory building, the assumptions stated above would seem to be at least partially substantiated.

The respondents were asked to rate the three concepts. Speech Course, Speech Communication Course, and Communication Course, on a semantic differential instrument consisting of twenty-one bipolar scales with a seven-point continuum for each scale. Information on the following questions was sought through the use of this semantic differential:

1. What will the group (mean score) response be for the three concepts which represent three different labels currently attached to curriculum in this general area?

2. Will the responses differ significantly between the three concepts? Will there be a significant difference in the rating of these concepts on the evaluative scales, potency scales, and activity scales of the semantic differential based on bipolar adjectives found to measure these factors by Osgood (Osgood, Suci, and Tannebaum, 1957:37,38).
The polarity of the bipolar adjectives was rotated randomly on the scales used over the three concepts to avoid problems that might be associated with any tendency to mark straight down one side or the other on the scales. Three different scaling sheets containing the same scales were thus devised. The concepts were then rotated across the three scaling sheets to act as an additional precaution against scaling errors.

Analysis of Data.

The questionnaires that were returned were treated as a single group with no distinction based on size or accreditation status of the individual school. This was in keeping with the main objective of determining the current status of speech communication education in the total population of the Bible colleges of the Christian Churches and Churches of Christ as listed in the Directory of the Ministry, 1969 (McLean, 1969).

The data were recorded and analyzed in relation to the following areas:

(1) Information on teachers.

(2) Information on course offerings in Speech Communication and Homiletics.

(3) Information on requirements for graduation in Speech Communication and Homiletics.

(4) Information on textbooks, classroom procedure, approach, trends and projections.
(5) The meaning assigned to the concepts *Speech Course, Speech Communication Course* and *Communication Course* as measured by semantic differential.

Data on course offerings was analyzed according to the following categories: (1) The number of colleges offering a specific course in speech communication or homiletics, and the per cent of the total number of reporting colleges offering this course; (2) Changes in course offerings (adds, drops, etc.) were analyzed by grouping them into specific categories of change in relation to each given course in an effort to determine trends developing and whether there were certain notable exceptions to the trends. For example: "Twelve schools out of eighteen responding indicated that they plan to add Advanced Public Speaking. Two schools are presently offering this course. If all the reporting schools' plans actually materialize, fourteen out of the eighteen schools responding will be offering Advanced Public Speaking." The data were reported in tabular form.

Information on the requirements for graduation was analyzed according to the range and mean of the hours required by the colleges for required courses in each of the various majors, e.g., "Two to six hours of Introductory Speech were required for graduation for ministerial majors. The mean number of hours required for this major were four
Classroom procedure was evaluated for the various courses using the same techniques of finding range and means for the time spent on actual student delivery of speeches, et cetera. Differences between schools relating to time spent in class on delivery may indicate differences in approaches to the course.

Information on textbooks was processed to determine what textbooks were in use, how they ranked in terms of popular usage for a given course. For example, "Monroe's, Principles and Types of Speech, was the leading text used in Introductory Speech, seven out of the eighteen reporting schools were using this book. The second choice was..."

Items 18 through 22 were subjectively judged to determine whether there was a uniformity of opinion in regard to trends and projections. If a measure of uniformity seemed to exist relative to trends of the past ten years or projections for the next ten, both the direction and the estimated degree of agreement that seemed to be indicated by the analysis was listed.

The final section of the questionnaire sought to determine the meaning that would be assigned to the three concepts, Speech Course, Speech Communication Course, and Communication Course, as measured by a semantic differential. These concepts were rated on a semantic differential
instrument of twenty-one bipolar scales on a seven-point continuum by the respondents. The scales were selected from the bipolar adjectives that had been factorially analyzed as to their ability to measure evaluative, potency and activity dimensions for semantic space (Osgood, Suci, Tannebaum: 50-66). Selection of the scales was made on the basis of the factor loadings assigned to them by Osgood and his co-workers. Those with the highest factor loading were chosen for each of the three factors. These factors were found to share most of the common variance of the semantic scales devised by Osgood, et al., with the evaluative factor accounting for 69 per cent of the common variance, the potency factor 16 per cent of the variance and the activity factor 13 per cent of the variance. The selection of the scales used here followed approximately the same proportions. Fourteen scales were chosen for their ability to measure the evaluative factor (66.6 per cent), four (19.4 per cent) were selected on the potency factor, and three (13 per cent) were selected to measure the activity factor.

The data generated by the subject's responses to this semantic differential instrument were analyzed in the following manner:

(1) The raw scores for each respondent were totaled across all the scales on each of the concepts; then the respondents' scores were totaled to
yield a group total from which a mean was computed for the group for each of the three concepts. To test any possible statistically significant difference between the concepts, three one-way analyses of variance were computed with F tests applied to the resultant data.

(2) The same procedure was followed as described above for the scores on the fourteen evaluative scales, on each of the three concepts with the same tests for significance applied. This was also done on the potency scales and the activity scales of the semantic differential instrument.

(3) The mean scores on each of the three dimensions were computed in terms of the seven-point scales to indicate the direction and degree to which the response appeared favorable or unfavorable. Thus a profile of each of the three concepts was arrived at on the three factors.

The conclusions for this area of the questionnaire were then based on the above analyses of the data.
CHAPTER III

RESULTS OF THE SURVEY

Introduction

The survey was conducted by the use of mailed questionnaires sent to the academic deans of the thirty-one Bible colleges listed in *A Directory of the Ministry of Christian Churches and Churches of Christ, 1969*. Three steps were used to obtain the data. First, a letter requesting cooperation in the study was mailed to the deans one week in advance of the mailing of the questionnaires. Second, several copies of the questionnaire were mailed to the deans under a cover letter requesting them to fill out the questionnaire and/or direct their speech communication and/or homiletics instructor(s) to complete it and return it in the postage paid envelope that was enclosed. It was hoped that at least one questionnaire would be returned from each college. One month was allowed for the returns to be made, with twelve colleges responding by that time. At this point the third step was undertaken with the mailing of a reminder letter to the schools which had not responded. Another copy of the questionnaire was enclosed in the event the first one had been mislaid. An
additional ten colleges responded within six weeks, yielding a total response of twenty-two, or 65 per cent, of the schools polled. The following results are based on the responses of these twenty-two colleges. (See Appendix for copies of the letters and questionnaire).

**Information on Teachers**

The respondents reported a total of thirty-seven instructors teaching speech communication courses in the twenty-two colleges that responded to the questionnaire. Of these, eight, or 22 per cent, were reported as full time instructors, while twenty-nine, or 78 per cent, were listed as part time instructors. Those who taught speech communication courses were also responsible for thirty-five sections in twenty-one courses in other subject areas; such as New Testament Introduction, English, Church Administration, Homiletics, and Biblical exegesis. (For a complete listing see Table 1).

A total of thirty-one homiletics instructors was reported. Twelve, or 39 per cent, were listed as full time instructors, nineteen, or 61 per cent, were reported as part time instructors of homiletics. The proportion of full time instructors for homiletics instructors is higher than for speech communication but, like the instructors in speech communication, the homiletics instructors also taught in other areas. Homiletics instructors were teaching
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Title</th>
<th>Number of Instructors Teaching (Sections)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bible</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christian Doctrine</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christian Education</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christian Ministries</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Church Administration</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Church History</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Composition</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counseling</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drama</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gospels</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hebrew</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homiletics</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journalism</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Literature</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Old Testament</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prison Epistles</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychology</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Education</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worship</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
thirty-seven sections in eighteen other courses; such as Evangelism, Pastoral Counselling, Acts of the Apostles, Missions, Christian Education, and Speech. (For a complete listing see Table 2).

Information on Courses

Introductory Speech

Course Offerings and Planning

Introductory speech was offered by twenty-two out of the twenty-two colleges responding to the questionnaire. With 100 per cent of the respondents offering the course it was apparently regarded as an important basic course in the overall curriculum of these colleges. This was further evidenced by the fact that only one out of the twenty-two colleges offered this course as an elective for all students. The course was a required course for one or more major areas by all the other schools. One college offered this course at a nearby state college through a cooperative study agreement.

None of the schools reported any plans to change the present status of the course. This would tend to agree with the importance apparently attached to the course as indicated by the number of schools offering it and the number having it as a required course.

Requirements for Graduation

Requirements by Major Areas

Requirements for graduation varied according to the major
### TABLE 2

**ADDITIONAL COURSES TAUGHT BY HOMILETICS INSTRUCTORS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Title</th>
<th>Number of Instructors Teaching (Sections)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Acts of Apostles</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bible</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christian Doctrine</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christian Education</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christian Ministries</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Church Administration</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Church History</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counseling</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethics</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evangelism</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History (West. Civ.)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language (English)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missions</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Testament</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speech</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban Sociology</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
area being pursued by the student. Therefore, the questionnaire asked that the requirements for any given course be indicated in accordance with the principal major areas offered by Bible colleges. Introductory speech was required for all students in fifteen colleges; of the remaining colleges, four required the course for ministerial majors, one for church secretarial majors. The course was listed as an elective for all students by only one college.

The number of credit hours offered in introductory speech ranged from one to six semester hours. Of the colleges responding to this question, five required one to two semester hours credit, three required two to three semester hours, one required three to four semester hours, and one college required five to six semester hours credit in introductory speech for graduation. Changes in Requirements

There were a number of changes since 1960 in the requirements for introductory speech. A reduction in the number of credit hours was reported by two of the colleges, one of these reducing the credit for this course from three semester hours to two semester hours, while the other school reduced the credit for the course from two semester

1In the interests of uniformity and ease of comparison, the data from the reporting colleges is recorded in terms of semester hours. Where the reporting college was on a quarter system, the quarter hours were converted to semester hours on the basis of one and one-half quarter hours equaling one semester hour.
(three quarter) hours to one and one-third semester (two quarter) hours. One college called attention to the return of this course to a required status. "In 1965 speech was made optional--not required if a student had it in high school. In 1970 it was returned to the required list of studies. The students who really needed it were avoiding it." While not actually a change in requirement, another school noted at this point in the questionnaire that it had changed instructors and textbooks, "hoping to stay current." No other changes were noted for this course by the respondents.

Class Time Spent in Delivery

A total of eighteen out of the twenty-two colleges responded to the question as to the amount of time spent in class in the delivery of speeches or other oral assignments. Of the eighteen colleges responding to this question, four, or 22 percent, reported spending less than one-third of the scheduled class time in delivery; four, or 22 percent, reported spending from one-third to one-half of the time in delivery; and ten, or 56 percent, spent between one-half to two-thirds of the available class time in the delivery of speeches. For a comparison with the time spent in delivery in other speech communication and homiletics courses refer to the Appendix.

Textbooks

The textbooks in use in the introductory speech course
showed a variety of authors. The sixteen colleges responding to the question on textbooks listed ten different titles as being currently in use. The majority of the books in use were either published or revised within the past few years. Only two books bore dates earlier than 1965. The most popular book listed was Monroe's Principles and Types of Speech, with three colleges using this book. The following four textbooks were each being used by two colleges. The author, title, edition and date of printing are listed:


Listed below are the titles of the textbooks being used by only one of the colleges:


Mardell, etc. al., Communicative Skills.

Four schools did not list the name of a text. A fifth school offered the course off campus at a nearby state college and it did not list the text being used there.

**Course Objectives**

The course objectives of the respondents seemed to fall into the following areas: (1) The presentation of the basic principles and theories of public speaking and communication through lectures and reading assignments; (2) The presentation of the basic techniques of research, speech composition, including the experience of delivering the speech before an audience (class), (3) The creation of an awareness of the total milieu of life in order that the student may become an effective communicator of the gospel message. This later objective apparently related to both the world view of the student himself and the way his audience looked at the world (audience adaptation). The following replies or excerpts from replies of stated objectives served to illustrate the above:

"To present the theory of public speaking in lectures and reading assignments..."

"To develop understanding of the basic principles of public speaking."

"Knowledge of the basic principles of communication."

The following replies demonstrated the second category, the presentation of the basic techniques of research, speech composition, and delivery.
"To incorporate the basic principles of speech preparation and delivery with the practical application of presenting speech before an audience."

"To organize and deliver basic types of speeches."

"Help student organize thoughts and present them effectively."

"Acquaint students with the techniques of research and speech preparation."

"To develop within the student the proper perspectives and ability to prepare and deliver an effective speech. To give the student experience in preparing and delivering the basic types of speeches."

"...to provide practice in public speaking."

"Use of voice, vocal training, poise, preparation and delivery of speeches."

"To acquire confidence in the speech situation."

"The student is expected to become proficient in organizing and presenting the material in his address."

The objective of producing effective communicators of the gospel through the understanding of themselves and their audience as both relate to the world was demonstrated in the following replies relating to the course objective in introductory speech.

"To produce effective speakers who can communicate the gospel in their various areas of life and service."

Note: We do something else that has several benefits. Each day one of the students (in alphabetical order) leads the class in a devotional and gives a summary of the news or a news feature item. This provides experience that is relevant, motivates to research the news, and helps to avoid the cloistered atmosphere that can exist in a Bible college. It helps a person to be a better citizen as current events are often compared to biblical principles.

"To understand the importance of speech in daily life, to learn to think analytically and speak
Advanced Public Speaking

Course Offerings and Planning

Advanced public speaking was offered at eight, or 36 per cent, of the twenty-two colleges responding to the questionnaire. One of the eight offered this course at a nearby state college through a cooperative educational agreement in which the students are permitted to take all the speech communication courses offered at the state college. The course was not offered by fourteen colleges and had been dropped by two colleges that previously offered it, one college was planning to offer it and, one school stated that it would like to add this course.

