TELECONFERENCING IN CONTINUING EDUCATION: AN ANALYSIS OF THE PRIMARY PRESENTER'S CHARACTERISTICS AS THEY AFFECT THE OVERALL QUALITY OF A PRESENTATION

JOYCE A. ELLIOTT NICHOLS

Bachelor of Science
Drake University
Des Moines, Iowa
1962

Master of Science
Oklahoma State University
Stillwater, Oklahoma
1980

Submitted to the Faculty of the
Graduate College of the
Oklahoma State University
in partial fulfillment of
the requirements for
the Degree of
DOCTOR OF EDUCATION
December, 1988

TELECONFERENCING IN CONTINUING EDUCATION: AN ANALYSIS OF THE PRIMARY PRESENTER'S CHARACTERISTICS AS THEY AFFECT THE OVERALL QUALITY OF A PRESENTATION

Thesis Approved:

Gary R. Brie
Thesis Advisor

Clyde B. Knight

Robert G. Nolen

R. E. Petty

Norman N. Durham
Dean of the Graduate College

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

My sincere appreciation to Dr. Garry Bice for his encouragement and advice throughout my graduate program. Many thanks also to Dr. Bruce Petty, Dr. Clyde Knight, and Dr. Bob Nolan for serving on my committee. Their support has been invaluable.

I also hope that this project will serve as a lifelong model for my son, Scott, from his mother, who took fourteen years to earn two advanced degrees after age 35.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Overview

Teleconferencing is a specific type of instructional television. As defined by Cowan (1984) and Olgren and Parker (1983), the purpose is to originate a live program and transmit to one or more groups where the audience has the opportunity to interact with the program. The broadest, most technologically acceptable form of videoconferencing today involves a full-color, full-motion video program transmitted live to a satellite. The satellite then retransmits the signal to sites in the United States or anywhere in the world by a broad beam. As the sites receive the program, they distribute it "live" to local audiences. Television shows are different from teleconferencing and interactive telecourses in that they traditionally do not allow the viewer to interact with the program. Teleconferences and interactive telecourses typically include one or more sections in the program for the viewer to call in on phone lines to ask questions, clarify information, and generally provide feedback. They also typically include a local component in which a local coordinator or teacher designs local segments to enhance the televised program. The sessions may include small group activities, case studies, role plays, or panels of local experts.

Chamberlain (1980) suggested that teleconferencing developed because the rapid growth in instructional television and the availability of satellite technology both happened during the mid-1960's. He gave examples of a few of the large universities and medical schools that participated in limited broadcasting during the

1950's, but for the most part, the cost and size of video equipment were beyond the limits for noncommercial users until the 1960's when smaller, less expensive equipment became available. Chamberlain (1980) noted the launching of the first communication satellite in 1965 as opening the possibility of communicating with one or more parties in full view and the launching of the first domestic satellite in 1974 as opening the way for instructional use.

Pinsel (1988), in a report for the American Association of Educational Service Agencies, described the current status of the larger educational broadcasters of interactive telecourses and staff development. He cited the National Technological University, the College of Arts and Sciences and the College of Education at Oklahoma State University, the University of California at Chico, the TI-IN Network, the National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA), and the National School Boards Association as leaders in the production of a variety of exemplary educational programming ranging from courses for high school and college credit to enrichment materials. Pinsel (1988) concluded that the technology is indeed in place, and the interest in producing and receiving quality programming exists.

As Moody (1980) observed, much of the programming in continuing education is not considered particularly innovative in style, form or technique, but that deficit is compensated by the audience usually starting out with a high motivation to learn. He discussed the expectations of students who have grown up with television and no longer find the medium unique or a novelty. He reasoned that as frequent television viewers, students know what television can be, and they expect a clear, well-organized presentation. They expect content relevant to their needs, and they expect it to be presented in an interesting manner. Cartwright (1986), Widner (1986), and Parker (1984) agreed and further commented that students expect all that they would have experienced in a face-to-face meeting plus added compensations such as cost savings, accessibility and convenience to

their time schedules.

Cowan (1984) and O'Bryan (1981) placed program content as the most important element for the teleconference producer who must find a way to appeal to that audience and capture their interest. Cowan (1984) and O'Bryan (1981) agreed that uninteresting, unclear or useless information will lose audience interest. However, they also stated that the component which makes the most immediate impact on viewers and captures their interest is the presenter.

Crow (1977), Gordon (1970), Shaeffer (1985), McMenamin (1974), Cowan (1980), Baird and Monson (1982), and Myers (1965) compared the characteristics of a television presenter to the regular classroom presenter. The consensus was that television completely rearranges the way a presenter is perceived and that those presenters who succeed at appearing on television either accidentally appear pleasing to the viewer, or they work at creating the image they want. Crow (1977), Gordon (1970), Shaeffer (1985), McMenamin (1974), Cowan (1980), Baird and Monson (1982), and Myers (1965) also agreed that certain characteristics enhance the speaker's camera presence, and their characteristics became the basis of their own evaluations of television presenters.

Once the presenter has been selected, Boudle (1983), Fahl (1985), and Baird and Monson (1982) recommended developing and enhancing the same characteristics in an individualized training program. Their three training programs take into consideration the presenter's past experience with television, the type and frequency of the presentations, and the presenter's familiarity with the technology.

Statement of the Problem

The problem is that although the technology for providing effective teleconferences and interactive telecourses is available, many programs are not viewed as being effective because the primary presenter was judged to be less than effective.

Need for the Study

The potential of teleconferencing in education cannot be assessed unless current conditions are evaluated. Rapid advancements in television technology make obsolescence a given in all aspects of the industry. In addition, the more viewers are exposed to the medium, the more their expectations are changed, and the more knowledgeable they become. Changing technology combined with changing viewer demands creates a need for continuing to improve the professional delivery of programs. Current programming and viewer attitudes toward it need to be assessed before determining the direction to be taken in the future.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to identify the characteristics of television presenters that a panel of experts perceived to be the most important for delivering high quality teleconferences in continuing education.

Research Questions

The information gathered to complete this study was controlled by two research questions:

1. What are the perceived characteristics of an effective television presenter?
2. What are the most important presentation characteristics?

Assumptions and Limitations

The following assumptions were necessary for the conduct of the study:

1. The effectiveness of a communicator is related to the way he/she is perceived by the recipient.

2. The expressed perceptions of a panel of experts are accurate measures of effectiveness.

Definitions

For the purpose of this study the terms (1) presenter characteristics, (2) perception and (3) high quality teleconference are defined as follows:

1. Presenter characteristics -- effective presenters are defined in two ways: (a) presenter activities, for example, communicative ability and organization and (b) presenter traits, for example, enthusiasm, friendliness, and composure. Presenter activities and presenter traits combine to make up the presenter characteristics referenced in the study.
2. Perception -- presenter characteristics are traits and activities of the presenter that are observable and discernible to the viewers over television. An individual's perception of the presenter depends not only upon his physical ability to perceive, but also upon his/her motivations, needs, values, and past experiences, which make that individual's perception, to a degree, unique.
3. High quality teleconferences -- teleconferences consist of the following three components: (1) the content or subject matter, (2) the presenters, and (3) production values. In a high quality teleconference, all three have been developed according to the highest standards. The content is well selected and of the utmost interest to the target audience. The presenter is able to convey the message in a positive, compelling, effective manner. The production values utilize camera angles, graphics, special

effects, set design, etc., with a subtle method that enhances and underscores the content of the program.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Brief History of Instructional Television

Development and Technology

Progress in the 21st Century, according to Cowan (1984), will be based in part on our ability to cope with what many have called the "Information Age." To show how the rate of information exchange increases annually, he reported that over 4 million electronic messages were sent in 1982, and that by 1992, the number of messages is expected to increase to over 21 billion.

Cowan (1984) and Pinsel (1988) agreed that instructional television by satellite, one of the types of electronic messages, has been increasingly valuable to business and education as an alternative to regular classroom instruction and training. In private business alone, Cowan (1984) observed that at the start of 1982, over 60 businesses and industries owned their own satellite networks. Pinsel (1988) cited several earlier studies to show the growing influence of television in education.

(a) In 1982-83, the Corporation for Public Broadcasting (CPB) reported that at least 53 percent of the school districts in the United States had access to cable television.

(b) In 1984, CPB reported that 1,464,000 (71 percent) of all teachers had television available to them for use in the classroom.

(c) In 1984, Quality Education Data, a school survey research company in Denver, reported that 64,528 school buildings had access to VCR equipment, and in 1986, they reported that 600 owned satellite receiving equipment (p. 6).

Cowan (1984 cited the market for satellite services at $146 million in 1981 and projected that by 1991, an expected $219 billion will be

spent annually on satellite services. Cowan (1984) and Pinsel (1988) concluded that "live" television by satellite has definitely made an impact in training rooms and classrooms and that it will continue to become more influential in the future.

Chamberlain (1980) traced the growth of instructional television as it developed according to Federal Communication Commission (FCC) guidelines. He reported that in 1934, the FCC was established with the task of setting aside nonprofit and noncommercial channels for educational use and that by 1938, five UHF channels were set aside for education. Even though, as Chamberlain (1980) observed, by 1948 at least eight colleges and universities were producing or airing ITV materials, in the late 1940's the FCC froze all action on station licenses to study the issue. In 1952, the freeze was lifted, and out of the resulting 1,053 television allocations, Chamberlain (1980) counted 242 channels that were reserved for noncommercial purposes. He credited KUHT in Houston as being the first non-commercial television station to go on the air, and by 1962, he said, seventy-four educational stations were broadcasting. Chamberlain (1980) saw the sanctions and validity given to instructional television by the FCC as important to its establishment and public acceptance.

Chamberlain (1980) also detailed several of the early experimental projects in ITV made possible by the Ford Foundation. One of the projects Chamberlain (1980) described was the Fund for Advancement of Education which supported classic television teaching and research projects. Another project, the Fund for Adult Education, supported the cause of public television and persuaded the FCC to reserve some ITV channels for public educational television. Chamberlain (1980) elaborated on two of the early experiments funded by the Ford Foundation. In the first experiment, the Midwest Program on Airborne Television Instruction (MPATI), a DC-6 aircraft broadcast on two channels while circling a four-mile area. Instruction was received within a 150-200 mile radius, reaching parts of six states.

The second experiment was Chicago Television College. As part of Chicago City Colleges, it offered courses leading to an associate of arts degree. Having begun in 1956, it is still in operation today despite low budgets and "talking head" productions. Chamberlain continued to discuss another Ford Foundation project, the Pennsylvania State University for on-campus closed circuit televised instruction. By 1966, twenty-eight courses had been produced for that project although enrollment had peaked at 20,000 in 1962 and was declining. The Ford Foundation funding for these early projects and experiments, according to Chamberlain (1980), gave instructional television its impetus in the early years. He called the Ford Foundation the "single most important source of funding for instructional television."

Chamberlain (1980) also recalled the early programs produced through partnerships between commercial networks and colleges and universities without a television station or closed circuit. He said that one of the partnerships resulted in WCBS-New York producing Sunrise Semester, a class in comparative literature, in 1957. Another partnership, he continued, with NBC in 1958, produced Continental Classroom "Atomic Age Physics" which was received by over 150 network stations across the country and over 300 institutions of higher education that offered the course during the first year. Chamberlain (1980) quoted NBC statistics showing that during the second year, an estimated 400,000 students viewed the physics course and 600,000 viewed a chemistry course. Chamberlain (1980) said that although Continental Classroom required heavy subsidies and was dropped within a few years, Sunrise Semester continues today. He viewed the popularity of both Continental Classroom and Sunrise Semester as an indication that the general public was ready to accept instructional material outside its traditional setting in a new electronic mode.

The mid-1960's were a turning point in educational television: as Wood and Wylie (1977) stated, "The early 1960's were the end of the era of the pioneers and trailblazers," and "1962-1966 were years of

regrouping and professional introspection" (p. 54). Even though, as Cowan (1984) suggested, television had "come a long way since the early days when performers had to compensate for poor quality cameras by wearing green makeup and purple lipstick in order to look natural" (p. 32), the early programs were not without problems. Cowan (1984) noted lack of courseware and lack of variety as plaguing the early shows. He said that in the interest of quick, low-cost productions, cameras were merely turned on instructors with students in classroom sets. As Gross (1966) observed, critics quickly pointed out that "the medium has displayed in public what had heretofore gone on behind too many closed classroom doors--uninspiring teaching" (p. 10).

Bunyan (1987) commented on the expense and poor technical quality of the early recorded productions because no effective way to record and replay the broadcasts existed. He said that everything was "live" or recorded on kinescope except for a few sophisticated studios that could afford the bulky and expensive two-inch quadruplex machines. (Kinescopes were produced by pointing a camera at the video monitor and recording the image on film.) Bunyan (1987) believed the introduction in the mid-1960's of the smaller, simpler, less expensive 3/4" helical-scan videotape recorder led to experimentation with small-format black-and-white recorded video productions in thousands of schools, government agencies and businesses. But, he added, out of that group of users, business and industry soon took the lead when they began adopting video recordings on a wide scale for in-house training programs.

Chamberlain (1980) also described the way education eventually moved into the business of producing their own programming. He observed that telecourses posed no threat to regular courses and that institutions utilizing network telecourses found they were not "competing with on-campus courses; the telecourses attracted a 'new' student--older, often full-or part-time employed, desiring convenient education. Thus telecourses have become an established device for

serving continuing education needs" (p. 26). But to Chamberlain (1980), the network courses also brought with them a new set of problems. He pointed to delays with the publishers as causing unpredictable enrollments because the schools could not get information about the courses in time to publish it in the college catalog. For that reason, he said, schools began getting into production themselves.

Chamberlain (1980) designated the era since around 1967 as a growth period for instructional television, moving from experimental to established. He listed the major accomplishments as including the following:

1. The establishment of the Corporation for Public Broadcasting in 1967, a national public broadcasting system for television.
2. The broadcast of several quality series to hundreds of institutions nationwide for continuing education.
3. The rapid growth in quality productions by several "telecourse" producers.
4. The development of successful systems for distributing and offering telecourses, often in the form of a cooperative between user stations and colleges, and the creation of consortia of colleges and universities. (p. 21-22)

Chamberlain (1980) believed that full videoconferencing grew from the initial experiments at AT&T in 1927 with the "picturephone," which transmitted visual material over telephone lines. He said that the concept was expanded when the first satellite television, broadcast over AT&T's Telstar, previewed satellite-delivered video for its stockholders in a special closed circuit broadcast from Andover, Maine, to Washington DC. That event, Chamberlain (1980) reflected, proved to the public that technically, one-way video transmission by satellite was possible.

Polcyn (1979) believed the major interest in using satellites for education began with the launching of the first International Telecommunications Satellite Consortium (INTELSAT) satellite in 1965. He explained further that in 1967, interest in satellites was renewed

with President Johnson's creation of the Task Force on Communications Policy which recommended investigating the use of communications satellites for domestic services. He said that the 1969 agreement between India and NASA to use the ATS-6 satellite for exploring the social benefits of communications satellites gained the involvement of several national education organizations. He credited the FCC request in 1970 for domestic satellite proposals with creating additional interest for educators: the request specifically asked the potential carriers to address educational services.

Cowan (1984) reviewed the eight applicants who responded to the request. In April, 1974, he reported, the first of those applicants' systems, Western Union's Westar I, was launched, opening the way for educational use.

Viewers and Viewing Habits

Not only has the technology changed, but, according to Moody (1980), viewers and viewing habits have changed over the last 25 years. He commented that watching television was not a daily activity in the 1950's, but by 1960 the number of sets in households had increased by 1200% to 53 million. He further characterized changing viewing habits as the following:

> A typical household by 1970 was using television five hours a day when the number of sets had increased to 88 million.
>
> By 1980 there were over 144 million television sets in this country, more sets than telephones or bathtubs.
>
> The average household in 1980 used television 6 1/2 hours per day.
>
> The heaviest viewing groups were women, Blacks, the elderly and children, especially boys age 4-7. By the time children entered school, most of them were averaging about 30 hours per week of television viewing (p. 4).

Proponents and opponents of television have contradictory points of view concerning the effects of television on the viewing audience.

Moody (1980) in Growing Up on Television: The TV Effects spoke out against the use of television:

> We now have evidence that habitual viewing can affect a young person's basic outlook and sensibilities, predisposition to violence and hyperactivity, IQ, reading ability, imagination, play, language patterns, critical thinking, self-image, perception of others and values in general. Further, habitual TV viewing can affect the physical self as it can alter brain waves, reduce critical eye movements, immobilize the hands and body and undermine nutrition and eating habits (p. 6-7).

Schneider (1987) disagreed. He spoke as a member of a television advertising firm that handled Barbie doll, Kool-Aid, Burger Chef, Post Cereals, Hersheys, and various gum, candy, beverage and toy accounts. He also helped develop the Nickelodeon cable network for kids. He argued that objections to television have remained stable over the last 20 years and that people are just not as enthusiastic about television as they were 20 years ago. He further stated:

> With so much information coming at children from all directions it is increasingly difficult for young people to sort things out and make value judgements. Just because television has the capacity to educate and enrich children's lives, it cannot be faulted for failing to do so in all cases. Whatever decline television has experienced has been attributed to the changing television audience, which today is better educated. Education is a strong predictor of critical attitudes toward television (p. 82).

Whether Moody (1980) and Schneider (1987) agreed or disagreed on the effects of regular television viewing, they did agree that today's adults who cannot remember life without television are different people than those who, 25 years ago, grew up in a print-oriented society.

Effectiveness of Instructional Television

Pinsel (1988) quoted the following illustration from "A Time for Results":

> When you go to the hardware store to buy a drill, you do not actually want a drill. Instead you want a hole. They don't sell holes at the hardware store, but they do sell

> drills which are the technology to create holes. We should focus our energy not on the tool itself, but upon the usefulness of the tool in satisfying unmet needs. We should identify the range of unmet educational needs with which we have had to live and, within the range of technological tools, examine the new possibilities that current technologies might offer in meeting those needs (p. 10-11).

Carlisle (1974) pointed out that television, in attempting to function as a tool in satisfying an unmet need for effective instruction, has been accused of merely being a poor imitation of regular classroom teaching. He cited Stephen White, Vice-President of the Alfred P. Sloan Foundation, who wrote in 1973, "for the most part, educational television up to now has devoted itself to doing not what television does best but what the teacher does best: It presides over the class and lectures" (p. 124). Carlisle (1974) also noted the New York State Legislative Commission on Expenditure Review Report in 1973 which stated that television "has not significantly altered the traditional teacher-textbook instructional techniques" (p. 22).