Requirements for Graduation

Requirements by Major Areas

Advanced public speaking was required of all the students by three schools, two required it for graduation for ministerial majors, one required it for Christian education majors, and one college required missionary majors to have this course in their program for graduation. The course was not required for other major areas.

Hours Required

The number of semester hours offered in advanced public speaking ranged from two to four hours. Three colleges required one to two semester hours for graduation in the given major areas and one school required three to
four semester hours for graduation.

Changes in Requirements

No changes in the requirement for advanced public speaking were reported by those who are presently offering the course.

Class Time Spent in Delivery

There were six schools offering the course that responded to this question. They reported as follows: two, or 33 per cent, spent from one-third to one-half of the class time in the delivery of speeches; four, or 67 per cent, spent from one-half to two-thirds of the class time in oral presentations.

Textbooks

Monroe's Principles and Types of Speech was in use in two of the colleges, one college each was using one of the following textbooks.


All the schools offering this course on campus listed a text; the only school not listing a text was the school offering it at the state school nearby.

Course Objectives

The course objectives of advanced public speaking
appeared to be substantially the same as those for introductory speech in the colleges surveyed. More emphasis was given to performance in the advanced course; however. This was borne out both in the results of questions on class time spent in delivery and the question on course objectives.

The following statement illustrates the continuing attention given to principles and theory in the advanced course:

"Knowledge of advanced principles of communication,"

The remaining statements of objectives, while reiterating the general objective noted in relation to the introductory course, gave less attention to techniques of composition, etc., while concentrating on the development of effective preparation and delivery of speeches through actual practice. The statements of objectives follow:

"Develop a direct and vigorous manner of speech through study and practice."

"To help students with various types of speech."

"Use of voice, vocal training, poise, preparation and delivery of speeches."

"Student gains personal experience in applying techniques."

Judging by the time given to speeches in class and the statements given above the last statement cited might well summarize the status of advanced public speaking in these Bible colleges and the objectives as perceived by the deans and instructors.
Argumentation and Debate

Course Offerings and Planning

Argumentation and debate was offered by five of the twenty-two colleges surveyed, or approximately 23 per cent of the respondents. Seventeen, or 77 per cent, of the schools did not offer the course at this time. The course had been dropped by one college. Two schools indicated they would like to add the course while one school planned to offer the course in the immediate future. The schools presently offering the course did not indicate any plans to change the present status.

Requirements for Graduation

This course was not required for graduation in any major area of any of the schools offering the course. It was uniformly offered as an elective.

Class Time Spent in Delivery

This course was reported on by four colleges in regard to the time spent in delivery. The one other school offered the course via a cooperative agreement at a state college and did not report on the course. Of the four schools reporting, one, or 25 per cent, reported spending less than one-third of the class time in delivery; one college, or 25 per cent, spent from one-third to one-half of the class time in delivery, while two, or 50 per cent, spent from one-half to two-thirds of the available class time in student performance.
Textbooks

There were three textbooks reported to be in use at this time by three of the four schools. One school did not report on the textbook. The following textbooks were in use by one of the three schools reporting on texts.


It will be noted that the dates on the first two books are from the early 1950's, while Freeley's book, which is currently one of the more popular texts in general use, is dated 1966. The basic techniques of debate remain relatively unchanged, but the Toulmin method of reasoning and arranging arguments has been introduced since the first two books were written. This method is mentioned in the book by Freeley.

Course Objectives

The stated course objectives for argumentation and debate centered on the theme of preparing the student to be able to present his arguments in an organized and skillful manner. The course objectives were stated as follows.

"Proper organization and presentation of the truth."

"To develop skill in oral argument."
"To teach our young people how to think and defend the faith."

"To help the student to present a good argument."

Both the items on time spent in delivery and the course objectives cited above pointed toward a skills orientation for this course.

Voice Training

In the past the study of voice and articulation received considerable attention from both speech and drama instructors. With the development of the emphasis on the conversational style in speaking from the platform, somewhat less attention was given to this area, but it was still considered important in assisting in the clarity of vocal expression.

Voice training was taught in six, or 27 per cent, of the colleges responding to the questionnaire. Sixteen, or 73 per cent, did not offer the course. The course had been dropped temporarily by one school due to staffing problems. There were two schools definitely planning to offer the course in the near future and two that stated they would like to add it to their curriculum.

Requirements for Graduation

This course was required for all students by one college, and for music majors by one school; four schools made it totally elective.
Hours Required

There was no response on this item for this course.

Changes in Requirements

There were no changes in requirements stated for this course. It was primarily an elective course.

Class Time Spent in Delivery

Only three of the six schools offering the course reported on this item. Of the three, one, or 33 per cent, spent less than one-third of the class time in student performances; two, or 67 per cent, spent one-half to two-thirds of the available class time in delivery or oral presentations by the students.

Textbooks

Textbooks were reported on by three schools; no response for this item was received from the other three colleges. The following textbooks were each in use by one college.


Unpublished outlines--"developed by professor with 30 years experience in the field." The author's name was not given.

Course Objectives

There was no response on this item from four of the colleges. The statements of objectives for this course by the two that responded to the item are given below.
"Better use of inflection and breathing techniques."

"To help student improve his voice for speaking."

Both replies indicated an emphasis on the training of the speaking voice. The response to the Time in Class question indicated this objective was sought via direct oral practice in class.

Oral Interpretation

Course Offerings and Planning

Oral interpretation was offered by seven, or 32 per cent, of the colleges responding; fifteen, or 68 per cent, did not offer the course at this time. There were three schools that planned to add the course in the near future and two indicated they would like to add the course. None of those presently offering the course planned to drop it. There appeared to be a growing interest in this course connected with reading aloud from the pulpit with emphasis on Bible reading.

Requirements for Graduation

Requirements by Major Areas

This course was required for graduation for all students by two colleges, two others required it for ministerial majors, three listed it as an elective subject. Over one-half of the schools presently offering the course had it as a requirement for graduation for one or more major areas.

Hours Required

Three colleges reported that the course was offered
from one to two semester hours. The other schools did not indicate the number of hours offered or required in this area.

Changes in Requirement

The only change in requirement reported was a reduction in the number of class hours reported by one school that required the course for all students. The requirement was reduced from three quarter hours (two semester hours) to two quarter hours (1.33 semester hours), in 1968.

Class Time in Delivery

There were eight schools reporting on class time spent in delivery. This included one who also reported dropping the course. Of the eight schools, two, or 25 per cent, used less than one-third of the available class time for delivery; two colleges used from one-third to one-half of the class time for delivery; and four, or 50 per cent, used from one-half to two-thirds of the scheduled class time for students' presentations in class. The latter included the one school that recently dropped this course. The above figures indicated a strong performance orientation among the colleges in relation to this course.

Textbooks

A variety of different textbooks was in use for this course, five different texts in use by six schools. Nedra Lamar's How to Speak the Written Word, Old Tappan, New Jersey: Revell, 1967, was being used by two colleges. The
following books were each being used by one school.


Joseph Satin's, Reading Poetry and Reading Prose Fiction, (rev. ed.), Houghton-Mifflin, 1968, had been in use by one college prior to the time the course was dropped.

Course Objectives

The question on course objectives was responded to by four of the colleges that reported offering this course. Their statements of objectives follow.

"Read understandingly."

"To better enable the students to achieve true effectiveness in public speaking, with emphasis on the importance of delivery... The voice is obviously the principal tool by means of which all the activities involving speech in any form, whether it be preaching, public speaking, business speaking, or ordinary conversation are performed. The individual's success or failure in those activities will be substantially influenced [sic] by the efficiency of his vocal mechanism and the skill with which he uses it."

"To understand what is read and read with expression of meaning."

"To learn how to communicate meaning from the printed page to listener so listener understands message."

"To improve oral reading habits."

The dominant goal or objective appeared to be the development of the ability to read clearly and correctly
enough in terms of pronunciation and punctuation to have the material understood by the listener. This objective evidently was sought through an emphasis on actual practice before the class by the individual student.

Introduction to Broadcasting

Course Offering and Planning

Introduction to Broadcasting was offered on campus by six colleges and at an adjoining state college by one of the twenty-two colleges replying to the questionnaire. Thus, a total of seven, or 32 per cent, of the schools offered this course; fifteen, or 68 per cent, did not offer the course. None of the respondents planned to add or drop the course; thus no immediate changes in the current status could be expected. There were two colleges that stated they would like to add the course.

Requirements for Graduation

Requirements by Major Areas

Of the seven colleges offering this course only two responded to this question. This course was required for all students by one college and one of the schools listed it as an elective, while no response was received from the other five schools.

Hours Required

No responses were received on this item for this course.
Changes in Requirements.

The only change noted by any of the schools was a change by one college. This change was as much a change in educational approach as it was a change of requirement. The change was described as follows: "Instead of starting broadcast students with theory and introduction, I plan to start with practical radio and TV programming and production to be followed by a broader history and introduction for students who wish to specialize."

Class Time Spent in Delivery

In Introduction to Broadcasting two, or 40 per cent, spent less than one-third of the class time in student presentations; one-third to one-half of the time was used by two colleges, or 40 per cent, of the schools offering the course; and one, or 20 per cent, spent from one-half to two-thirds of the class time in students' presentations.

Textbooks

The respondents reported using six different published textbooks, and one unpublished manuscript. Three of the books, Gillies, Griswold, and Kimsey were all being used by one school. Each of the other books and the manuscript were in use by one school. A list of the books in use follows.


Course Objectives

The objectives for the course as stated by the four colleges responding to this question were as follows.

a. To give the student an introduction to religious radio.

b. To survey the history of radio and the various kinds of effective radio programs.

c. To study effective radio speech writing and programming.

d. To produce religious programs.

e. To produce Christian workers trained to utilize the media of radio to preach the gospel to all the world.

"Bring an understanding of the problems and potential of broadcasting."

"To develop announcing ability."

"To introduce student to radio as a communication medium."

In addition to the theoretical, historical, and practical application objectives it was noted that the schools were concerned with alerting students to the possibilities and potentialities of the medium of radio as a means of reaching men with the message of Christ.
Process of Communication

Course Offerings and Planning

This course was offered on campus by one school and was offered cooperatively at a state school in connection with one college. Plans for the future indicated that one college was definitely planning to add the course and one would like to add this course to its curriculum.

Requirements for Graduation

Requirements by Major Areas

This course was listed as an elective by the one school offering it on campus and was evidently an elective at the other school offering through the state college.

Hours Required

No report was given on the number of credit hours for which this course was offered.

Changes in Requirements

No changes were listed. The course was an elective at both schools.

Class Time Spent in Delivery

The one school responding that offered the course on campus indicated that less than one-third of the class time was spent in delivery or oral presentations by students in class.

Textbooks

No published textbooks were used. The unpublished outlines of the professor with thirty years' experience.
were being used by the reporting school.

Course Objectives

The course objectives were described very briefly by the respondent from the first of these colleges, as follows: "Basic principles applied!" How they were applied was not explained. It appears from the small amount of time spent in class in student performances that the class was handled with lectures, assignments, discussion, etc.

Nonverbal Communication

This course was offered by one college at a state college through a cooperative arrangement between the schools. It was offered as an elective. No response was given on any of the other items on the questionnaire. No other colleges offered this course.

General Semantics

One respondent replied under this course title. No other colleges indicated offering this course. The respondent inserted the title Grammar at this point and indicated the course was offered for three hours. No response was made to the requirements area questions, or class time. The textbook listed was Blumenthal, Joseph C. *English 3200: A Programmed Course in Grammar and Usage* (4th ed., 1970, New York: Harcourt, Brace, Co. The course objective was described by the respondent in this manner: "The use of better English in all phases of life. More effectively
express thoughts." It seems to be evident from this response that this may not be a course in General semantics, but rather an English grammar course containing both semantics and syntax.

Survey of Linguistics

Course Offerings and Planning

This course was offered by four, or 18 per cent, of the twenty-two colleges involved in the survey. The course had been dropped by one college. None of the schools indicated they would like to add the course, but one college stated under changes of requirements that it would add work in cultural anthropology and linguistics for mission majors. The offering of this course appeared to be closely connected with language study and missionary majors as indicated by the information about requirements and objectives following.

Requirements for Graduation
Requirements by Major Areas

Survey of Linguistics was required for missionary majors by three of the four schools currently offering the course. The course was required for English minors by the other school.

Hours Required

One to two semester hours were required by two colleges and from three to four semester hours by two of the schools now offering this course.
Changes in Requirements

An increase in the number of hours required for the course was indicated by one college; this requirement was an increase from four quarter hours (2.66 semester hours) to five quarter hours (3.33 semester hours). This course was offered for the first time in 1970-71 at one school.

Class Time Spent in Delivery

There were two, or 50 per cent, of the schools offering this course that spent less than one-third of the class time in student presentations in class; one, or 25 per cent, reported spending one-third to one-half of the class time; and one reported spending one-half to two-thirds of the available class time in the delivery of oral presentations by students.

Textbooks

Survey of Linguistics was offered by four schools with three giving responses on textbooks. Of the three schools, one was using two published textbooks, one was using one published textbook, and one was using the unpublished notes of the professor with reference books which were not listed. The textbooks in use were.