Carlisle (1974) disagreed with White and the New York report, describing the differences between the early experimental telecourses and the trends at that time in televised instruction: (1) No longer did television programs just broadcast another version of the professor's standard lecture. Sophisticated design techniques were being developed. The "talking head" had not been banished, but it had become a partner with illustrative inserts. (2) No longer was television the only instructional component. The student had more chances to interact with the teacher. The components had more variety--mail-in essays, self-quizzes, records, audio and video cassettes, textbooks, computerized feedback, home lab kits, etc. (3) No longer were television courses suitable only for the local market. (4) Lastly, no longer were television courses nickel-and-dime productions. A typical series cost from $400-$700,000. To cover these costs, more consortia were being formed to share in the production and accompanying materials. Carlisle (1980) believed that

the course design, program format, interactivity, content and support materials had improved and that those were key elements to the overall quality of the programming.

Despite the differing opinions about its similarity to regular classroom instruction, televised instruction does continue to survive. Cartwright (1980) suggested the reason: video is inherently interesting, a visual medium, and it holds our attention with color, motion and sound. Others have done a more detailed analysis of television's effectiveness from both the educator's point of view and the student's point of view.

Carlisle (1974) included White's list of the strengths of televised instruction from the educator's point of view:

1. its ability to bring a slice of the real world into the living room and the classroom almost instantaneously,
2. the power of television to motivate which exists beyond a shadow of a doubt,
3. the capability to teach students at the moment when they are most interested in learning, and
4. the capacity to link the abstract removed world in the institution of higher education with the real world in which the education is supposed to interact (p. 124).

Cartwright (1986), Wider (1986) and Parker (1984) believed that instructional television also saves time for both students and teachers. Cartwright (1986) stated that with the compressed format of television, it is possible for the instructor to save up to 75% of the time it would take to deliver the same material in a traditional lecture. For this reason, he said, the students in training sessions are not off the job for long periods while receiving instruction; furthermore, instructors who are also not tied up in the classroom can be developing more programs, allowing for more information to be delivered to the student. Widner (1986) observed that time is also a factor in getting the message to people who need to know; the immediacy of television can accomplish that in addition to getting a few key people into a group via satellite on short notice. Parker

(1984) figured that the instructor who could previously teach 20 students in the classroom could teach 40, 60 or more by satellite.

Cartwright (1986), Widner (1986) and Parker (1984) also agreed that instructional television saves money. Widner (1986) calculated the cost of a typical video teleconference at Private Satellite Network, New York, at $60 to $80 per site per meeting--about the cost of a telephone conference call. Cartwright (1986) cited the example of the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) which disseminates emergency procedure information: using an affiliate network, agency training for 60,000 people costs less than $2.00 per person per program. Parker (1984) said teleconferencing is a way to reduce the nearly $9 billion United States corporations spend each year for air fare, lodging and meals.

Cartwright (1986) and Lipson (1977) discussed the convenience and consistency of televised instruction. In Cartwright's (1986) opinion, the viewer is seldom ready to receive the information when a trainer is ready to give it, but with video, instructors do not have to be present to deliver the information because the program is recorded, actually allowing for training 24 hours a day. He also indicated the consistency of delivery in television. All viewers receive the same information in the same style of delivery which is especially important in relaying attitudes or philosophy in a company. Lipson (1977) studied the consistency of pace in distance learning. In his research, students had a higher completion rate in courses with television (65%) as opposed to courses without television (25%). He concluded that television acted as a pacer and motivated students to keep up with the work.

From the student's point of view, television is an effective form of instruction for many of the same reasons. Hansell, Green and Erbring (1982) reported on a study conducted by Satellite Business Systems, McLean, Virginia, in which ten Fortune 100 companies were surveyed. The companies they used represented most segments of

industry from aerospace to financial services to consumer goods; their video systems ranged from simple to complex; their videoconferences were mostly discussions with a lot of interaction. Hansell, et.al. reported that what the students "liked most" were the time and cost savings, accessibility, and convenience; what the students "liked least" were the impediments to communication including the perception of distance, lack of eye contact, poor graphics, and technical difficulties. With the overall videoconferencing experience, the survey found that 89% of the students were "satisfied" or "very satisfied."

Again, from the student's point of view, Sherman (1982) supervised an in-house study in 1980 at AT&T/BTL. The purpose was to study teleconferencing usage. Sherman (1982) reported that students felt their attention wandered less easily than in face-to-face meetings and that they felt freer to say what they thought and less constrained by a physical presence. Sherman (1982) concluded that students needed to feel in control of their own lives and that teleconferencing gave them that feeling.

Steinke and Griffin (1982) conducted a study at Waubonsee Community College, 40 miles west of Chicago, which enrolled about 1250 students in televised instruction annually. They drew the following conclusions:

1. The students responded very positively about recommending the telecourse program to others, and a very large majority (70%) indicated they would enroll again in a telecourse.

2. Half of the students indicated preferences for telecourses in either psychology (31%) or science (19%) with other subject-area preferences evenly distributed in the 8% to 12% range.

3. There were no definite days of the week nor times of the day for which the students expressed a clear viewing preference. Their preferences were fairly well spread over the entire week and throughout the day.

4. The great majority of students (79%) felt that the telecourse in which they were enrolled required as much or more outside reading than a comparable classroom course. A substantial majority (63%) felt a telecourse was equal

to, or more difficult than a similar classroom course in subject content difficulty.

5. There seemed to be a strong indication that, when students contacted them, the instructors were meeting student needs. Only a very small number of students (7%) were unable to contact the instructor and/or felt the instructor was not helpful.

6. A substantial majority of students (67%) favored test review sessions, and slightly fewer (57%) favored an organized orientation session. Only a small percentage (5%) did not favor either organized reviews or orientation (p. 49).

The general consensus, then, from Carlisle (1974), Cartwright (1986), Widner (1986), Parker (1984), Sherman (1982), Hansel, et.al. (1982), and Steinke and Griffin (1982) was that televised instruction saved time, saved money, was consistent, convenient, and despite its continued similarity to regular classroom instruction, was generally effective for both instructors and students. If students did have objections, they centered around the production values and the presenter.

Production Values

Carlisle (1974), producer of the series Rise of the American Nation, related the following incident:

> The college history teacher, converted for a summer into a television lecturer, had sidled back and forth for almost an hour in front of the grass cloth-wallpapered set. The 63rd program in his 76-hour American History series was being tape-recorded. His subject: "The Lost Generation: 1914-1930." Periodically, the director's second camera bore down on art cards of Billy Sunday flaying the Devil, Al Capone fishing. . . and a series of period authors- Dos Passos, Millay, Cummings, Hemingway, Fitzgerald. A one-minute film clip captured H.L. Mencken and George Jean Nathan together, and then, after the lecturer's wind-up, the cameras went to work on a 1020's cameo. One cameraman defocused on a wall picture of Fitzgerald. The other began playing over the hallmarks of the Twenties, as "Honky Tonk Blues" filtered out from a gramophone horn. . . . these, merged with a voice-over reading by the teacher brought the program to a close . . . This was college credit course TV, vintage 1963. Except for the style of the teacher in the flesh ("most popular lecturer on campus, except for the 28 artcard-mounted illustrations and two bits of film, except for the lazy swing of the camera lens through the cliches of the Twenties, it could have been done on radio, scratchy recorded voice of Billy Sunday and all.

> . . . there are those who fondly call it "radio with pictures" (p. 21-22).

In the same way that technology, the viewer and programming have changed, so have production values. According to Cowan (1984), "We expect a certain level of production quality whenever we sit down in front of a television" (p. 192). He commented that we are so accustomed to sophisticated production, when we see programs of lesser production value, regardless of interest, we tend to initially discount the program as less than professional.

O'Bryan (1981) agreed, but he did not believe that production values were the most important component in producing good instructional television.

> Research done over the years suggests that if you have content that is sufficiently compelling, you don't need much in the way of production values. The first most important and most effective way to get the attention of your audience is to have something they are interested in to talk about and to talk about it in the most positive possible way (p. 35-36).

Both O'Bryan (1981) and Cowan (1984) agreed that production values can be used to capture the viewer's interest. However, Cowan did state that he found "the greater the viewer interest in content, the less important the production value" (p. 192). O'Bryan went even further to add, "You can ruin a good program by too-clever camera work, too-sleek special effects and general mucking around. If you make the production values too compelling, nobody will pay attention to the content" (p. 36).

The Role of the Television Presenter

Cowan (1984) viewed the role of the television presenter as a facilitator, guiding discussions, rather than the all-knowing expert, disseminating information. He stated that teleconferencing should be a "discovery of knowledge in a group setting." The television

presenter should help the students internalize, integrate and apply information.

Boudle (1983) elaborated further:

> The skilled teleconference moderator combines his/her planning, leadership and presentation ability with interpersonal skills which both motivate and enhance interaction. Active listening is critical to the teleconferencing process as is the ability to ask key questions or bring forward key points within the discussion. Managing information flow must be handled in such a manner as to elicit response from remote site participants, maintain and reinforce interaction, and encourage/motivate each participant to contribute to the fullest extent possible. Thus, the leader in a teleconferencing situation plays a key role in assuring that desirable outcomes are reached (p. 318).