Larson. Techniques of Language Learners.

Nida, Eugene. Learning a Foreign Language.
Course Objectives

The respondents' statements of objectives for the course are listed below. The first was the most extensive and complete.

a. To offer a course in general orientation to language and communication to prepare the prospective missionary to learn more effectively the language of the country to which he will go.

b. To introduce the prospective missionary to applied linguistics.

c. To give the prospective missionary an awareness of the cultural situations in which people live and speak, and to be prepared for cross-cultural communication.

d. To challenge the prospective missionary to be dedicated to proclaiming the Gospel of Christ in ways meaningful to the hearers.

"Acquaint students with sound and morphology."

"Understanding of nature of language."

From the first rather comprehensive statement of objectives and the requirements for missionary majors it seemed clear that the course was aimed primarily at preparing these majors for their communicative task of Christian evangelism in a language and culture that differed from their own.

Cross Cultural Communication

This course was offered by one college for two semester hours and was required for missionary majors. Less than one-third of the class time was spent in student performance before the class. No changes in requirements were listed and no information was given on textbooks. In the future two colleges planned to add the course.
Course Offerings and Planning

Cultural anthropology was offered by six, or 27 per cent, of the twenty-two colleges responding to the questionnaire. There were plans made to offer the course at one additional college in the near future. No other changes had been made or were planned according to the returns.

Requirements for Graduation

Requirements by Major Areas

This course was required for graduation for all students by one college, for missionary majors by two schools and was listed as an elective by one college.

Hours Required

From one to two semester hours was required by four of the schools. No report on this item was received from the other colleges offering the course.

Changes in Requirements

None of the colleges offering this course indicated any changes in the requirements for the course.

Class Time Spent in Delivery

The five colleges responding to this item indicated that they all spent less than one-third of the available classroom time in the delivery of oral presentation in class by the students. Evidently this was not considered to be a performance oriented class.
Textbooks

There were three colleges reporting on the use of textbooks. The others did not report on this item. The materials in use are listed below.


Unpublished note of the professor with reference books. (Titles of references was not given).

Unpublished outlines of professor (name not given).

Course Objectives

The statements of the objectives of the three schools that responded to this question are listed below. This course seemed to be oriented toward missionary majors, but not exclusively so, as the first statement reveals:

A study of customs, cultures, and basic linguistics to help the prospective worker in worldwide evangelism to be better prepared to meet cultures different from his own. This study is to benefit Christian workers in the United States and Canada as well as other regions of the world.

"Acquaint student with cultural problems of races."

"To understand what factors influence men in the development of society."

This course, as did a number of the others, appeared to be viewed as a "tool" course for the task of the student upon graduation.

Discussion and Small Group

Course Offerings and Planning.

Classes in discussion and small group were offered on campus by four of the schools and through a cooperative
agreement with a state college by one other school making a
total of five, or 23 per cent, of the colleges responding
to the questionnaire. It was taught as part of advanced.
public speaking by one of these colleges. None of the.
colleges had any plans regarding adding or dropping the.
course. At least for the immediate future the status
appeared static for this course.

**Requirements for Graduation**

Requirements by Major Areas

Discussion and small group was required for all
students for graduation by one college and for Christian
education majors by one college. No response on this item
was received from the other schools offering this course.

**Hours Required**

This course was required from one to two semester
hours by the two schools that responded to this item.

Changes in Requirements

The only change reported was a reduction in the number
of hours offered and required for the course at one college.
The course was reduced from three quarter hours (two semes­
ter hours) to two quarter hours (1.33 semester hours).

**Class Time Spent in Delivery**

There were two, or 50 per cent, of schools reporting
on this item that used less than one-third of the class
time in delivery. One school spent one-third to one-half
of the time in delivery and one spent from one-half to
two-thirds of the class time in student presentations.
Textbooks

Only one textbook listed was directly in the field of group discussion. The other text listed was used in advanced public speaking and this "course" was included as a part of the public speaking course. A professor's outlines were used in one class and no textbook was listed for the remaining college offering the course. The textbooks as reported by the respondents are:


Monroe, Alan H. Principles and Types of Speech. (Used as text in advanced public speaking.)

Unpublished outlines of professor with thirty years' experience. (Name not given).

Course Objectives

Three brief statements of course objectives were returned and are given below:

"To learn how to communicate in conversation."

"To understand nature and dynamics of task groups."

"To acquaint students with discussion as a means of problem solving and teaching."

From the above statements it can be seen that the objectives centered on the nature, dynamics and effects of group discussion. Evidently opportunity was afforded the student to practice his skills and understanding of the theoretical aspects of the course by direct interaction in groups with the class.
Sociodrama

The responses to the questionnaire indicated one college offered sociodrama. The course was an elective offered for from one to two semester hours. The amount of time spent in classroom delivery was not indicated. The textbook being used was: Cantrell, Van H. Amateur Theater: Guide for Actor and Director, New York: Funk & Wagnalls, 1968. No statement of the course objective was given by the respondent.

Interviewing and Counseling

Course Offerings and Planning

The course was offered by nine, or 41 per cent, of twenty-two colleges that responded to the questionnaire. No changes in the current curriculum plans for this course were indicated.

Requirements for Graduation

Requirements by Major Areas

Interviewing and Counseling was required for graduation for all students by two of the colleges, while three required it for ministerial majors. No response was given on major area requirements by four of the schools that offered the course.

Hours Required

The course was offered from one to two semester hours by two of the schools, and from two to three semester hours in one college. The other schools did not state the number of semester hours the course is offered.
Changes in Requirements

The primary changes made in the requirements in relation to this course were that the course had been added to the curriculum since 1960 and was a requirement for graduation in at least five of the nine schools currently offering the course. Comments on the changes made since 1960 are inserted below.

"This course added in about 1964."

One school indicated a change in requirement since 1960 but did not state the nature of the change.


"A new course altogether since 1968."

Evidently this area was considered of growing importance by the Bible colleges in view of the number that added this course to the curriculum in the decade of the 1960's.

Class Time Spent in Delivery

Only three out of the nine offering the course responded to this question. Of the three, two use less than one-third of the class time in student presentations in class, the one school reported that they were currently devoting from one-third to one-half of the class time in students' oral presentations before the class.

Textbooks

The textbook in use by two colleges was Narramore, Clyde, The Psychology of Counseling, Grand Rapids, Michigan: Zondervan. The unpublished outlines of a professor were
in use at one school. No text was listed by any of the other schools.

Course Objectives

There were three brief responses given to this question on objectives, which are stated in full below. No response on objectives was received from the other schools offering this course.

"Recognition of true situations and what to do."

"Bring an understanding for a better counseling ministry."

"To understand basic principles of human problems."

It would appear from the changes that have been made since 1960 (colleges adding the course to the curriculum) and the statements of objectives made above that the course was considered by a growing number of schools to be needed by the minister on the field to meet the situations he will face in this area of his ministry.

Public Relations

This course was offered by one out of the twenty-two colleges that responded to the questionnaire. No plans existed to drop the course at any of the other schools. One college indicated it would like to add the course to the curriculum. The course was offered as an elective for two semester hours of credit. The college offering this course spent from one-half to two-thirds of the time in classroom delivery by the students. They used Stuber,
Public Relations Manual for Churches. The stated objective for the course was—"Getting message across."

Persuasion

Persuasion was offered at two colleges. It should be noted, however, that one college evidently gave a strong emphasis on persuasion under its advanced public speaking course as judged by the textbook in use and the statement of objective by this school. None of the colleges indicated that they planned to add or drop or would like to add or drop this subject. The course was required for ministerial majors by one school, information on this was not given by the other college. It was required for one to two semester hours by the one college. Changes in requirements since 1960 were not indicated by the respondents. There was also no response to the question on class time spent in delivery. The textbook in use at one college was: Marsh, P.O., *Persuasive Speaking*, New York: Harper & Row, Publishers, 1967. Information on the textbook in use was not supplied by the other respondent. The respondent that replied on textbooks stated as the course objective that it was intended to "develop preacher's appeal."

Other Courses

There were two courses appearing on the questionnaire (see Appendix) in the speech communication area that were not offered in any of the colleges responding to the questionnaire, and apparently have not been offered since 1960.
These courses are History of Public Address and Rhetorical Theory. One respondent indicated a desire to add Critical Speech Evaluation and Listening under "Other Courses."

Table 3 presents a summary of the course offerings in speech communication.

Introduction to Homiletics

Course Offerings and Planning

Introductory Homiletics was offered at twenty, or 91 per cent, of the colleges answering the questionnaire. There were no plans for adding or dropping the course in the curriculum of any of the responding colleges.

Requirements for Graduation

Requirements by Major Areas

Introductory Homiletics was required by all students in three colleges; of the remaining colleges, nine required it for Christian education majors, and five for missionary majors.

Hours Required

The number of credit hours offered in Introductory Homiletics ranged from two to four semester hours. Among the colleges responding to this question three required one to two semester hours of credit; two required from two to three semester hours of credit in this course. There were four colleges from which no response was received as to the number of credit hours offered or required.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Title or Similar Title</th>
<th>Offered Now</th>
<th>Not Offered</th>
<th>Plan to Offer</th>
<th>Plan to Drop</th>
<th>Has Been Dropped</th>
<th>Like to Add</th>
<th>Like to Drop</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Introductory Speech</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advanced Public Sp.</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Argument. &amp; Debate</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hist. Public Address</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhetorical Theory</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voice Training</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oral Interpretation</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intro. Broadcasting</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Process of Comm.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonverbal Comm.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Semantics</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Survey Linguistics</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cross Cult. Comm.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disc. Small Group</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sociodrama</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interviewing &amp; Coun.</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Relations</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persuasion</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crit. Sp. &amp; Listen.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Changes in Requirements

Several changes in the requirements since 1960 were made in Introductory Homiletics. In one instance the requirement was extended to a major area in which the course had not been previously required. The respondent stated, "Homiletics was made a requirement for degree with major in missions--1967." In the second case the requirement was reduced in 1970 from requiring this course for all students to the present status of requiring it only for ministerial students. No other changes were reported for this course.

Class Time in Delivery

A total of fifteen colleges responded to the question about the time spent in delivery of speeches (sermons) or other oral presentations in class. Of the fifteen colleges responding to this question, five, or 33 per cent, spent less than one-third of the class time in delivery; nine used from one-third to one-half of the class time in student speeches (sermons) etc., one college used from one-half to two-thirds of the time in class for delivery of student presentation in this course. For a comparison with the time spent in delivery in other homiletics and speech communication courses, see Table 10, page 121.

Textbooks

A variety of textbooks were in use in Introductory Homiletics. The colleges reported ten different titles of
published books in use at the present time and two different unpublished manuscripts or outlines. The text of three colleges offering this course was not listed. The most popular book in use was: Don DeWelt, If You Want to Preach, Grand Rapids, Michigan: Baker Books, 1957. This book was being used by three colleges. Next in popularity were three different books each being used by two colleges. The titles of these books were:


The following books and unpublished materials were each used by one college.


Broadus, John A. and Jennings. Preparation and Delivery of Sermons.


Silsby, Conley. Unpublished manuscript (Author is currently a professor of speech and homiletics).
Course Objectives

The primary objectives of this course were (1) the preparation (all phases) of sermons, and (2) the delivery of sermons. By comparing the stated objectives for this course and the time allocated for the students to deliver their sermons in class with these same factors in the Advanced Homiletics course it seemed clear that more emphasis was placed on gaining a knowledge of homiletical theory and basic principles in this course, whereas the advanced course emphasized the application of these in a greater opportunity to actually prepare and deliver sermons.

The stated course objectives of the respondents appearing below pointed to these two primary objectives; at times with more emphasis on one of these objectives; at others more emphasis on the other objective; and at times about equal emphasis on the two objectives.

"How to prepare and deliver a sermon."

"Learn what sermon building is, and some practice."

a. To acquaint the student with good homiletical theory including invention, arrangement, style, and delivery. b. The second semester is given to student preaching to provide experience in the materials studied first semester. c. To produce preachers of the Word, workmen that needeth not to be ashamed, rightly dividing the Word of God.

"Learn to present the Word in a meaningful and forceful manner."
From the standpoint of homiletics, the objective is to unleash the power of the Word itself in proper homiletical form. It is my feeling that the Word itself when properly "unleashed" will convince, convict, etc.

"Homiletics courses are aimed to teach the preparation, delivery and illustration of sermons."

"Principles of sermon preparation and delivery."

"To understand the nature of preaching and basic principles of sermon preparation."

"How to make and deliver sermons."

"The student is expected to become proficient in organizing and presenting the material of his address."

"To prepare students to develop sermons."

"To help students use the Bible and other sources in the orderly development of sermons."

"Acquaint students with principles of sermon preparation."

In addition to the objectives previously mentioned, it should be noted that there was considerable emphasis laid on the Bible as the basic source of the sermon.

**Advanced Homiletics**

**Course Offerings and Planning**

Advanced Homiletics was offered by fifteen, or 68 per cent, of the twenty-two colleges responding to the questionnaire, while seven did not offer the course, and one planned to offer the course and one college indicated it would like to add it to their curriculum.

**Requirements for Graduation**

**Requirements by Major Areas**

This course was strongly oriented toward the preparation
of ministers, with ten, or 67 per cent, of the colleges offering it requiring it for ministerial majors, while three colleges required the course for missionary majors. It was not required for any other major areas.