O'Bryan placed even more emphasis on the role of the television presenter:

> The second major element in a production is the talent. . Certain people have the ability to deliver messages that would not be acceptable if delivered by anybody else. Massive amounts of research tell us that if you don't have a compelling message to deliver, get compelling people to deliver it in a compelling manner (p. 35-36).

The positive relationship of the television presenter's effectiveness to the success of a teleconference was verified in an unpublished 1987 in-house study of viewer reactions to teleconference components conducted by Joyce Nichols at the National University Teleconference Network (NUTN), Oklahoma State University. For the study, she used the thirty-five teleconferences presented through the network during the two-year period between 1985 and 1987. Using the evaluation sheets that had been completed and returned at the time of the telecast, she analyzed the teleconferences for the type of format and supplementary materials used, the amount of interaction, the presenter, the participants' overall ratings and the coordinators' overall ratings. Each area had been rated on a scale of 1 (the lowest) to 5 (the highest). Nichols (1987) reported the following result: the format, materials and interactivity could be rated high or low in any combination, but the rating for the presenter most

closely correlated to the overall ratings of the participants and coordinators. (The ratings of the two groups were always about the same.)

Using the Nichols (1987) information, the results can be further explained. For example, in one of the NUTN programs, the materials were rated 1.00, the interactivity 2.50 and the format 4.00. The presenters were all rated 3.50, and the overall ratings were 3.50 even though the materials were extremely poor, the interactivity average and the format superior. In another NUTN example, the materials were rated 1.33, the interactivity 1.00, and the format 1.00. The presenters were rated 3.35, and the overall rating was 2.67 although from all other signs, the program was far below standards. In a third NUTN program, for example, quality materials were rated at 4.44, the interactivity at 2.84 and the format at 3.36. The presenter was rated at 3.71 and the overall evaluations were 3.65 and 3.55 despite superior materials and below average interactivity. This pattern continued throughout the study. Nichols (1987) concluded that the presenter's rating has the most direct influence on the overall rating of a teleconference.

Characteristics of the Television Presenter

Many suggestions have been given as to what type of person should be selected for the television presenter. Crow (1977) listed eight traits that the television teacher should possess:

1. thorough knowledge of subject,
2. classroom teaching experience,
3. ability to communicate,
4. creativity,
5. well-organized,
6. ability to work with others and take criticism,
7. sense of humor, and
8. ability to improvise (p. 21).

Gordon (1970) added another characteristic, that of an awareness of the audio and visual materials which may enhance the quality of the lesson.

A study by Shaeffer (1985) looked at the television instructor from a student's point of view. He said that students were most satisfied when the instructor "enunciated clearly, encouraged discussion of practical application of content, related the subject matter to student background, made transitions clear between topics, moved the class at a lively pace, reviewed important points, encouraged interaction, was approachable, and praised students" (p. 221). The study did not indicate that these teaching behaviors are only successful in television teaching. If the same behavior had been used in face-to-face teaching, would the ratings of student satisfaction have been similar? If these characteristics have as much application to regular classroom teaching, does success in the classroom indicate potential success on television?

A study by McMenamin (1974) found that successful classroom teachers do not necessarily make successful television teachers. He said that the medium itself changed the viewer's perception of the presenter in that the "audience sees a television personality differently, not because he 'performs' for the cameras, not because his delivery is different, but basically because he is presented in a different form" (p. 51). In his study to test the effect of instructional television on the viewer's perception of the presenter, a single instructor was viewed while giving the same lecture "live" and on tape. The students rated the instructor on thirty characteristics. The ratings were compared to ratings the students had done previously on the "ideal" characteristics of a teacher. The results of the McMenamin (1974) study showed that the characteristic "poised" was a factor only in the face-to-face group. McMenamin (1974) concluded that the machine between the student and the teacher had filtered out that quality, perhaps because the student had no way to see it challenged. In other results, he found that the characteristic "empathetic" was a factor only in the television treatment, supporting Marshall McLuhan's theory that television

involves the viewer who fills in the gaps with his own experience and extends the image beyond the frame. He also found that even though the characteristics "forceful" and "enthusiastic" are highly visible characteristics, they were perceived less in the television presentation than in the face-to-face presentation. McMenamin (1974) concluded that television diminishes the most obvious aspects of an instructor's character traits and that the television teacher needs more force and enthusiasm to compensate for the television system.

Cowan (1980) emphasized the flexibility of the television presenter as being a way to determine the individual's adaptability to new situations and a new medium.

> The type of individual who performs well in the television environment needs to be flexible as the newer educational challenges emerge. Since the instructor cannot physically be in every location and demand attention, the electronic teacher needs to have more refined persuasive and group process skills than his or her classroom counterpart. An important psychological component for the electronic instructor is understanding that there is no "right" way to solve a problem; there are multiple solutions depending on environmental factors. An instructor who believes that his or her way is the correct way is not the type of instructor who will do well on television (p. 80).

Baird and Monson (1982) agreed that flexibility of the presenter is a key element, and they added a list of attitudes that deter flexibility and hinder the television instructor's success.

1. Fear of the unknown, fear of failure, and fear of loss of control or power,
2. Fear of the risk involved in giving up old habits both psychological and social,
3. Negative attitudes--which may be caused from lack of understanding of the medium, and
4. Resistance to change (p. 283).

Students in the Brown, Brown and Danielson (1975) study responded with higher test scores to an enthusiastic, friendly, self-assured and confident presenter. They reacted most negatively to bland, confusing presentations. The study also cited findings by

Coats and Smidchens (1966) indicating that audience recall can be a function of speaker dynamism. Brown, Brown, and Danielson (1975) concluded that "an upbeat presentation produces the most positive results, and it is better to risk an over-enthusiastic presentation than a neutral or noncommittal one" (p. 402).

In a study which began in 1962, Lawrence Myers (1968), Syracuse University, developed a television teacher rating instrument. The study asked students to rate teachers as they appeared in kinescope lectures. Taking into consideration the lack of direct teacher-student classroom interactions that are a result of using the media, he complied a list of adjectives describing television teacher behaviors into a semantic differential scale and pretested it on 618 students. Myers (1968) selected specifically only those adjectives that he thought reflected the television experience, where the only interactivity is in the mind of the student as he perceives himself in a classroom. His process identified ten specific television teacher traits: communicative ability, stimulation, control, assertiveness, composure, dynamism, friendliness, wit, profundity, and intimacy.

Selecting the Television Presenter

Hedrick, Maynard and Price (1977) also viewed the selection of an ITV presenter as one of the most important elements in a program's success when they found a significant relationship between the appeal of the television presenter, the attitudinal reactions of the learner, and achievement. However, they suggested that too often television presenters are selected by other than objective methods, and they referred to the "political pitfalls" that hinder objective decisions. Hedrick, Maynard and Price (1977) recommended using a "screen test" to determine the presenter's appeal and resulting effectiveness. The 3 1/2 minute presentations in their study were taped and viewed by a cross section of the potential target audience. The instrument they

used measured the presenter's ability to hold the interest of the audience.

The length of the 3 1/2 minute length of the "screen test" tape was confirmed by Zunin (1972) as being an adequate period of time to determine the appeal of the presenter. He had observed that we are accustomed to meeting people on a face-to-face basis and forming opinions about them in a 3-5 minute length of time. He referenced that phenomena to our culture which has developed a rule of social courtesy whereby when two people meet and neither wishes to be rude, the two will converse for an average of four minutes, the first socially acceptable "breaking-away" period. During the four-minute interval, he said, the two parties are deciding whether they will accept or reject the other person and whether they wish to continue or end the conversation. Zunin (1972) was aware that most people do not understand the ramifications of those first four minutes: they sense an importance, but they do not realize that contact is usually made or lost in that brief period.

Training the Television Presenter

Assuming that an individual with the characteristics of a successful television presenter can be identified, only a few organizations have recognized the necessity of providing training assistance to the inexperienced candidate to develop specific television presenting skills. Johansen, McNulty and McNeal (1978) contacted fifty systems producing instructional television, and although 80% of them recognized training for television teaching as a factor in success, most efforts toward training were limited to a users' manual. Baird and Monson (1982) cautioned that this is "not a spectator sport. It demands not only a favorable attitude towards this way of communicating, but actual skills-- a relearning of some of the communication behaviors that work well in a face-to-face setting but need to be adapted for this new environment" (p. 283). They

suggested that the presenters would be more successful if they understood what the advantages were for them, saw how it fit their purposes, and above all, experimented with the technology.

Boudle (1983) added that since full motion video teleconferencing most closely simulates the face-to-face presentation, he had also been questioned on the importance of training the presenters. Comments to him ranged from "No training is needed . . . Just walk in and conduct your meeting" to "Some training would be helpful to best learn how to integrate conventional meeting behavior with this electronic medium" (p. 320). Boudle saw training or "coaching" as absolutely essential, even for experienced presenters, because any distractions or hindrances to effective communication are so exaggerated on television:

> Video teleconferencing is "face-to-face television" where one's actions and inactions may be continually viewed by remote site participants. Symbolically, by dress and body language, participants are always communicating. Facial expressions, movements and the like enhance communication or distract depending on the circumstances. Coaching is a recommended approach to help new users communicate both efficiently and effectively and to help experienced users improve their communication skills when using video full motion systems (p. 321).