Hours Required

Advanced Homiletics was required for one to two semester hours of credit by four colleges; two schools required from two to three credit hours; one required three to four credit hours; and one college required five to six semester hours of credit for graduation.

Changes in Requirements

The changes in the requirements reported as occurring since 1960 indicated an increasing emphasis on homiletical studies for those most directly involved in sermon building and delivery; that is, students planning to be ministers and missionaries. For example, the increase in the requirement in this area by one college during the 1965-1966 academic year resulted in adding six semester hours of credit in Advanced Homiletics for ministerial majors seeking the Bachelor of Science Degree; this requirement was in addition to the existing requirement of three credit hours of Introductory Homiletics for all students at this college. In another instance, the respondent stated that this course was--"Not required before 1967 (recommended, however)." His return indicated that it had been required since 1967 for both ministerial majors and missionary majors.
One college reported changing this course from the undergraduate or Bible college level to their graduate school. It should be noted, however, that this same school required two semesters of Introductory Homiletics and Preparation and Delivery of Sermons at the Bible college level. The respondent stated:

Advanced Homiletics was transferred to the Graduate School curriculum from the Bible college and made a requirement in the Master of Arts program and in the Master of Divinity program.

No other changes in the requirements for this course since 1960 were reported.

Class Time Spent in Delivery

Reports were received on the time spent in class in delivery from eleven of the fifteen colleges offering this course. They reported that two colleges, or 18 per cent, spent less than one-third of the class time in the delivery of speeches or sermons; five, or 45 per cent, spent from one-third to one-half of the class time for delivery; and four, or 37 per cent, spent from one-half to two-thirds of the class time in student performances in class. There apparently was more emphasis on the actual performance of the individual student at this level. A comparison with Introductory Homiletics revealed that 67 per cent of the respondents spent over one-third of the time in class for delivery while in the advanced course, 82 per cent of the respondents spent over one-third of the class time for individual student performances. For further comparison,
see Table 10, page 121.

Textbooks

Ten textbooks were reported to be in use for the teaching of Advanced Homiletics. Several of the titles, when compared to the statements of objectives that follow, indicated that considerable emphasis was placed on the development of expository and exegetical preaching. The only book used by more than one college was Knott, Harold E. *How to Prepare an Expository Sermon*, Cincinnati: Standard Publishing Company, 1930. This text was in use by two colleges. The following were each in use by one college.

- Stewart, Heralds of God.
Course Objectives

The course objectives stated by the respondents indicated that a number of them stressed Biblical exegesis and exposition coupled with theology, apologetics and Biblical languages. The goal of practice in delivery and audience adaptation are also mentioned. The respondents' statements are given below.

"Advanced preparation and delivery of a sermon."

"Learn to prepare and practice expository sermon."

"Learn to extract from the Scriptures God's message to mankind."

"Introduction to theology of preaching and advanced theory."

"To learn how to use biblical studies, theology, apologetics, Greek, etc. to produce a good sermon."

"Give a perspective of the audience and the problems of preaching."

Preparation and Delivery of Sermons

Course Offerings and Planning

This course was offered by thirteen, or 59 per cent, of the twenty-two colleges responding to the questionnaire. It was not offered at nine of the colleges, and none of these planned to add or drop the course or indicated that they would like to add or drop this course. The point at which this course occurred in the curriculum seemed to vary. Some of the schools offered this course as a beginning homiletics course, others as a course occurring between Introductory and Advanced Homiletics and yet others as a
course following Advanced Homiletics. A few of the schools indicated the order but most did not, since it was not asked specifically on the questionnaire.

Requirements for Graduation

Requirements by Major Areas

This course was required for all students for graduation by one college; by twelve colleges for ministerial majors; by three colleges for Christian education majors, and by three of the schools for missionary majors.

Hours Required

The number of hours required for the course ranged from less than two to four semester hours of credit. Of those responding to this item, three colleges required from one to two credit hours, two required from two to three credit hours, and two schools required three to four semester hours of credit in this course for graduation. The other six schools did not report on the number of hours required in this area.

Changes in Requirements

Only one change was reported as occurring since 1960. The college reporting this change stated that this course had been changed from Preparation and Delivery of Sermons to Expository Preaching in 1969.

Class Time Spent in Delivery

This course appeared to be oriented in the direction of student performance as evidenced by the time spent in
delivery in classes and the indications of emphasis on research, outlining, and sermon construction in the statements of objectives which follow this section. There were two colleges, or 17 per cent, that spent less than one-third of the class time in the delivery of sermons in class; seven, or 58 per cent, of schools were using from one-third to one-half of the time for this purpose; and three, or 25 per cent, spent from one-half to two-thirds of the time in student presentations before the class. A total of twelve colleges reported on classroom time.

Textbooks

A variety of textbooks were in use in the courses in Preparation and Delivery of Sermons, with seven published books and two unpublished manuscripts or outlines listed by the respondents. The most popular title in use was: Koller, Charles W. Expository Preaching Without Notes, Grand Rapids, Michigan: Baker Books, 1962. This book was used by three colleges. The following textbooks were each used by two colleges.


Listed below are the titles of textbooks being used by only one of the colleges.


Silsby, Conley. Unpublished manuscript.

Unpublished outlines of a professor (name not given).

Course Objectives

The statements of objectives submitted by the respondents indicated that this course was aimed primarily at the development of skills including organization, illustration, and delivery of sermons. Comparing the objectives here to those of Advanced Homiletics it seemed that less emphasis was placed on the theoretical aspects of sermon building and more emphasis upon the pragmatic factors. The following statements of objectives for the course in Preparation and Delivery of Sermons were received from the respondents.

To define the expository method of preaching as distinguished from the textual and topical method and to teach the student how to gather material, how to outline and how to preach an effective expository sermon.

"Opportunity to prepare and practice preaching a sermon."

"Homiletics courses are aimed to teach the preparation, delivery, and illustration of sermons."

"Most class time is taken for preaching and constructive criticism."

"Acquaint the student with principles of sermon preparation."
"Give technical and practical knowledge in preparation of sermons."

Expository Preaching

This was one of the courses listed by several respondents under "Other Courses" in the questionnaire (refer to Appendix). This course was offered at three colleges. No plans for adding or dropping this course were indicated by any of the colleges. The course was required for ministerial majors by two colleges. One college required from one to two semester hours of credit for the course. Responses were not received from the other colleges on the above items. The only change in requirements was noted by the college that changed its Preparation and Delivery of Sermons course to this course title in 1969. In connection with this change the respondent called attention to the fact that they were using video tape recording in the teaching of this course. Textbooks were reported on by two of the three schools offering this course. Both were using the same book. Koller, Charles W. Expository Preaching Without Notes, Grand Rapids, Michigan: Baker Books, 1962. Only one college reported on time spent in delivery, stating they used less than one-third of the class time for the delivery of speeches (sermons). The objectives for this course are quoted below.

"Development of expository preaching."
"This has been changed to Expository Preaching--1969--use video tape."

"To help students learn the process of discovering and presenting the truths inherent within a passage of Scripture."

Planned Preaching

This course title was listed by one college under "Other Courses." It was offered as an elective course for one to two semester hours of credit toward graduation. No indication was given as to the amount of time spent in delivery in class. The textbook in use was: Pearce, J. Winston, Planning Your Preaching, Nashville: Broadman Press, 1967. The instructor's stated objective for the course follows: "To learn strategy and sources for long-range planning of the preaching program." One other school planned to offer this course.

History of Preaching

This course was offered by one college and one other school planned to add the course. It was offered as an elective, but the number of credit hours was not listed, nor was the time spent in delivery listed. The textbook being used was: Dargan, Edwin C. History of Preaching, Vol. I (1965), Vol. II (1970), published by Baker Books of Grand Rapids, Michigan. No statement of course objectives was given by the respondent.
Special Forms of Ministerial Address

One college offered this course for one to two semester hours of credit toward graduation and required it for ministerial majors. According to the respondent no text was used for the course, and no response was made as to time spent in delivery in class by students and no statement of objectives for the course was given.

Critical Speech Evaluation and Listening

This course was not offered by any of the twenty-two colleges responding to the questionnaire. However, one respondent listed this title under the "Other Courses" designation on questionnaire and stated that they would like to add this course, and stated that no textbook had been chosen to date.

Table 4 presents a summary of the course offerings in Homiletics.
Past Trends and Anticipated Developments In Speech Communication Education and Homiletics Education

Trends In Speech Communication Education Since 1960

In an attempt to learn something of the trends in speech communication education over the past decade within the Bible colleges surveyed, the academic deans and/or instructors were asked--"What trends in speech communication education at the undergraduate Bible college level have you observed
since 1960?" The opinions of the twenty respondents to this question varied considerably. Their observation as to the trends over the period included at least one or more references to each of the following areas.

1. An increasing awareness of communication theory.
2. An increasing emphasis on the mass media.
3. An increase in the demand for teachers with better preparation, such as a major in speech communication.
4. A growing use of electronic equipment as aids to instruction.
5. The trend toward better (or poorer) pre-college preparation of students.
6. An increasing emphasis upon independent thinking and an opportunity for students to speak on vital issues.
7. An increase (or decrease) in the opportunities or time available for the student to speak before the class.
8. Conditions were described as static by some observers, with no noticeable trends or changes occurring during this period, their explanation for this was included.

The response of the observers often contained a number of trends which they had noted during the period from 1960
to the present, hence there are frequent overlaps in the eight areas appearing above. In order to emphasize the various areas the respondents' responses have been excerpted in such a manner as to place that portion of the response under a specific area mentioned above. Every response received is quoted fully.

The first reference points to the increasing attention being given to communication theory by Bible colleges according to the respondents' observations.

"A definite increase in the stress on communication has impressed me."

The trend toward an increasing use of the mass media and in studies relating to its use was evidenced in the replies received. The following observations relating to this area were received.

"An increased interest in the mass media as a means of furthering the gospel."

"More radio."

"Interest in modern means of communicating the Gospel--(TV, radio)."

"More use has been made of electronic devices... as well as in the actual process of communication."

The observations of a number of respondents noted a trend toward upgrading of the speech communication offerings within the Bible colleges, most noticeable was the attempt to achieve this upgrading through more exacting qualifications.
for teachers.

The observations relating to course upgrading and teacher qualifications and availability follow.

"An attempt to upgrade offerings and value of courses."

"An increasing awareness of the need for more instruction in communication techniques."

The trend is to secure teachers who have a speech major rather than a person who has preached. We have not taken this step yet, but we would like to in the future.

An apparent shortage of qualified people to teach the area because we have not replaced a vacancy in the last three years with a full time speech teacher.

More and more requirements are being made of teachers in this area, and a growing conviction is evident for requiring basic speech for every student on the collegiate level.

The use of electronic equipment designed to assist in the instruction of the student apparently has been a growing trend as reflected by the responses quoted below.

More use has been made of electronic devices in training in the speech arts, as well as in the actual process of communication....Language laboratories have come into their own, and in some areas seemingly passed the peak with more emphasis coming back to the individual instruction face to face with the pupil.

"...additional use of audio-visuals (video-tape), and less emphasis on theory."

The following observations were made relating to the high school preparation of the student and its effect upon the courses in speech communication at the college level.
It will be noted that the two statements express exactly opposite views on the trend in pre-college preparation. For the reader's benefit it should be noted that these two responses came from two very different geographical areas of the country separated by half the width of the continent. Whether this has an effect of the widely differing views or not cannot be determined on the basis of available data. The statements appear in full below.

"Students come better prepared from high school. Can do more extensive training in college."

Less formal. Entering freshmen have generally poorer high school background in platform deportment and in correct structural English. The college professor now begins instruction at a more elementary level than formerly.

Two different views are expressed in relation to trends relating to the relative position of the theoretical areas and the applied areas of actual public speaking opportunities of the student. This appears even more forcefully in the statements of trends since 1960 in the homiletics field, but is more than hinted at in the quotations that follow relating to speech communication courses.

"No significant change except additional use of audio-visuals (video-tape), and less emphasis on theory."

"More emphasis on independent thinking and relevancy. Controversial, current topics used."

"There seems to be a tendency to substitute a study of psychological motivations for actual practical courses in speech with emphasis on speaking."
Several statements were received to the effect that the respondents had not observed any particular trends in this area since 1960. Reasons for the static conditions were expressed in the opinions of the observers which accompanied this observation.

"No trends established in our experience."

Little change. The emphasis still seems to be upon basic speech, fundamentals of public speaking. Recent theories and trends in speech communication are often not known or ignored. Two reasons are, that not many of our speech professors have advanced education in speech communication, and that the Bible college curricula do not provide room for much beyond an introductory course.

The following responses do fit into the classification stated earlier but are quoted here to provide all the possible data for explaining the situation as it apparently exists in some of the schools.

"We haven't placed as much emphasis on this as we should, so not in a position to answer."

Largely fads such as 'non-verbal communication' have been considered in the courses at ________[a state college]. We do not teach speech at ________ College and I am not abreast of what other Bible colleges may be doing in this area, though I suspect little.

"I am relatively new in the business so cannot make a positive judgment as such."

"Just in 3rd year of teaching."

Not a new trend, but a continuing one—that is—a student's contentment with mediocrity, rather than desiring to go on to become a dynamic speaker. Of
course, this is hard to do with only one course in Public Address. Courses in Homiletics and Advanced Homiletics help.