Fahl (1985) stated in "Training the Teletrainer-A Varied Approach" that "planning skills, presentation skills and familiarity with the equipment are needs common to all presenters" (p. 345). He divided television presenters into four categories: (1) the ad hoc presenter - a novice to education and television technology but required to deliver one to two hours of information infrequently, (2) the occasional instructor - a novice to television technology but required to develop and deliver a half-day to two-day workshop, (3) the professional course developer - a novice to television technology but seasoned in instructional design and required to develop training courses up to five days in length, and (4) the professional instructor - a novice to television technology but seasoned in course delivery and required to conduct training courses up to five days in length.

Fahl (1985) designed a different training program for each of the four groups. His ad hoc presenters are introduced to teletraining and its applications, planning and presentation skills, equipment, and support materials information. The equipment and visual uses are demonstrated, and a brochure is distributed as a checklist. His occasional instructors receive instructions for class preparation and management, equipment options, availability and operation of equipment, voice qualities and their use to establish credibility, fielding questions, selection and application of instructional aids, preparation, and attitude. They are also shown how to adapt visuals to television delivery. His professional course developers are given information on guidelines, checklists and job aids to include in the instructor guide on preparation and management of instructional television, adaptation and selection of instructional methods, formatting questions, the use of sensory and action predicates, nouns and adjectives as well as metaphors and analogies, adaptation and application of instructional aids and the operation and use of equipment. A practicum allows them to apply the techniques. The professional instructors, in addition to the practicum given to the professional course developers, learn about the comparison between face-to-face and television instructor competency behaviors, class preparation and management, equipment options and instruction, voice and language use, conversion of existing course content and instructional aids to television, techniques of asking and fielding questions, and variations for specific instructional methods. The content is delivered with a variety of guidelines, checklists, job aids, student-involved exercises and a workbook.

Boudle (1983) as a designer for Tele-Comfort Training Resource Management Consultants in Derry, New Hampshire, listed even more specifically the presentation skills included in his training course.

> Coaching teleconference users includes attention to the skills of verbal persuasion and presentation (i.e., controlling the rate, pitch, volume and inflection of verbal messages), promoting the ability to speak concisely

> and clearly, encouraging enthusiastic interaction, and minimizing the use of "non-words" such as ahs, ums, etc. Beyond skills in verbal communication, teleconference users can be coached to appear alert, responsive and in control of the communication process by developing a positive visual communication presence. The use of body language as it is seen and perceived in the video teleconferencing medium, eye contact with viewers and symbolic communications through appearance and gestures will enhance or destroy both the message and the image which is attempting to be communicated. Distracting mannerisms are not only exposed but are enhanced through the video teleconferencing medium. Therefore, it is advantageous to the presenter to recognize that such mannerisms exist in order that they can be avoided (p. 319).

The training programs of Fahl (1985), and Boudle (1983) confirm the opinions of Crow (1977), Shaeffer (1985), McMenamin (1974), Cowan (1980), Baird and Monson (1982) and Myers (1965) in that the presenter is either selected for or trained to have the same general presenter characteristics. The training programs also reinforce the ideas of McMenamin (1974) and Hedrick, et.al. (1977) that the television presenter's effectiveness can only be determined by watching the presentation on television, whether it is part of the selection or training process.

Summary

A review of the literature revealed that in instructional television, the technology, the viewers, their viewing habits, programming, and production values have all changed over a period of time, particularly in the last 25 years. It also revealed the importance of the television presenter to the effectiveness of a program and produced a list of presenter characteristics which contribute to the presenter's success. However, there is a void in the literature when it comes to identifying the characteristics of presenters that viewers currently perceive to be the most important for delivering high quality televised instruction.

CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

The purpose of this study was to identify the characteristics of television presenters that a panel of experts perceived to be the most important in delivering high quality teleconferences in continuing education. The information gathered to complete this study was controlled by two research questions: (1) What are the perceived characteristics of an effective television presenter, and (2) what are the most important presentation characteristics? This chapter will contain information on the method used in collecting and analyzing the data. The chapter is divided into the following sections: (1) type of research and data, (2) population and sample, (3) instrumentation, (4) data collection, and (5) analysis of the data.

Type of Research and Data

The type of research used in this study was descriptive. Gay (1976) discussed descriptive research:

> Descriptive research involves collecting data in order to test hypotheses or answer questions concerning the current status of the subject of the study. A descriptive study determines and reports the way things are. One common type of descriptive research involves assessing attitudes or opinions toward individuals, organizations, events or procedures. Descriptive data are typically collected through a questionnaire survey, an interview, or observation (p. 123).

The particular type of descriptive research in this study was survey research. The data were collected to determine the most important to least important characteristics of an effective television presenter. The survey assessed the current attitudes of a

panel of experts toward presenters after observing the first four minutes of his/her presentation on videotape. The nine-step bi-polar semantic differential scale in the survey was the same instrument used in a 1962-1968 study by Myers at Syracuse University (Appendix A). The scale produced interval data about each presenter, which, according to Linton and Gallo (1975), is a "numerical score that represents his performance or behavior."

Population and Sample

During June and July, 1987, an unpublished in-house study of viewer reactions to teleconference components was conducted by Joyce Nichols at the National University Teleconference Network (NUTN), Oklahoma State University. This study used evaluation sheets from participants and coordinators that were returned to NUTN after each of the teleconferences had been broadcast. Of the 168 presenters in 35 teleconferences marketed through NUTN between 1985 and 1987, seven presenters were selected based on the overall ratings they had received from observers of the teleconference. Of the sample, four of the presenters were selected for their extremely high ratings at the time of broadcast; one of the presenters was selected for the "average" rating received; two of the presenters were selected for their extremely low ratings. Since viewing a videotaped portion of the presentation was a necessary part of the evaluation process, availability of a taped copy of the program in some cases determined whether a presenter could be included in the sample.

Gay (1976) defined population as "the group to which a researcher would like the results of a study to be generalizable" and as having "at least one characteristic which differentiates it from other groups" (p. 80). The group to which the results were generalizable was adults who were characterized by two factors: (1) They were associated with continuing education either as students or instructors. (2) They had past experience with teleconferencing or

telecourses. The panel of experts used in this study had lifelong exposure to television, had past experience with managing, producing, presenting or coordinating teleconferences or telecourses, and were recognized experts in the field of teleconferencing and interactive telecourses. The number of panel members was set at 14 based on Gay's (1976) recommendation:

> Some authorities believe that 30 per group should be considered a minimum. However, considering the difficulty involved in securing subjects, and the number of studies that are reported with less than 15 in a group, requiring 30 seems to be a little on the idealistic side. Further, while we would not be super-confident about the results of a single study based on small samples, if a number of such studies obtained similar results, our confidence in the findings would generally be as high, if not higher, than for a single study based on very large samples (p. 77).

The panel of experts was selected with consideration given to the inclusion of four states considered to be leaders in instructional television production for their utilization of a statewide ETV network, organization at the state level and numbers of schools in their networks: Washington, Oklahoma, Missouri, and West Virginia. The panel members included state or national ETV network directors, ETV network program producer/directors, ETV network trainers for television presenters, university teleconference coordinators, and ETV television presenters. They were all recognized experts in the field of teleconferencing and telecourses by their associates and counterparts in other states and universities. They were all contacted as a result of their appearances at conferences as presenters on teleconferencing.

Instrumentation

To conduct the survey, the panel of experts was given a semantic differential attitude scale as an evaluation instrument. The reliability of the semantic differential scale to measure the meaning of a particular concept to a particular person was explored by Osgood

(1969) in 1962. In his study, 40 out of 1,000 items were randomly selected and repeated with a .85 reliability coefficient. In 1957, Osgood, Suci and Tannenbaum (1969) clarified the construction of the semantic differential scale. They said that the use of opposites was "natural" to the human species, that ethnolinguists supported the idea of semantic opposition being common to most language systems. They also explained the choice of adjectives for use in the scale as being no more than selecting the part of speech that has the most general and natural qualifiers in the English language. Osgood, Suci and Tannenbaum (1969) also had evidence for the validity of a semantic differential scale:

> The evidence shows that for individual subjects a shift of more than 1.00 to 1.50 scale units in factor score (depending on the particular factor) is probably significant. For group data ("cultural meanings"), changes of differences in measured meaning as small as one-half of a scale unit are significant at the 5 per cent level. These levels of reliability should be satisfactory for most applications of the instrument (p. 79).

The bi-polar adjectives used in this scale were those used in the Myers (1968) study at Syracuse University. Myers (1968) derived the adjectives on his semantic differential scale from a list of 18,000 adjectives, of which a large proportion might be applied in discussing teacher effectiveness. He combined and shortened the list to 25 adjectives which could be perceived independently of student-teacher interaction. In compiling the list, he took other adjectival teacher-rating scales into consideration as well as criteria used to select teachers at educational television facilities and the suggestions of television teachers themselves. His final list of positive adjectives were matched with what were believed to be adjectival opposites and presented in the form of semantic differential scales. He used over 2,300 students for evaluation which resulted in two instruments: (1) Of the total group, 618 students described an ideal teacher on the adjectival rating scale. A mean

score was determined for each characteristic, and the characteristics were ranked in order of importance. (2) The remaining students used the semantic differential scale to rate five selected professors in five different television teaching experiments. Myers (1968) used factor analytic procedures to identify ten recommended factors in eighteen adjectival opposites to be used in the assessment of television teacher traits--

A. communicative ability: clear [1], communicative [2], easy to take notes [3], and direct [4]; B. stimulation: stimulating [5] and interesting [6]; C. control: controlled [7]; D. assertiveness: assertive [8]; E. composure: poised [9] and relaxed [10]; F. dynamism: dynamic [11]; G. friendliness: friendly [12] and sincere [13]; H. wit: witty [14]; I. profundity: profound [15] and brilliant [16]; and J. intimacy: personal [17] and intimate [18]. In the second half of his study, Myers (1968) correlated major changes in student affective behavior to varying degrees of effective presentation to validate the study. He also used correlations between student post-lesson moods and teacher traits to validate the selection of the ten traits.