Anticipated Developments In Speech Communication Education In The Next Ten Years

The responses received in reply to the question on anticipated developments in speech communication education indicate that in the opinion of some of the respondents a number of the trends will continue and some of these will grow and expand over the next ten years. They anticipated a continuation of the following trends in the Bible colleges of the Christian churches.

1. A continuing improvement in instruction coupled with an increasing use of electronic equipment.
2. An acceleration of the stress on the mass media.
3. Increasing opportunities for the student to speak in public, and increasingly higher standards of performance.
4. Further awareness of communication theory and a growing demand for training in speech communication.

Probably the most important development anticipated is a growing demand for training in speech communication which is foreseen as leading to a broadening and deepening of the field of speech communication education with the Bible
colleges. The respondents anticipate that a broadening of the offerings in courses in speech communication will occur over a broad range of subjects. This was seen by some as occurring through diversification within the department as the present day specialists move into the position of department heads. One respondent "saw" the depth of study increasing to the point that within five years a major would be offered in this area.

The statements of the respondents immediately below point to a continuing interest in the improvement of instruction and the growing use of electronic equipment as aids to instruction.

"There is talk of improvement in the future. How or what I do not know."

"As not a specialist in speech, I can only guess that instruction will improve. Video tape and other devices will be used more."

In a very elementary sense the problems of Speech Education are no different than they were ten years ago but hopefully new methods of teaching and dealing with age old problems can be uncovered, introduced, and utilized.

"We would hope to strengthen this department."

"Better tools such as video tape will be a great help."

Those foreseeing a continuing and growing emphasis on the mass media reported as follows.

An acceleration of the stress on the importance of mass communication is my anticipation. I think we will be hard put to keep up with the rapid developments in this field.
"Emphasis upon modern means of communication—
Teaching of mass media methods."

"I definitely see a trend toward mass communica-
tion. This is our only hope. The Bible College
must get prepared."

Two different views were expressed concerning public
speaking opportunities for students in comparison with
group dynamics and personal development. These trends were
noted in the previous ten years by some of the respondents.
These ideas are apparently viewed by some of the respondents
as conflicting one with the other. Considered in view of
the broadening of the whole range of courses anticipated by
some respondents, this may indicate a parallel development
rather than an opposing development.

In Bible College—a more concentrated effort
to encourage the student to set higher standards of
effectual communication for himself—and more oppor-
tunity for public appearances.

I think we can expect to see a swing back to a
more practical approach. Certainly there will be
much use made of technological advances. I expect
to see most schools using both audio and video tape
with almost all speech classes.

"Less emphasis on mechanics and form—more on
becoming a person and relating to the world."

"I have no idea—I would imagine a trend away
from formal public address with stress upon the
informal group dynamic."

"I anticipate a gradual change from the conversa-
tional mode of presentation."

The response that follows calls attention to the need
and possible development of a broadening presentation of
communication theory over the next ten years. It also
calls attention to the development of other courses which
do not receive much attention in the colleges at the
present time.

"Hopefully to broaden presentation of communica-
tion theory as well as a comprehensive study of
persuasion and small group dynamics."

The anticipated developments connected with an increas-
ing demand for training in speech communication, the broad-
ening of course offerings and increasing depth of study in
this area quoted from the respondents replies appear below.

"More diversification within the departments as
the specialists become department chairmen, and as
many Bible colleges tend to become Christian colleges."

"I anticipate a communication major perhaps
in the next five years--and increasing communication
offerings next year."

No specific plans for change. I believe addi-
tion in oral interpretation and debate (as electives)
would benefit many students. Our Christian service
program affords many students a continuing prac-
ticum beyond the required introductory discipline.

We predict a growing demand for training and
education in speech communication with more and more
emphasis on some of the areas which have been on the
fringe as far as the Bible College is concerned--
how to read the English Bible, oral communication,
nonverbal communication and the like.

The continuation of an existing trend was noted by
one college as it applied to their own situation in this
field of study.

"So far as communication education in this area
we shall continue to rely upon _____ ___ College."
This refers to arrangements made with a nearby state college which appears to have a fairly well developed program, judging by this respondent's return.

Trends Since 1960 In Homiletics Education

The question, "What trends in homiletics education at the undergraduate Bible college level have you observed since 1960?" was included in the questionnaire in an attempt to determine the trends in this area among the Bible colleges surveyed. The fourteen responses to this question included one or more references to the following areas.

1. An increasing emphasis upon or return to biblical preaching.

2. A trend away from the emphasis on preaching and a change toward more emphasis on personal and small group methods in communicating the gospel was noted by several respondents, while others stated they observed a deterioration in preaching.

3. A slight trend toward better teacher preparation was noted by one instructor, while another noted a sharp contrast in scholarship within this field in comparison with the speech communication field, noting particularly the lack of scholarly journals in homiletics.

4. Trends in course requirements were seen as growing stronger.
5. The emphasis on student participation in class was increasing according to some observers. This is in contrast to the trend noted by others under the second trend listed above.

6. Increasing use was being made of electronic equipment.

7. Static conditions with no definite trends were reported by some in their replies.

The responses of the academic deans and/or instructors of homiletics regarding the trends over the past decade are given below for the reader's perusal and are arranged in the order stated above.

First are the statements regarding the increasing interest in Biblical preaching.

"There seems to be renewed emphasis on biblical preaching (what has been traditionally called expository and/or textual preaching)."

"A return to biblical preaching."

Other respondents noted a trend away from preaching to larger audiences toward a greater emphasis on communication at the personal and small group levels. Their observations follow.

Many schools are emphasizing the more personal approaches such as pastoral counseling and personal evangelism to the expense of course in preaching.
There seems to be fewer students who desire to go into the preaching ministry as such. Some are undecided, others choose Christian education or some related field. I feel this is a national trend.

There is lesser emphasis on homiletics and preaching. More encouragements are given to the use of "canned" sermons. More emphasis is given to church administration. The sermons are not as scholarly or polished, but the congregations are larger.

"Less men desire to preach. Lack of ability or willingness to prepare sermons--the 'quickie' concept for everything."

Other courses in Christian ministries such as counseling, church administration, etc. have led to less emphasis on preaching as an 'art' or 'science.'"

The statement of the instructor that follows is along the same general trend, but he sees a deterioration in preaching on the basis of what some would refer to as style.

In this area I have noticed a deterioration of the one time idea that preaching is highly emotional, dramatic. There seems to be a clearer distinction between 'evangelistic' preaching and 'pastoral' preaching. There is definitely a N.T. [New Testament] distinction that should possibly be given greater care in homiletics education.

Other respondents also spoke of trends in style and manners of approaching the sermon.

Movement from rhetoric to conversational style of speaking. Scientific study of what's wrong with our preaching. To give more attention to life situations. Need to define biblical terms stressed.
"Some trends toward psychological and persuasive types--perhaps less on the purely logical."

Attention was called to the slight increase in the quality and breadth of preparation by one respondent, while another respondent was critical of the lack of progress in scholarliness. Both statements are given below.

A few more men are preparing themselves to teach homiletics by securing graduate work in speech communication, etc. However there needs to be a balance in a preaching professor's background between speech communication and theology of preaching. Too often either one or the other aspect is absent. Good homiletics should be grounded in both communication theory and theology.

I have taught only since 1969. I have observed that trends in homiletics education are severely behind speech education--viz. no outstanding journal in the field compared to QJS, SM, ST, et. al. No scholarly organization available (the religious speaking interest group of the Speech Communication Association notwithstanding). Lack of good texts: most texts written by successful preachers with little or no background in communication theory.

The fourth group of observed trends centered around the requirements of the courses in homiletics. The respondents' observations follow.

Once again a growing conviction for requiring homiletics of all male students, whether they are preparing for service on the foreign field or in the United States of America.

"Here at _____ we require 12 hours in homiletics and make available another 12 hours. All of these courses lay the emphasis on preaching."

The trend toward an increase in the amount of time
devoted to student participation in class in presenting their own sermons, etc. was noted in some replies while, in contrast, others saw exactly the opposite trend.

"There seems to be a greater emphasis on student participation as opposed to lectures."

"Many schools are emphasizing the more personal approaches...to the expense of course in preaching."

"Other courses...have led to less emphasis on preaching as an 'art' or 'science.'"

The increasing use of electronic equipment, such as video tape and audio tape recorders in the teaching of homiletics was noted by one respondent.

The electronic equipment has also been put to work in this area for the practice of the principles learned in homiletics--video tape machines, the tape recorders of voices, and the use of visual aids in the actual presentation of messages. In this field, there does not seem to be the passing of the peak in the use of such devices.

Several replies indicated that the conditions were considered static or little change during this period.

"Not much new."

"None."

"Ours has remained static."

"No answer."

No response was received on this question from a number that did respond on the similar question related to speech communication.
Anticipated Developments in Homiletics Education In The Next Ten Years

A number of the trends established or continued through the past decade were expected to continue in the opinion of the respondents. The trends which they anticipated would continue were:

1. An increasing interest in Biblical preaching.
2. The further broadening of course offerings in homiletics.
3. A growing use of the various electronic devices in the instructional process in homiletics.
4. Further attention will be devoted to the mass media.
5. Needs for improved preparation of teachers will continue throughout the 1970s.
6. Continued attention will be given to course improvement with more emphasis on scientific studies, relating to listening, message effects, theories of construction of sermons, and adaptation to the needs of the audience.
7. The development of an internship-type of on-the-field training for religious workers was anticipated by at least one of the respondents. Such training was viewed as important to the understanding of the actual problems of ministers and
missionaries on the field.

The developments anticipated in regard to the strengthening or weakening of preaching in the next ten years were stated as follows:

"There may be a turn in the road--turn to greater interest in preaching."

We also seem to be moving toward an emphasis in training men in expository preaching as over against topical and textual type of sermon preparation.

"I hope that more and more schools will insist on more emphasis in this field."

I anticipate a continual decline and departure from 'evangelistic' style. It doesn't seem to be culturally acceptable to 'holler' and get emotionally involved [sic]. I hope that this is not true and that the 'foolishness' of preaching will continue to be the powerful means of communicating the gospel it has always been.

The broadening of course offerings in the homiletics field was anticipated by a number of the colleges. Note their responses:

I would like to see a course or more than one developed in interpretative readings including serious and humorous materials. I would also like to see a course developed in public scripture reading--especially for preacher students.

We also predict a fragmentation of subjects to give specific [attention] to the need for preparing evangelistic sermons as over against the more pastoral types of messages.

"Should be strengthened for ministerial students."

The respondents that anticipated a continuing and growing
interest in the use of electronic devices as aids to teaching reported their expectations as follows.

"Improved instruction--use of video-tape, etc. New techniques of involvement of others in presenting message."

"Video tape--great help,..."

"Here, too, I expect more use of the newer technological devices for teaching."

The mass media were thought to be an area of continuing and growing interest among the Bible colleges--both in terms of training for the use of these mediums of communication and in the direct use of them. Responses on the anticipated developments in relation to the mass media follow.

"...greater use of Radio and T.V. potential in preaching on the mission field--Satelite T.V. to mission fields will necessitate training in these mediums."

"Undoubtedly more attention will need to be given to communication through the mass media."

Developments in teacher preparation were mentioned specifically by one respondent.

Unless some men become prepared educationally as suggested in Item 20, [speech communication and homiletical background] I don't see much improvement in homiletics education in our Bible colleges.

The respondents anticipated a good bit of interest to be shown in the area of course improvement, with attention being devoted to a more scientific approach to evaluating the whole communicative process in relation to the sermon itself. The number of responses on this area was greater than for the other areas indicating that there is consid-
erable interest in the factors involved and in improving the teaching by becoming more aware of these factors.

"Separation from general to a more pointed course next year."

"Continued scientific study of how to speak so people will listen."

"More emphasis upon sound theory of sermon construction and illustration. Methodical approach to sermon construction."

No specific plans for change as far as pure homiletics is concerned. Any addition would probably be more properly termed, 'Practical ministries' courses which would help the student effectively relate his preaching to the congregation's needs.

The following quotation suggested the improvement in this course area in a number of different ways.

"Anticipate--or hope?--Academic journal--Academic Association--Well written, theoretical based text."

The last anticipated development to be considered here was new, so far as the responses of the respondents indicated, for no mention of this idea was made in the period from 1960 to the present either in connection with speech communication studies or in connection with homiletics studies. The quotation is short, but this anticipated development points toward an internship type of participatory learning situation.

"Perhaps more association with 'on the field' programs in understanding work."
Summary

It is clear from the results above that the major emphasis was placed upon the introductory courses in speech communication and homiletics, and closely followed by the advanced homiletics courses and advanced public speaking. Further perusal of the data revealed that the remaining interest in speech communication courses was concentrated in the courses emphasizing performance and the development of specific skills. Courses emphasizing theory or history were given little or no attention by the schools surveyed. However, the statement of one or more individuals indicated a slight trend in this direction.

There seemed to be a rather strong interest in adding courses in Voice Training and Oral Interpretation. Four other courses had shown a growing interest over the past ten years. Interviewing and Counseling had been added to the curriculum of one-third of the colleges that presently offered it since 1964. A block of three courses, evidently considered to be primarily "tool" courses for missionaries by the respondents, had been growing in importance over this period. There seemed to be a trend to add these courses to the curriculum in the future as well. They were: Survey of Linguistics, Cross Cultural Communication, and Cultural Anthropology. From the standpoint of speech communication these courses appeared to come closer to the application of
the cross disciplinary approach to communication problems and the application of theory than any of the other courses listed, with the possible exception of Interviewing and Counseling. Interviewing and Counseling was taught by various departments of psychology, Christian ministries, and speech communication. The emphasis upon performance and "tool" courses probably stemmed from the primary objective of these schools, which was the education of ministers and other church leaders who would be engaged frequently in public speaking and small group communication situations. The development of courses in cross cultural communication and interviewing and counseling indicated a growing awareness of the complexities of the communication task of the religious worker.
Meaning Assigned To The Concepts, Speech Course, Speech Communication Course, and Communication Course, As Measured By The Semantic Differential

The overall objective of the survey was to determine the existing status and the current trends in the speech communication and homiletics curriculum of the colleges surveyed. In addition to the questions dealing directly with course work, questions were asked as to the trends over the past ten years and the respondents' opinions as to the trends anticipated in the next ten years. An attempt was also made to discover additional information that might give some indication of the "set" or frame of reference from which the respondents were replying. The three terms (above) were arbitrarily selected as representative labels for courses in the area commonly termed "speech" or "speech communication". It was assumed that a preference for the term Speech Course would indicate a conservative approach to the area, whereas a preference for the term Speech Communication Course might indicate a moderate approach to the area combining elements of classical and/or modern rhetorical theories with modern communication theories. It was further assumed that a preference for the term Communication Course would indicate that the "set" or approach to the area would primarily embrace modern communication theories.
The respondents were asked to rate the three concepts, Speech Course, Speech Communication Course, and Communication Course, on a semantic differential instrument consisting of twenty-one bipolar scales with a seven-point continuum for each scale. Information was sought on the following questions through the use of this instrument:

(1) What will the group (mean score) response be for the three concepts which represent three different labels currently attached to curriculum in this general area?

(2) Will the responses differ significantly between the three concepts?

(3) Will there be a significant difference in the rating of these concepts on the evaluative, potency, and activity factors on the semantic differential instrument?

The Semantic Differential

The semantic differential instrument was prepared on the three concepts, Speech Course, Speech Communication Course, and Communication Course, (a copy of the questionnaire will be found in the Appendix). Twenty-one bipolar terms were selected to serve as scales on a one
to seven-point continuum. Selection of the scales was made on the basis of factor loadings assigned to them by Osgood and his co-workers. Those with the highest factor loadings were chosen from the scales which Osgood, et. al., had factorially analyzed for their ability to measure the evaluative, potency and activity factors of semantic space (Osgood, Suci, and Tannebaum: 50-66). The value of one was assigned to the extremely favorable (positive) reaction, the neutral position on the scale was assigned the value of four, and the extremely unfavorable (negative) response the value of seven. Osgood found that the evaluative, potency and activity factors shared most of the common variance on the scales which they devised. They found that nearly 69 per cent of the common variance was accounted for by the evaluative factor, 16 per cent by the potency factor, and 13 per cent by the activity factor (Osgood, Suci, and Tannebaum: 37,38). The selection of the scales for this instrument followed approximately the same proportion of these factors. Fourteen (66.6 per cent) of the scales were selected for their ability to measure the evaluative factor, four (19.4 per cent) were chosen on the potency factor, and three (13 per cent) were selected to measure the activity factor.
The semantic differential instrument formed the final section of the questionnaire and consisted of one instruction sheet, and the three separate sheets of scales with one of the three concepts at the head of each of the sheets. The instruction sheet was modeled after that appearing in *The Measurement of Meaning* (Osgood, Suci, and Tannebaum: 82, 83).

Results

Thirteen respondents completed the semantic differential instrument prior to the initial return of the questionnaire. Those that had incomplete or no response to the semantic differential instrument were returned to the respondents with a request to respond or complete their response to the instrument. Five additional forms were completed and returned as a result of these follow-up procedures, two were not returned at all, one was returned still incomplete, and one was returned with the comment that the respondent did not understand what was wanted and, therefore, he had marked all scales in the neutral position. This last-mentioned response was discarded as unusable since it appeared from the respondents' comment that no attempt had been made to discriminate
between concepts. The results were based on the data obtained from the eighteen completed semantic differential instruments returned.

The group means for the three concepts based on the one to seven-point semantic scales were as follows: The mean value assigned to the concept **Speech Course** was 2.53; to **Speech Communication Course** 2.81, to the concept **Communication Course** the value assigned was 2.76. All three of these values fall within the "Moderately Favorable" distance on the semantic scale employed. The above values represent the means calculated across the entire set of twenty-one bipolar adjectives and includes all three factors, evaluative, potency and activity.
Table 5 (above) shows the results of the analyses between concepts. To test for any possible significant difference between the responses to the three concepts, three one-way analyses of variance were computed with F tests applied to the resultant data. No significant difference was found to exist between the responses to the three concepts. Without regard to significance it will be noted from the means shown above that a slight preference was indicated by the respondent for the concept Speech Course, which was rated "more favorable".

### Table 5

**ONE-WAY ANALYSES OF VARIANCE BETWEEN CONCEPTS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Concept Comparison:</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Speech Course ↔ Speech Communication Course</td>
<td>Between</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>312.1111</td>
<td>nsd</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Within</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>3317.8824</td>
<td>.0941</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>35</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speech Communication Course ↔ Communication Course</td>
<td>Between</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11.1111</td>
<td>.1210</td>
<td>nsd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Within</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>91.8170</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>35</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speech Course ↔ Communication Course</td>
<td>Between</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>205.4444</td>
<td>2.8125</td>
<td>nsd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Within</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>73.0458</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>35</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Further analysis of the data was made on each of the three concepts in relation to the evaluative scales, the potency scales and the activity scales. The profile of the respondents mean scores on the three concepts over the three scales is shown in Figure 1.

Figure 1.
Profile of Mean Scores for the Concepts Speech Course, Speech Communication Course and Communication Course.

Key:
A--Speech Course
B--Speech Communication Course
C--Communication Course

Evaluative
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A-2.10
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C-2.44

A-3.86
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A-2.70
B-3.09
C-3.01
Table 6 (below) shows the analyses between the concepts on the evaluative scales.

### Table 6

**ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE BETWEEN CONCEPTS ON EVALUATIVE SCALES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Concept Comparison:</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Speech Course ↔ Speech Communication Course</strong></td>
<td>Between</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>186.7778</td>
<td>3.9141</td>
<td>.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Within</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>47.7190</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>47.7190</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Speech Communication Course ↔ Communication Course</strong></td>
<td>Between</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.4445</td>
<td>.0069</td>
<td>nsd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Within</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>64.6797</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>64.6797</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Speech Course ↔ Communication Course</strong></td>
<td>Between</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>205.4444</td>
<td>4.1441</td>
<td>.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Within</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>49.5752</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>49.5752</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Analyses of variance of the three concepts on the evaluative scales indicated that there was significant difference between the concepts, Speech Course and Speech Communication Course at the .10 level. Respondents gave a significantly more favorable rating to the term Speech Course than to the term Speech Communication Course. No significant difference was found on the evaluative scales between the Speech Communication Course and Communication Course concepts. A significantly more favorable response
was made to the concept Speech Course than to the concept Communication Course on the evaluative dimension at the .10 level of significance.

Table 7 (below) shows the analyses between concepts on the potency factor.

**TABLE 7**

**ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE BETWEEN CONCEPTS ON POTENCY SCALES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Concept Comparison: Speech Course ↔ Speech Communication Course</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>.6944</td>
<td>.2070</td>
<td>nsd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within</td>
<td>34</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.3546</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>35</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Concept Comparison: Speech Communication Course ↔ Communication Course</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>11.111</td>
<td>3.1511</td>
<td>.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within</td>
<td>34</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.5261</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>35</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Concept Comparison: Speech Course ↔ Communication Course</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between</td>
<td>6.2500</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.9911</td>
<td>nsd</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within</td>
<td>3.1389</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

On the potency factor, no significant difference was found between the concepts, Speech Course and Speech Communication Course, and between Speech Course and Communication Course. Significant difference was found between the concepts Speech Communication Course and Communication Course at the .10 level.
Table 8 (following) indicates the results of the one way analyses carried out between each of the three concepts. No significant difference was found between any of the three concepts on the activity factor.

**TABLE 8**

**ANALYSES OF VARIANCE BETWEEN CONCEPTS ON ACTIVITY SCALES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Concept Comparison:</th>
<th>Speech Course</th>
<th>Speech Communication Course</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Source</td>
<td>df</td>
<td>MS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12.2500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>7.5703</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>35</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Concept Comparison:</th>
<th>Speech Communication Course</th>
<th>Communication Course</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Source</td>
<td>df</td>
<td>MS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.4444</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>5.6634</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>35</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Concept Comparison:</th>
<th>Speech Course</th>
<th>Communication Course</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Source</td>
<td>df</td>
<td>MS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8.0278</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>5.2565</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>35</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary**

The results above indicate a slight but not significantly more favorable response for the concept **Speech Course** (2.53) in comparison with the concepts **Speech Communication Course** (2.81), and **Communication Course** (2.76) on the scores of the respondents across all scales. Significance was found on the evaluative factor with the respondents indicating a more favorable attitude toward the concept **Speech Course** than
toward either the concept *Speech Communication Course* or the concept *Communication Course*, but no significant difference was found between the latter two concepts. On the potency factor, a significant difference was found between the concepts *Communication Course* and *Speech Communication Course*, with the responses favoring the former over the latter. No other significant difference was found on the potency or activity factors. The above data, while not significant across all concepts or all factors, would tend to indicate that the respondents assign a more favorable meaning to the concept *Speech Course* than to the concepts *Speech Communication Course*, or *Communication Course*, and if the assumptions suggested at the beginning of this section are valid, then the "set" or frame of reference from which they are responding is that of a conservative approach to the area of speech communication and homiletics. This may be accounted for by the relationship which was found between homiletics and rhetorical theory (Aristotelian and modifications thereof). Winegarden found the strongest connection between homiletics and the rhetorical approach to oratory when compared to eight other oratorical approaches (Winegarden:187,279). This study was a comparison of the leading homiletics texts with the various oratorical approaches. It would seem that this would be a factor then in the responses to the concepts since many of the
same textbooks in homiletics were in use in the group of colleges that were the subject in this survey.
CHAPTER IV

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Summary

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to investigate the current status of speech communication and homiletics education in the Bible colleges of the Churches of Christ and Christian Churches in the United States and Canada, as listed in A Directory of the Ministry of Christian Churches and Churches of Christ, 1969. The survey reported in this study attempted to answer the general question, "What training do these colleges offer the student in the field of speech communication and homiletics? The survey sought answers to the following specific questions:

(1) What courses are offered in speech communication and homiletics in the current curriculum of the colleges?
(2) What courses are required, and how do the requirements vary for the different major areas of study?
(3) What is the nature, extent and focus of the speech communication and homiletics program in the colleges?
(4) What are the anticipated changes in the program?
(5) What meaning will the respondents assign to the concepts Speech Course, Speech Communication Course and Communication Course as measured
by the semantic differential?

Importance of the Study

The professional and popular religious journals of the recent past have expressed concern over the communication tasks of the church and its workers and the need for improvements in speech communication education in the colleges and seminaries. This study was made in an attempt to evaluate the status of the speech communication and homiletics curriculum of the Bible colleges of the Churches of Christ and Christian Churches. The information provided by this study should be of value to three distinct groups. (1) Academic deans and administrators engaged in planning to meet the curriculum needs of the 1970s and beyond, (2) speech communication and homiletics faculty members and, (3) students of speech communication and homiletics.

Methods

The method employed for the collection of the data was a twenty-two item questionnaire with an attached semantic differential instrument for three concepts measured over twenty-one bipolar scales. This was mailed to the academic deans of the thirty-one Bible colleges listed in A Directory of the Ministry of Christian Churches and Churches of Christ, 1969. Several copies were enclosed with instructions for the deans to complete the questionnaire themselves and/or have their speech and/or homiletics instructors complete the
form. It was hoped that at least one fully completed response would be received from each of the colleges. Follow-up procedures were used to increase this possibility. These procedures were outlined previously in detail.

The data was analyzed and reported in the chapter on results in three sections: I. Information on teachers; II. Information on courses, plans, objectives, and requirements, textbooks, and Trends in speech communication and homiletics education since 1960, and the anticipated developments over the next ten years; III. Meaning assigned to the terms Speech Course, Speech Communication Course, and Communication Course as measured by the semantic differential.

Results

The results were tabulated as mentioned above. It was found that there were thirty-seven instructors teaching speech communication courses in the twenty-two colleges that replied. Eight of these were full time instructors, while twenty-nine were listed as part time teachers. The speech communication instructors were also responsible for courses in other areas, teaching a total of thirty-five sections in twenty-one courses. Homiletics instructors numbered twelve teaching full time and nineteen on a part time basis for a total of thirty-one. Homiletics instructors were teaching forty sections in nineteen other courses.

The first research question posed was, "What courses are offered in speech communication and homiletics in the
current curriculum of the colleges?" Detailed information in response to this question was reported in Chapter III. Below is a general summary of these findings.

In relation to the courses currently offered by these colleges it was found that a total of eighty-six courses were being taught in the speech communication area under nineteen different course titles, resulting in a mean offering of nearly four courses (3.9). The number of courses offered by an individual college ranged from one to ten. One college offered ten courses, one offered nine, one offered eight courses, six courses were offered by three different colleges, two colleges offered three courses, one school offered two courses, and one college offered only one course in the area of speech communication.