Data Collection

In addition to the eighteen semantic differential scales, the panel of experts for this study was given a videotape for evaluation. Seven presenters each appeared on the tape for four minutes. The segments selected for evaluation were the first four minutes each presenter appeared on camera. The order in which the presenters appeared on the tape was randomly selected. Between each presenter a graphic insert advised the panel members to "Stop the tape," followed by the number of the next presenter.

The evaluation procedure asked the panel members to provide a quick reaction to each of the presenters and rate each presenter's characteristics using the adjectival opposites on the series of nine-

step rating scales. If a set of opposing adjectives did not seem to apply to a particular presenter, the panel members were asked to check #5, the middle number (Appendix A).

The panel of experts was invited to participate in advance, and once they had given their consent, the videotapes, evaluation instruments, written instructions and return stamped envelopes were mailed to them within a week. The members were asked to have the forms completed within the week following their arrival and allowed to complete them at their own convenience. If a panel member did not have access to a videotape player, one was provided. Those who did not return the materials within ten days were reminded by phone or in person.

As the data were received, each panel member was assigned a number. That number was written beside each presenter's number on the evaluation sheets to be able to identify the source of each evaluation sheet if necessary at a later date. The sheets were then cut apart and filed in seven categories with all of the results together for each presenter.

Analysis of Data

The first procedure was to determine a mean score, using the panel of experts' ratings, for each presenter characteristic. As defined by Gay (1976) the mean is "calculated by adding up all of the scores and dividing that total by the number of scores." (p. 225).

The eighteen adjectival opposites were combined where necessary under the ten headings for presenter characteristics. Any multiple scores for a category were averaged to find the mean score for the category. (For example, "communicative ability" was composed of scores for the presenter's ability to be clear, communicative, easy to follow in note taking and direct. Those four scores on each panel member's evaluation were averaged to provide one score for each

presenter's "communicative ability.") A mean score on the overall effectiveness rating was also determined.

The scores for each category of presenter characteristics were then ranked, giving the order of importance each panel member had placed on the ten characteristics of each presenter during evaluation. Intra-rater reliability was established by computing Kendall's Coefficient of Concordance: W (Seigal, 1956). Next, the strength of association between the above average and below average presenters on each of the ten characteristics was determined. An arbitrary dividing line separating the above average and below average presenters was set by the researcher at 3.5 on a scale of 1 (the lowest) to 5 (the highest). Four of the presenters were above, and three of the presenters were below 3.5. A t-test was used to find whether a significant difference existed between the scores given to the presenters above and below average (Linton and Gallo, 1975). The mean scores for each of the ten categories for the four above average presenters were then determined in order to rank the ten characteristics.

Finally the overall effectiveness scores given to each of the presenters by the campus teleconference coordinators at the time of broadcast were correlated to the overall effectiveness scores of the panel of experts by using the Pearson r (Linton and Gallo, 1975). This determined the probability of the panel of experts forming the same opinion of the presenters' characteristics within the first four minutes of the presentation that the teleconference coordinators had formed after seeing the entire telecast.

CHAPTER IV

FINDINGS

The purpose of this study was to identify the characteristics of television presenters that a panel of experts perceived to be the most important in delivering high quality teleconferences in continuing education. This chapter will contain an analysis of the data gathered from the panel of experts. The chapter is divided into the following sections: (1) participants in the study, (2) reporting the data to research questions #1 and #2, and (3) summary of findings.

Participants in the Study

The participants in this study represented five states and a broad range of experience in producing, directing, administering and presenting instruction by television. Their positions within their organizations included the following:

2 State University teleconference coordinators with at least 5 years' experience in producing and coordinating teleconferences.

2 State University national teleconference network directors who founded the networks and continue to manager them.

2 State University teleconference network directors who manage the University networks.

2 State Department of Education distance learning/media administrators.

1 State University associate professor who has produced and participated in a number of teleconferences as both moderator and presenter.

1 Statewide educational television program producer/director/host.

1 Statewide educational television network director.

1 State University instructor who has taught twice weekly "live" instructional broadcasts by satellite for 3 years.

2 State University educational television trainers in television presenting for all persons who appear on the University networks.

All of the panel members are recognized as experts in the field by their associates and counterparts in other states and universities. They are frequently asked to present at conferences and workshops. It was through contacts with them at conferences where they were giving presentations on teleconferencing that the researcher became familiar with them and was able to enlist their assistance.

Reporting of the Data

The reporting of the information tabulated from the semantic differential scales is organized below according to the research questions in this study. References to mean scores and ranks are included throughout this chapter. All of the scores given by each member of the panel for each presenter are included in Appendix B. Tables indicating the ranks for those scores are shown in Appendix C.

Research Question #1:

What are the perceived characteristics of an effective television presenter?

Each of the 14 panel members scored 7 presenters on 18 semantic differential scales which represented 10 presenter's characteristics. Those scores are recorded in Appendix B. Using the raw scores from each panel member's evaluation sheet, the ten characteristics were ranked for each presenter according to the scores given by each panel

member. Those rankings appear in Appendix C. Each panelist's ranks were compared to every other panelist's ranks using Kendall's Coefficient of Concordance: W to determine intra-rater reliability. The formula used was the following:

$$W = \frac{s}{1/12\ k^2\ (N^3-N)}$$

where s = sum of squares of the observed deviations from the mean of Rj

k = number of sets of rankings, e.g., the number of judges

N = number of entities (objects or individuals) ranked

$1/12k^2(N^3-N)$ = maximum possible sum of the squared deviations, i.e., the sum s which would occur with perfect agreement among k rankings

W was computed to determine the degree of agreement among the panel members for each of the seven presenters and yielded the results in Table I.

TABLE I

KENDALL'S COEFFICIENT OF CONCORDANCE: W VALUES FOR FOURTEEN EXPERTS ON EACH OF SEVEN PRESENTERS

Presenter	W Value
1	.276
2	1.410
3	.353
4	.432
5	.478
6	.430
7	.516

The significance of W was tested by applying the formula for chi square: $x2 = k(N-1)W$. Referring to a chi square table at the .05 level, W is significant at a value of 22.36 (Linton and Gallo, 1975). The values shown in Table II were determined for each of the presenters.

The values all far exceed the level of significance at the .05 level. The agreement among the 14 members of the panel of experts is considerably higher than it would be by chance.

TABLE II

THE SIGNIFICANCE OF W FOR FOURTEEN EXPERTS ON EACH OF SEVEN PRESENTERS

Presenter	x2 Value
1	34.70
2	177.66
3	44.77
4	54.43
5	60.22
6	54.18
7	65.01

x2 c.v. p.05 = 22.36 df, 13

In addition to determining the degree of agreement among the panel members, the overall scores were compared to overall scores given by another group of experts. At the time of the broadcasts in which the seven presenters appeared, the university teleconference coordinators returned evaluation sheets covering a range of topics, including an assessment of the presenter. The evaluation form appears in Appendix D. On a scale of 1 (the lowest rating) to 5 (the highest

rating), each presenter was rated on overall effectiveness. (See question 4 p. 77, Appendix D.) A comparable question asking for the same type of information was given to the panel of experts. (See p. 59, Appendix A.) The scores given by the panel of experts and the scores given by the campus coordinators yielded the mean scores in Table III, indicating the overall effectiveness of the presenter.

Using Pearson product-moment coefficient (r), the two sets of scores were correlated to determine the relationship between them. The calculated r was r = .9099. At the .01 level, r is significant if the r obtained is greater than the r tabled, a value of .8745 (Linton and Gallo, 1975). The relationship of the panel of experts' scores and the teleconference coordinators' scores is significant beyond the .01 level.

TABLE III

MEAN OVERALL SCORES OF THE EXPERTS AND COORDINATORS FOR SEVEN PRESENTERS

Presenter	Mean Values	
	Experts	Coordinators
1	4.60	4.40
2	1.40	2.20
3	3.00	3.56
4	2.78	2.40
5	4.42	4.90
6	3.92	4.70
7	3.92	4.52

*Scores based on 5-point scale

Research Question #2

What are the most important presentation characteristics?

First the strength of association between the four above average and the three below average presenters was determined. An arbitrary

decision by the researcher divided the above average and below average presenters at a score of 3.5 for overall effectiveness on a scale of 1 (the lowest) to 5 (the highest). (The value of 3 on the scale was neutral.) The presenters whose mean scores were above 3.5 on the overall evfectiveness rating were considered above average. Those presenters whose scores fell below 3.5 were considered below average. A t-test was used to determine whether the mean scores for the two groups were significantly different on each personality characteristic. The t-test compared the actual mean difference observed with the difference expected by chance. The following formula was used:

$$t = \frac{\bar{X}_1 - \bar{X}_2}{\sqrt{\left(\frac{\left(\Sigma X_1^2 - \frac{(\Sigma X_1)^2}{n_1}\right) + \left(\Sigma X_2^2 - \frac{(\Sigma X_2)^2}{n_2}\right)}{(n_1 + n_2 - 2)}\right)\left(\frac{n_1 + n_2}{(n_1)(n_2)}\right)}}$$

Where x_1 = any score from Group 1

$\bar{x}_1$ = the mean of Group 1

n_1 = the number of subjects in Group 1

$\bar{x}_2$ = the mean of Group 2

n_2 = the number of subjects in Group 2

N = total number of subjects

The obtained t is evaluated with N-2 df using the table of critical values of the t distribution (Linton and Gallo, 1975). If the obtained t is greater than the tabled t, the difference between the two groups is significant. At the .05 level, t is significant if it is greater than 2.571. At the .01 level, t is significant if it is greater than 4.032. Table IV shows the levels of significance that were determined.

Five characteristics were significant at the .01 level: (2) Stimulation, (4) Assertiveness, (5) Composure, (6) Dynamism and (7) Friendliness. For each of the four above average presenters, the scores they received on the five characteristics that were significant

at .01 level were totaled. A mean score was calculated to determine the order of importance the panel of experts placed on the top five characteristics. The totals are shown in Table V.

TABLE IV

t-TEST LEVELS OF PROBABILITY COMPARING ABOVE AVERAGE AND BELOW AVERAGE

Characteristic	t-Value	Levels of Probability
1. Communicative ability	0.60	none
2. Stimulation	4.10	**
3. Control	3.25	*
4. Assertiveness	4.14	**
5. Composure	8.06	**
6. Dynamism	4.93	**
7. Friendliness	12.03	**
8. Wit	2.97	*
9. Profundity	3.90	*
10. Intimacy	2.89	*

*=p<.05 **=p<.01
t c.v.p.05=2.571 p.01=4.032

TABLE V

TOTAL SCORES AND MEAN SCORES FOR TOP FIVE CHARACTERISTICS

	Characteristics				
Presenter					
1	7.39	7.70	8.07	7.70	7.30
5	7.60	7.71	7.92	7.07	7.10
6	7.14	7.28	8.17	6.50	7.57
7	6.28	6.57	6.53	5.78	6.67
Totals:	28.41	29.26	30.69	27.05	28.64
Mean Scores:	7.10	7.30	7.60	6.70	7.16

*Scores based on a 9-point scale

That placed the top five characteristics in the following order:

1. Composure (poised, relaxed)
2. Assertiveness (assertive)
3. Friendliness (friendly, sincere)
4. Stimulation (stimulating, interesting)
5. Dynamism (dynamic)

The process was repeated as shown in Table VI with the remaining four characteristics that were significant at the .05 level: (3) Control, (8) Wit, (9) Profundity, and (10) Intimacy. The characteristic that showed no significant difference, (1) Communicative Ability, was placed at the end of the list.

That placed the remaining characteristics in the following order:

6. Control (controlled)
7. Intimacy (personal, intimate)
8. Profundity (profound, brilliant)
9. Wit (witty)
10. Communicative Ability (clear, communicative, easy to take notes, direct)

Finally, a comparison between the list of characteristics in order of importance according to the panel of experts was compared to the list of characteristics in order of importance according to the Myers (1968) study. Those ranking are shown in Table VII.

One final section on the evaluation sheet left space for the panel of experts to write additional comments. The comments, which did not impact the study, are included in Appendix E.

TABLE VI

TOTAL SCORES AND MEAN SCORES FOR FOUR REMAINING CHARACTERISTICS

	Characteristics			
Presenter				
1	6.78	7.85	5.33	7.67
5	6.85	6.35	6.96	6.82
6	7.42	5.21	6.89	6.53
7	6.85	4.64	6.18	5.89
Totals:	27.90	24.05	25.34	26.91
Mean Scores:	6.90	6.00	6.30	6.76

*Scores based on a 9-point scale

TABLE VII

CHARACTERISTICS IN ORDER OF IMPORTANCE ACCORDING TO PANEL OF EXPERTS (1988) AND MYERS (1968)

1988		1968	
1.	Composure	1.	Communicative Ability
2.	Assertiveness	2.	Stimulation
3.	Friendliness	3.	Control
4.	Stimulation	4.	Assertiveness
5.	Dynamism	5.	Composure
6.	Control	6.	Dynamism
7.	Intimacy	7.	Friendliness
8.	Profundity	8.	Wit
9.	Wit	9.	Profundity
10.	Communicative Ability	10.	Intimacy

Summary of Findings

As a result of calculating the data received from the panel of experts on their evaluation forms, the following findings were made:

1. Using Kendall's Coefficient of Concordance: W and chi square to test the significance of the value of W, a high degree of agreement at the 0.5 level among the panel of experts was determined in their scoring of the seven presenters.
2. Using Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient (r), the scores of the panel of experts, for the seven presenters, were correlated to the scores of the university teleconference coordinators, yielding a significant relationship at the .01 level.
3. Using a t-test, the scores of the presenters scoring above 3.5 in the overall ratings were compared to the scores of the presenters scoring below 3.5 in the overall ratings, yielding a difference significant at the .01 level for the characteristics stimulation, assertiveness, composure, dynamism, and friendliness, and a difference significant at the 0.5 level for the characteristics of control, wit, profundity and intimacy. No significant difference between the two groups was found for communicative ability.
4. Using mean scores for the four presenters ranked above 3.5 overall, the order of importance for the ten characteristics was determined to be the following:

    1. Composure
    2. Assertiveness
    3. Friendliness
    4. Stimulation
    5. Dynamism
    6. Control
    7. Intimacy
    8. Profundity
    9. Wit

10. Communicative Ability

A comparison between the rankings given by the 1988 panel of experts and the 1968 panel of experts did not place the characteristics in the same order of importance.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, RECOMMENDATIONS

Summary of Purpose and Objectives

Instructional television has grown during the last 35 years from unfamiliar and experimental to commonplace and highly technical. The period between the early 1950's to the mid-1960's was designated as the "experimental years," when research projects, the licensing of educational television networks, and creative methods for sending the broadcast signal were developed in order to establish instructional television and gain the public's acceptance of it (Chaberlain, 1980). During the mid-1960's, instructional television had a turning point when educators became concerned about the quality of the instruction, and an increasing amount of programming began being produced by colleges and universities (Wood; Wylie 1977, Chamberlain 1980). Only two decades ago, technology had not progressed past the point of using 2-inch quadruplex machines and kinescopes as methods for recording (Bunyan, 1987). Production techniques included no more than a broadcast of what was being done in a regular classroom (Carlisle, 1974). The audience was no more than a handful of occasional viewers (Moody, 1980 and Schnieider, 1987). During this time Myers (1968) developed a semantic differential scale to determine the presenter characteristics most valued by viewers in a good instructional television presentation.

Within the last 25 years, technology has made instructional television more accessible to the viewer (Moody, 1980). Production techniques and improved instructional design have made the programming a more exciting package (Cowan, 1984). At the same time, the audience

a more exciting package (Cowan, 1984). At the same time, the audience has become a group of habitual viewers, critical of any programming presented for instruction (Schnieder, 1987).

At the heart of any instructional program is the instructor. Experience and studies have shown that classroom teachers do not necessarily make good television teachers (McMenamin, 1974). Knowledge of the subject area and an organized presentation which may suffice in the classroom may not be enough to be effective on television.

The problem in this study was to explore why, even though technology is capable of providing effective televised instruction, many teleconferences and interactive telecourses are viewed as being less than effective because the primary presenter is judged to be less than effective. The problem is compounded by the changes in viewer attitudes in the last 25 years.

The purpose of this study was to identify the characteristics of presenters that a panel of experts perceived to be the most important for delivering high quality teleconferences in continuing education. In order to accomplish that purpose, two research questions were set forth:

1. What are the perceived characteristics of an effective television presenter?
2. What are the most important presentation characteristics?

Summary of the Methodology

The evaluation form for the study was the form used by Myers in a 1962-1968 study. It contained 18 sets of bi-polar adjectives in a semantic differential scale.

A panel of 14 experts was identified. The members were selected with consideration given to their association with instructional television either in management, production, training, coordinating or presentation capacities. A concerted effort was also made to include

members from four of the leading states in the use of instructional television: Oklahoma, Missouri, Washington and West Virginia.

Each of the panel members was asked to view 7 presenters on a videotape and evaluate them on the semantic differential scale. Kendall's Coefficient of Concordance: W was used to determine intra-rater reliability. The overall scores given each presenter by the panel of experts were also compared to the presenter's overall scores given by campus teleconference coordinators at the time of broadcast using Pearson r. The difference between the scores given to the above average presenters and the below average presenters was determined with the t-test. The scores for the above average presenters were totaled to determine the characteristics which had most to least importance on the evaluation.

Summary of Findings

1. A significant level of agreement among the panel of experts existed at the .05 level in their evaluation of the presenters.
2. A significant relationship existed at the .01 level between the scores given by the panel of experts and the scores given at the time of broadcast by the university teleconference coordinators.
3. A significant difference in the scores given to the above average presenters and the below average presenters existed at the .01 level for 5 of the characteristics and at the .01 level for 4 of the characteristics. No significant difference was found for 1 of the characteristics.
4. According to the panel of experts, the ten characteristics ranked from most important to least important were in the following order:

    1. Composure
    2. Assertiveness
    3. Friendliness
    4. Stimulation

5. Dynamism
6. Control
7. Intimacy
8. Profundity
9. Wit
10. Communicative Ability

5. The panel of experts did not place the characteristics in the same order of importance as the evaluators did in the 1968 Myers study.