In the area of homiletics it was found that the twenty-two colleges responding offered a total of fifty-eight courses under eight course titles, yielding a mean offering of almost three (2.6) courses per college.

The second research question was, "What courses are required, and how do the requirements vary for different major areas of study?"

It was found that the twenty-two colleges were requiring forty-eight courses (classes) for one or more major areas under eleven different course titles in speech communication. Requirements for homiletics were similar with forty-two courses (classes) being required under five
titles. Table 9 (below) summarizes the hours required.
Differences in course requirements for the various majors are found in the third chapter.

**TABLE 9**

**SUMMARY OF THE NUMBER OF HOURS REQUIRED FOR COURSES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Title</th>
<th>Total N Offering</th>
<th>Total N Requiring</th>
<th>Total N Hrs. Required</th>
<th>Mean Hrs. Required</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Introductory Sp.</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>3.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advanced Pub.Sp.</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arg. &amp; Debate</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>(2.00)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hist. of Pub. Ad.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhetorical Theo.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voice Training</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oral Interpre.</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intro. to Broad.</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Process of Comm.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonverbal Comm.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Seman.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Survey Ling.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cross Cul. Comm.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural Anthro.</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disc. &amp; Sm. Grp.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sociodrama</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inter. &amp; Coun.</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Relations</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>(2.00)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persuasion</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2 (2)</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intro. Homiletics</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>3.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adv. Homiletics</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>3.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prep.&amp;Del. Serm.</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>3.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biblical Preach.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expository Preach.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hist. of Preach.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spec.Forms Min.Ad.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planned Preaching</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>(3.00)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1Indicates Elective
The third question was, "What is the nature, extent and focus of the speech communication and homiletics programs in the colleges?" An analysis of the data revealed that the present programs in the field of speech communication appeared to concentrate upon courses that might be called "tool" courses which were more or less designed to be directly applicable to the task the students may be expected to be engaged in upon graduation from college. Thus, introductory speech and introductory homiletics were offered at nearly all of the schools since a high proportion of the graduates would be actively engaged in public speaking, preaching or the presentation of lessons from the Bible. These introductory courses were followed by advanced courses in the same areas with a higher proportion of the advanced courses being offered and required in homiletics than in speech communication. Other courses offered by over 25 per cent of the colleges included: Voice Training, Oral Interpretation, Introduction to Broadcasting, Cultural Anthropology, and Interviewing and Counseling.

In addition to the courses currently offered in speech communication it was found that from one to three colleges were planning to offer the following courses: Advanced Public Speaking (1), Argumentation and Debate (1), Oral Interpretation (3), Voice Training (2), Process of Communication (1), Cross Cultural Communication (2), and
Cultural Anthropology (1).

The questionnaire sought answers to the question, "What are the anticipated changes in the program?", by means of questions on planning, trends observed over the past ten years and developments anticipated in the next ten years.

Responses to the items on planning and trends in speech communication indicated that expansion had taken place and/or was still under way in curriculum in the following course areas: (1) Performance oriented courses such as Advanced Public Speaking, Argumentation and Debate, Voice Training, Oral Interpretation, and Interviewing and Counseling; (2) Communication theory courses such as Rhetorical Theory, Process of Communication, General Semantics, Cross Cultural Communication, and Cultural Anthropology.

It was found that there was a gradually increasing awareness of communication theory during the decade of the 1960s. During the same period there was increased emphasis placed on the mass media and its use. There was an increase in the demand for teachers with better preparation, such as a major in speech communication, but the colleges were not always able to find persons with all the qualifications they desired, and the demand apparently still exceeded the supply. This period was also characterized by the increased
use in the classroom of the tape recorder, video recorder, and other electronic and audio-visual equipment as aids to instruction. More emphasis was placed on providing the opportunity for the student to engage in actual public speaking situations. The respondents anticipated that most of these trends would continue over the next ten years. It was anticipated that there would be a continuing and growing demand for training in speech communication within the colleges themselves plus a growing demand from the colleges for better qualified instructors of speech communication.

The trends in homiletics paralleled the trends noted above for speech communication and, in addition, the respondents noted an increasing emphasis on Biblical preaching (this was reflected both in courses added and in textbook titles). This emphasis was enhanced by stronger requirements in the homiletics field in a number of the reporting colleges, and with an emphasis on expository preaching. It was found that the respondents anticipated that the trend toward increased emphasis on Biblical preaching would continue through the decade of the 1970s. Others anticipated there would be a broadening of the course offerings in homiletics coupled with a growing use of electronic and audio-visual equipment in the classroom. It was anticipated that there would be even greater emphasis placed upon the use of the mass media in the coming decade, particularly as it
related to missionary evangelism. Other respondents anticipated more emphasis upon scientific studies related to homiletics and preaching and a more scholarly approach. This improvement in instruction was expected to result from improved teacher preparation. However, it seemed that the respondents did not anticipate this would be as rapid a development in the homiletics area as it would in the speech communication area. Respondents expected the use of an internship program of training to increase in the next decade.

The course objectives stated by the respondents in their replies indicated general agreement with what the course title would seem to indicate. For example, the stated objectives of Introductory Speech emphasized the basic research, speech composition, and delivery while the Advanced course included the same things but placed the emphasis more on the application of the techniques in the actual speaking situation. Class time spent in delivery reflected this in both the speech communication areas and in the homiletics areas in that more attention was given to delivery in the advanced courses than in the introductory courses (see Table 10, p. 121). The course objectives stated by the respondents tended to show agreement with both the trends indicated and the textbook titles for the course. For example, one of the trends noted under homiletics was an increasing emphasis on Biblical preaching. This was also
TABLE 10

SUMMARY OF TIME SPENT IN DELIVERY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Title</th>
<th>Less Than 1/3</th>
<th>1/3 to 1/2</th>
<th>1/2 to 2/3</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>PerCent</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>PerCent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intro. Speech</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adv. Pub. Sp.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arg. &amp; Deb.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voice Train.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oral Interp.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intro. to Bro.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proc. of Comm.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surv. of Ling.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cross Cul. Comm.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cult. Anth.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disc. &amp; Sm. Gp.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Int. &amp; Couns.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pub. Relations</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intro. to Hom.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adv. Homiletics</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prep. &amp; Del. Serm.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expository Pr.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History of Pr.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1This table contains all titles on which a response was received for this item.
stated as the objective of the courses by a number of the
respondents and books such as Charles Koller's, *Expository
Preaching Without Notes*, and Dwight Stevenson's, *In The
Biblical Preacher's Workshop*, bear this out (a complete
listing of the textbooks appears in Chapter three under
the individual course titles and further substantiates this
claim).

The textbooks in use in the area of speech communica-
tion, particularly in the introductory courses, were all
of fairly recent date or were revisions of older texts
that had thus been brought up-to-date. Textbooks on homi-
letics were, to a degree, less up-to-date in their original
authorship or revision by later editors. However, in the
particular areas such as Biblical and expository preaching
the textbooks in use were among the latest and best avail-
able.

The last research question was, "What meaning will
the respondents assign to the concepts Speech Course, Speech
Communication Course, and Communication Course, as measured
by the semantic differential?"

The meaning assigned to the concepts Speech Course,
Speech Communication Course, and Communication Course as
measured by the semantic differential, was found to be
within the moderately favorable semantic distance for all
three concepts with no significant difference between con-
cepts when scored across the entire semantic differential.
of twenty-one scales. The results indicated a significant difference at the .10 level, between the concepts Speech Course and Speech Communication Course, and between the concepts Speech Course and Communication Course at the same level when measured over the evaluative scales alone. In both cases the respondents gave a significantly more favorable response toward the concept Speech Course. No significant difference was found to exist in meaning assigned between Speech Communication Course, and Communication Course on the evaluative factor. Significant difference at the .10 level was found to exist between the meanings assigned to the concepts Speech Communication Course and Communication Course on the potency factor with respondents indicating a significantly more favorable response for the term Speech Communication Course. No significant difference was found between the concepts Speech Course and Speech Communication Course, and the concepts Speech Course and Communication Course on the potency factor. No significant difference was found between any of the concepts on the activity factor. The strongest meaning assignment was found to be given to the concept Speech Course, on both the evaluative and activity factors. The other two concepts were found to be very close to one another of the scores on the evaluative and activity factors, falling near the mid-point of the moderately favorable position of the evaluative factor and high on the slightly favorable response area on the
activity factor. This would seem to indicate that as a group there is a preference for the concept Speech Course, over the concepts Speech Communication Course, and Communication Course, on the evaluative factor which according to Osgood is the strongest factor related to meaning assignment. On the potency factor it was found that Speech Communication Course, seemed to be preferred over the term Communication Course, but no significant difference existed between any of the other concepts on potency or activity.

Conclusions and Implications:

The basic purpose of the study has been fulfilled in that the basic question and its attendant sub-questions have been answered under the results section of this study. That is, "What training do these colleges currently offer the student in the field of speech communication and homiletics?" The size of the program in speech communication and homiletics did not appear to relate directly to the size of enrollment of the school. The school with the largest program ranked eleventh in enrollment, but it also has a full time instructor with excellent professional preparation and qualifications both in speech and homiletics. The largest of the four schools offering a total of over ten courses ranked fourth in size of enrollment. Therefore, it must be concluded that factors other than size alone are affecting the size and nature of the program of a given school. No definite
conclusions can be reached as a result of this study to determine fully the variation in the programs. It is suggested, however, that the following factors may be operating to cause this condition.

(1) It is possible that the best programs are found in the schools that have professors on their staff who have had a strong background in their own educational program in speech communication with either a major or minor in the area.

(2) The survey revealed that there was a shortage of teachers with both the religious and professional qualifications desired for the area of speech communication. This may account for the difference in the size of the programs and the quality of the programs of schools of comparable size.

(3) Most of the schools surveyed that have enrollments of over seventy full time students have a program with a total of six or more courses. However, with the schools having less than this enrollment with but one exception they all offer four courses or less in speech communication and homiletics; usually an introductory course in speech, an introductory course in homiletics and an advanced course in homiletics. Therefore, it
would seem that at a given point the size and financial capability of the school begins to exercise a strong limiting factor on the curriculum offered in speech communication and homiletics.

(4) A further conclusion is that the trend toward increased offerings to meet particular communication needs such as those missionaries, inner city church workers and urban church workers will continue to expand through the addition of courses from a variety of disciplines.

(5) Awareness of the need for the study of communication theory in connection with the study of homiletics will occur, but at a slower rate than in the speech communication area due to fewer instructors in the homiletics area with a knowledge or background in communications theories.

**Recommendations**

Courses in communication theory have been introduced in a number of the schools, particularly in the cultural and cross cultural areas since 1965. This growth has been accompanied by the introduction of courses in urban sociology, interviewing and counseling. Much of the other growth has also occurred in the speech communication field since that time. Hence, it is recommended that it would
probably be of value to do a follow-up study in five years to determine the outcome of the current developments and the direction that this and ensuing developments might take.

Academic deans and administrators and faculty responsible for curriculum planning ought to familiarize themselves with the trends in speech communication education as evidenced by the survey and the literature, and use these as the basis for evaluating their own programs as they make plans for the future. Increased effort ought to be placed on recruiting educationally and professionally qualified instructors in both speech communication and homiletics education in the Bible colleges. These instructors ought to be given more time (full time if possible) to devote to the area of speech communication and homiletics instruction if truly adequate programs are to be developed that will enable the student to cope with the communicative task he will have upon graduation and entrance into the area of religious service as preacher, missionary, Christian educator, etc.

It is recommended that the smaller schools investigate the possibilities of shared programs or shared professionally qualified instructors in the area of speech communication as a means of adding breadth and depth to existing programs which presently appear to be too limited in scope. Such an
approach might aid in overcoming the financial problems that would be involved in expanding present programs.

It is recommended that the present trend toward Biblical expository preaching be encouraged, but that it be supplemented either within the homiletics courses or in separate speech communication courses by studies on both modern rhetorical and communication theories and their application. It would seem particularly true of the area of persuasion among colleges whose task is stated as that of training men and women for the task of evangelizing the world in which they live.

Suggestions for Further Research

One outcome of the study that developed as the study progressed was that not all of the information was being discovered that might account for the variations in the nature and size of the programs in the various colleges surveyed. Additional questions might have added to the overall value of the study. The following might have helped to reveal this information and/or provide areas for additional research.

1. Perhaps the study should have included questions on the size of the student body, the total number of faculty members, and the financial capability of each school. This information might have given additional insight into the reasons for variations found to be existing in the size and
nature of the programs in speech communication and homiletics within these colleges.

2. Perhaps specific information should have been sought on the educational background of the instructors in speech communication and homiletics. It seems that variations in the educational background of the instructors may have been a variable affecting the programs, but this study failed to supply this information. However, the writer's personal knowledge of the situation in a number of the schools surveyed would tend to indicate that a definite relationship may exist between the educational background of the instructor and the nature and size of the program. In the future it might be advisable to investigate this area to determine, if possible, the degree of influence this has on the nature and size of the programs in speech communication and homiletics programs in the Bible colleges.

3. Perhaps a two-fold question should have been included in this study that was not a part of it, since responses to this question(s) might in some cases yield additional information and give a different impression as to the strengths and/or weaknesses of a given program in speech communication and/or homiletics studies at a given school.

"(a) Is the college now a liberal arts college or in the process of becoming a liberal arts college?"
Affirmative responses to such a question would tend to indicate that a broadening of the curriculum in the area of the arts and sciences was taking place. Such broadening of offerings is not as likely to occur at a comparable rate within the Bible college structure with its concentration on professional education for ministers and religious workers. A broadening of the liberal arts offerings of colleges due to shift in emphasis could result in increased offerings in speech communication, but whether this was actually occurring would have to be determined by additional sub-questions. If a definite trend exists here, it could have a profound influence in the future on speech communication education among these colleges. A follow-up study might be useful to determine the nature, size, and extent of this trend.

"(b) Does your college have or plan to enter a cooperative study program with a state or private college in your community to enable your students to have access to a broader range of subjects and/or a dual major program? If so, what courses are available in speech communication at the cooperating institution?"

Responses to this could indicate the availability of a much broader program than if the responses were based
only on what is available within the Bible college itself. While not a part of the questionnaire used in this study one school indicated that just such a program was in existence at their institution. It is believed that similar programs are now in existence or in the developmental stages in other schools. Further information is needed in this area since it would influence future developments in speech communication offerings available to the students of these colleges. Hence, this should be a part of any future study of speech communication in these colleges.

4. Under the trends reports appearing in the chapter on results it was noted that there seemed to be an increasing emphasis on theory courses in the area of speech communication and also a trend toward the general increase in the size of the programs. It seems that in order to determine whether these are continuing trends and developments, a follow-up study in five years would contribute to further understanding of the status of speech communication education and the direction it is developing at that time.
REFERENCES
LIST OF REFERENCES


APPENDIX
The task of educating young people for Christian service involves not only teaching them the facts of the gospel but also the development of the skills and understanding to communicate its message to others. For this reason I am undertaking a survey of the speech communication and homiletics studies of our Bible colleges. Hopefully when completed this will reveal the status of these studies within the colleges, the present day trends and projected plans for the future.

In order to conduct this survey in a comprehensive way I will be mailing each of the Bible colleges questionnaires on their current course offerings, future plans, etc., in the speech communication and homiletics areas. You will be receiving questionnaires from me in a short time. Several questionnaires will be enclosed so that those teaching these subject areas may each fill one out.

I would sincerely appreciate your cooperation in filling out the questionnaires. A self addressed, postage paid envelope accompanies each questionnaire. A prompt and complete return of all the questionnaires is vital to the overall success of the study. The results will be made available free of charge to all who desire them for the information or for curriculum planning.

May I count on your cooperation?

Sincerely yours,

Joe W. Kaiser, Graduate Student
Recently I wrote to you requesting your assistance in completing a survey about speech communication and homiletics education. Since I am a graduate of Lincoln Christian College and Seminary and have been actively involved in new church evangelism, I am particularly interested in the status of speech communication and homiletics education in our Bible colleges. Therefore I am sending this questionnaire to all the Bible colleges listed in the Directory of the Ministry of the Christian Churches and Churches of Christ, 1969, except those serving foreign language or ethnic groups. This questionnaire is designed to elicit answers to the question, "What is the present status of speech communication and homiletics curriculum in our Bible colleges and what are the foreseeable developments actually planned for the immediate future?" It is hoped that the answers to this questionnaire will be useful to the faculties and administrators of the Bible colleges responsible for course planning, and to students preparing to teach in the speech communication and homiletics areas.

I would appreciate it very much if you would distribute the enclosed questionnaires to members of your faculty teaching in the speech communication and homiletics fields, and have them complete the questionnaire, and/or complete a copy of the questionnaire yourself. It is designed so that it can be answered in a relatively short time, requiring only a simple check mark to answer most of the questions, or a numeral to indicate the number of credit hours. Will you please complete and return these at your earliest convenience.

The data will be used as a basis for a Master's thesis at the University of Montana. The results of the survey will be available to those returning the questionnaire upon request.

Thank you for your kind assistance with this study.

Sincerely yours,

Joe W. Kaiser,
Graduate Student
February 17, 1971

This letter is intended as a reminder concerning the questionnaire which I sent you on January 18, 1971. If you have just mailed the questionnaire, please accept my thanks. Perhaps, because of the demands of your administrative or teaching position, the previous letter arrived at an inopportune time. Therefore I am enclosing a second copy of the questionnaire for your convenience.

The questionnaire has been designed so that it can be completed in a relatively short time, many items requiring only a simple check mark to answer. At the present time I have approximately a fifty per cent return; I hope that this figure will increase so that the data can be more meaningful.

You may recall, that the questionnaire is designed to gain information on the present status of speech communication education and homiletics education in our Bible colleges, definite plans, and possible trends for the future in these areas. The data will be used as the basis of a Master's thesis at the University of Montana.

An abstract of the results of this survey will be available upon request to those returning the questionnaire.

Sincerely yours,

Joe W. Kaiser
Graduate Student
SPEECH COMMUNICATION AND HOMILETICS QUESTIONNAIRE

Name of School__________________________________________

Location of School________________________________________

Plan of operation
Semesters____
No. per year____

Quarters____
No. per year____

Faculty

Full time____ Part time____ Total____

Number teaching Speech Communication
Full Time____
Part Time____

Number teaching Homiletics
Full Time____
Part Time____

What other areas are taught by Speech Communication instructors?
____________________________________________________________________________________

What other areas are taught by Homiletics instructors?
____________________________________________________________________________________

Person completing form__________________________ Position________

Do you want a summary of my findings? Yes____ No____

* * * * * * *

INSTRUCTIONS:

Please place a check mark ( / ) after each item that applies to your undergraduate program. Leave blank if it does not apply. For ITEM 9, write in the author and title of the book if the course is now being offered or if you plan to offer it and textbook has been selected. Some answers require writing in class hours, others, your own evaluation or opinion. On any item that you feel the need for additional space for your answer, please turn the sheet over and continue your answer or use additional paper, noting the item number that you are responding to and the course(s) title(s).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COURSE TITLE OR SIMILAR TITLE</th>
<th>ITEMS</th>
<th>REQUIRED FOR MAJORS IN</th>
<th>CHANGES IN REQUIREMENT SINCE 1960</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>introductory speech</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advanced Public Speaking</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Argumentation and Debate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History of Public Address</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhetorical Theory</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voice Training</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>oral interpretation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introduction to Broadcasting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Process of Communication</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonverbal Communication</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Semantics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Survey of Linguistics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cross Cultural Communication</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural Anthropology</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussion and Small Group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sociodrama</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intervening and Counseling</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Relations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introduction to Homiletics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advanced Homiletics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preparation and Bell of Sermons</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>others</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTE: Write in course name required

HAVE YOU MADE CHANGES IN REQUIREMENTS INDICATED TO THE LEFT SINCE 1960?
(check yes or no, if yes write in change)

YES NO CHANGES MADE AND YEAR MADE
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COURSE TITLE OR SIMILAR TITLE</th>
<th>ITEM 16 CLASSROOM TIME</th>
<th>ITEM 17 TEXTBOOK USED</th>
<th>ITEM 18 OBJECTIVES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Class time spent in delivery of speeches, seminars or other oral)</td>
<td>(Check /) area that applies</td>
<td>WHAT DO YOU VIEW AS THE MAIN OBJECTIVE OF THE COURSE?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LESS THAN 1/3</td>
<td>1/3 TO 1/2</td>
<td>1/2 TO 2/3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTRODUCTORY SPEECH</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADVANCED PUBLIC SPEAKING</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARGUMENTATION AND DEBATE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HISTORY OF PUBLIC ADDRESS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RHETORICAL THEORY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VOICE TRAINING</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ORAL INTERPRETATION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTRODUCTION TO BROADCASTING</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROCESS OF COMMUNICATION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HONORIAL COMMUNICATION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GENERAL SEMANTICS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SURVEY OF LINGUISTICS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CROSS CULTURAL COMMUNICATION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CULTURAL ANTHROPOLOGY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DISCUSSION AND SMALL GROUP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOCIOGRAMMA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTERVIEWING AND COUNSELING</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PUBLIC RELATIONS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTRODUCTION TO HOMILETICS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADVANCED HOMILETICS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PREPARATION AND DEL. OF SEMINARS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTHERS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTE: Use reverse side for additional space for reply. Writing in course name.
19. What trends in speech communication education at the undergraduate Bible college level have you observed since 1960?

20. What trends in homiletics education at the undergraduate Bible college level have you observed since 1960?
ITEM

21. What developments in speech communication education at this level do you anticipate in the next ten years?

ITEM

22. What developments in homiletics education at this level do you anticipate in the next ten years?
INSTRUCTIONS: MEANING RATING SCALES

The purpose of this study is to measure the meanings of certain things to various people by having them judge them against a series of descriptive scales. In taking this test, please make your judgments on the basis of what these things mean to you. On each page of this booklet you will find one concept to be judged and beneath each a set of scales. You are to rate the concept on each of these scales in order.

Here is how you are to use these scales: If you feel that the concept at the top of the page is extremely related to one end of the scale, you should place your check mark as follows:


or

If you feel that the concept is quite closely related to one or the other end of the scale (but not extremely), you should place your check mark as follows:


A check mark in the position third from either end means slightly.

The direction toward which you check, of course, depends upon which of the two ends of the scale seem most characteristic of the thing you are judging.

If you consider the picture to be neutral on the scale, both sides of the scale equally associated with the concept, or if the scale is completely irrelevant, then you should place your check mark in the middle space.


IMPORTANT

1. Please place your mark between the dividers rather than on them.

This: :: X: :: Not This: :: : X:

2. Be sure you check every scale for every concept—do not omit any.

3. Never put more than one check mark on a single scale.

REMEMBER:

Your name and opinion will remain anonymous. All data will be treated CONFIDENTIALLY (Your name on this paper is merely to keep the papers from becoming lost.)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Bad</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kind</td>
<td>Cruel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ugly</td>
<td>Beautiful</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clean</td>
<td>Dirty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>False</td>
<td>True</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wise</td>
<td>Foolish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disreputable</td>
<td>Reputable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meaningful</td>
<td>Meaningless</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dissonant</td>
<td>Harmonious</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Important</td>
<td>Unimportant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Successful</td>
<td>Unsuccessful</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regressive</td>
<td>Progressive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>Negative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Light</td>
<td>Heavy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hard</td>
<td>Soft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feminine</td>
<td>Masculine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Severe</td>
<td>Lenient</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Active</td>
<td>Passive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slow</td>
<td>Fast</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excitable</td>
<td>Calm</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
BAD : __________ : ______ : Good
Kind : __________ : ______ : Cruel
Ugly : __________ : ______ : Beautiful
Dirty : __________ : ______ : Clean
False : __________ : ______ : True
Wise : __________ : ______ : Foolish
Reputable : __________ : ______ : Disreputable
Meaningful : __________ : ______ : Meaningless
High : __________ : ______ : Low
Harmonious : __________ : ______ : Dissonant
Important : __________ : ______ : Unimportant
Successful : __________ : ______ : Unsuccessful
Progressive : __________ : ______ : Regressive
Positive : __________ : ______ : Negative
Light : __________ : ______ : Heavy
Soft : __________ : ______ : Hard
Feminine : __________ : ______ : Masculine
Severe : __________ : ______ : Lenient
Passive : __________ : ______ : Active
Slow : __________ : ______ : Fast
Excitable : __________ : ______ : Calm
COMMUNICATION COURSE

Good : _______ _______ _______ _______ _______ _______ _______ _______ _______ _______ _______ Bad
Kind: _______ _______ _______ _______ _______ _______ _______ _______ _______ _______ _______ Cruel
Ugly : _______ _______ _______ _______ _______ _______ _______ _______ _______ _______ _______ Beautiful
Clean : _______ _______ _______ _______ _______ _______ _______ _______ _______ _______ _______ Dirty
False : _______ _______ _______ _______ _______ _______ _______ _______ _______ _______ _______ True
Wise : _______ _______ _______ _______ _______ _______ _______ _______ _______ _______ _______ Foolish
Disreputable : _______ _______ _______ _______ _______ _______ _______ _______ _______ _______ _______ Reputable
Meaningful : _______ _______ _______ _______ _______ _______ _______ _______ _______ _______ _______ Meaningless
High : _______ _______ _______ _______ _______ _______ _______ _______ _______ _______ _______ Low
Dissonant : _______ _______ _______ _______ _______ _______ _______ _______ _______ _______ _______ Harmonious
Important : _______ _______ _______ _______ _______ _______ _______ _______ _______ _______ _______ Unimportant
Successful : _______ _______ _______ _______ _______ _______ _______ _______ _______ _______ _______ Unsuccessful
Regressive : _______ _______ _______ _______ _______ _______ _______ _______ _______ _______ _______ Progressive
Positive : _______ _______ _______ _______ _______ _______ _______ _______ _______ _______ _______ Negative
Light : _______ _______ _______ _______ _______ _______ _______ _______ _______ _______ _______ Heavy
Hard : _______ _______ _______ _______ _______ _______ _______ _______ _______ _______ _______ Soft
Feminine : _______ _______ _______ _______ _______ _______ _______ _______ _______ _______ _______ Masculine
Severe : _______ _______ _______ _______ _______ _______ _______ _______ _______ _______ _______ Lenient
Active : _______ _______ _______ _______ _______ _______ _______ _______ _______ _______ _______ Passive
Slow : _______ _______ _______ _______ _______ _______ _______ _______ _______ _______ _______ Fast
Excitable : _______ _______ _______ _______ _______ _______ _______ _______ _______ _______ _______ Calm