Conclusions

1. Based upon the findings, it is concluded that the use of a panel of experts is a valid method for determining the effectiveness of presenters on television.
2. Based upon the findings, it is concluded that the use of evaluations by teleconference coordinators is a valid method for determining the effectiveness of presenters on television.
3. Based upon the findings, it is concluded that the checklist of characteristics used in the study is a valid instrument for evaluating presenter characteristics and the overall effectiveness of television presenters.
4. Based upon the findings, the following related conclusions were drawn:
   a. Viewers form a lasting opinion about the overall effectiveness of television presenters within the first four minutes of the presentations.
   b. During the last 25 years, the characteristics that the viewer perceives as most important to least important in effective television presenters have changed.

Recommendations for Further Study

One recommendation for further study explores the question of the overall importance of the presenter. Taking into consideration the variables of different content, audiences, purposes and formats, the study would determine which variable most affects the importance placed on the presenters in judging them to be effective. For example, could a particular audience needing particular content be less interested in the presenter if their primary needs are being met?

A second recommendation for further study would question whether each of the panel of experts rated the best presenters similarly. The study would determine whether the same characteristics were rated high for all of the presenters receiving high overall scores or whether the good presenters were perceived to be effective for different reasons.

A third recommendation for study would center on the use of live audiences. The study would determine whether a live audience enhanced the viewers' perception of the presenter's effectiveness as opposed to the presenter who had no studio audience.

A fourth recommendation for further study would take into consideration how set design and camera angle might influence the viewer's perception of a presenter's effectiveness. For example, would the same presentation appear more organized or friendly with a different set or closer camera angles?

A final recommendation for further study deals with the use of training to enhance the presenter's characteristics that have been identified as deficient. The study would determine which characteristics as they are perceived on television can be improved by training. The amount and type of training a presenter had received would be compared to the overall effectiveness scores given by the panel. A related study would correlate scores given to the presenters before and after training.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Baird, Marcia and Monson, Mavis, "Training Teleconference Users: How to Tackle It" Teleconferencing and Electronic Communications: Applications, Technologies and Human Factors. Compiled by Lorna A. Parker and Christine H. Olgren. University of Wisconsin-Extension: Center for Interactive Programs, 1982.

Bland, Michael, The Executive's Guide to TV and Radio Appearances. White Plains, N.Y.: Knowledge Industries Publications, Inc., 1980

Boudle, Jim. "Coaching Teleconference Users" Teleconferencing and Electronic Communications II: Applications, Technologies and Human Factors. Compiled by Lorne A. Parker and Christine H. Olgren. University of Wisconsin-Extension: Center for Interactive Programs, 1983.

Brown, Robert D.; Brown, Laurence A, and Danielson, J.E., "Instructional Treatments, Presenter Types and Learner Characteristics as Significant Variants in Instructional Television for Adults" Journal of Educational Psychology, 1975.

Bunyan, John A. Why Video Works: New Applications for Management. White Plains, N.Y.: Knowledge Industry Publications, Inc., 1987.

Carlisle, Robert D. B. College Credit Through TV: Old Idea, New Dimensions. Lincoln, Nebraska: Great National Instructional Television Library, 1974.

Cartwright, Steve R. Training with Video. White Plains, N.Y.: Knowledge Industry Publications, Inc., 1986.

Chamberlain, Margin N. "Providing Continuing Education by Media and Technology" New Directions for Continuing Education. Alan B. Knox, Editor-in-Chief. San Francisco: Josey-Bass Inc., Publishers, 1980.

Chute, Alan G. "Selecting Appropriate Strategies for Training Teleconference Presenters" Teleconferencing and Electronic Communications: Applications, Technologies and Human Factors. Compiled by Lorne A. Parker and Christine H. Ogren. University of Wisconsin-Extension: Center for Interactive Programs, 1982.

Cowan, Robert A. Teleconferencing: Maximizing Human Potential. Reston, Virginia: Reston Publishing Co., Inc., 1984.

Crow, Mary Lynn Teaching on Television. The University of Texas at Arlington: Faculty Resource Center, 1977.

Dwyer, Francis M. Strategies for Improving Visual Learning. State College of Pennsylvania: Learning Services, 1978.

Fahl, Lisal A. "Training the Teletrainer- A Varied Approach" Teleconferencing and Electronic Communications IV: Applications, Technologies and Human Factors. Compiled by Lorne A. Parker and Christine H. Olgren. University of Wisconsin-Extension: Center for Interactive Programs, 1985.

Gay, L.R. Educational Research: Competencies for Analysis and Application. Columbus, Ohio Charles E. Merrill Publishing Company, 2976.

Gordon, George N. Classroom Television, New Frontiers in ITV. New York: Communication Arts Books, Hastings House Publishers, 1970.

Green, Ronald E. "Communicating with Color" Audio Visual Communications. November, 1978.

Hansell, Kathleen J.; Green, David and Erbring, Lutz. "A Report on a Survey of Teleconferencing Users" E-ITV. September, 1982.

Hewitt, Louise M., Editor. Telecourse Source Book for the 80's. Coast Community Colleges, 1982.

Johansen, Robert; McNutty, Maureen and McNear, Barbara. Electronic Education: Using Teleconferencing in Post Secondary Organizations. Menlo Park, California: Institute for the Future, 1978.

Levine, Toby Kleban. Teaching Telecourses: Opportunities and Options. Annenberg/CPB Project and Public Broadcasting Service, 1987.

Linton, Marigold and Gallo, Phillip S., Jr., The Practical Statistician: Simplified Handbook of Statistics. Monterey, California: Brooks/Cole Publishing Company, 1975.

Lipson, J. "Technology and Adult Education: A Report on the University of Mid-America Experiment" Technological Horizons in Education Journal. September, 1977.

Laughary, John W. and Hopson, Barrie, Producing Workshops, Seminars and Short Courses: A Trainer's Handbook. Chicago: Follett Publishing Company, 1979.

McMenamin, Milton James. "Effect of Instructional Television on Personality Perception" AV Communication Review. Spring, 1974.

Martin, J. Telematic Society. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1981.

Moody, Kate. Growing Up on Television: The TV Effect. New York, Time Books, 1980.

Murphy, J. and Gross, R. Learning by Television. New York: Academy for Educational Development, 1966.

Neumann, David R. "Teleconferencing Training Program: Poise, Clarity and Brevity" Teleconferencing and Electronic Communications IV: Applications, Technologies and human Factors: Compiled by Lorne A. Parker and Christine H. Olgren. University of Wisconsin-Extension: Center for Interactive Programs, 1985.

O'Bryan, Kenneth. "Industrial TV: The Science of the Art" E-ITV. August, 1981.

Olgren, Christine H., and Parker, Lorne A. Teleconferencing Technology and Applications. Dedham, Massachusetts: Artech House, Inc., 1983.

Osgood, Charles E. "The Nature and Measurement of Meaning" Semantic Differential Technique. edited by James G. Snider and Charles E. Osgood. Chicago: Aldine Publishing Company, 1969.

Osgood, Charles E.: Suci, George J. and Tannenbaum, Percy H. "The Measurement of Meaning" Semantic Differential Technique. edited by James G. Snider and Charles E. Osgood. Chicago: Aldine Publishing Company, 1969.

Parker, Lorne A. "Teletraining: An Overview" Teleconferencing and Electronic Communications III: Applications, Technologies and Human Factors. Compiled by Lorne A. Parker and Christine H. Olgren. University of Wisconsin-Extension: Center for Interactive Programs, 1982.

Shulman, Susan A. "Improving Voice Quality for Teleconferencing" Teleconferencing and Electronic Communications IV: Applications, Technologies and human Factors. Compiled by Lorne A. Parker and Christine H. Olgren, University of Wisconsin-Extension: Center for Interactive Programs, 1985.

Siegal, Sidney. Nonparametric Statistics for the Behavioral Sciences. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., Inc., 1956.

Steinke, Ralph G. and Griffin, Daniel J. "Doing 'Distance Learning'? Do Student Surveys Too" E-ITV. November, 1982.

Thomas, W. and Thomas C. "Investment Trends in Teleconferencing" E-ITV. August, 1982.

Watson, Walter; Pardo, Luis, and Tomovic, Vladislav. How to Give an Effective Seminar: A Handbook for Students and Professionals. Don Mills, Ontario: General Publishing Co. Limited, 1978.

Widner, Doug. Teleguide: A Handbook on Video-Teleconferencing. Public Service Satellite Consortium, 1986.

Wood, D.M. and Wylie, D.G. Educational Telecommunications. Belmont, California: Wadsworth, 1977.

Zunin, Leonard, M.D. with Zunin, Natalie. Contact: The First Four Minutes. Los Angeles: Nash Publishing, 1972.

APPENDIXES

APPENDIX A

LETTER OF EXPLANATION AND EVALUATION FORM USED BY THE PANEL OF EXPERTS

Dear--------,

Enclosed you will find the evaluation sheet and videotape we discussed. Please view the tape and complete the form at your convenience. I would appreciate having **the form returned to me by September 23.** You will find a stamped envelope in the contents of this package for returning the evalution. It is not necessary to return the videotape.

To clarify the use of the information you will provide, let me briefly explain the study. The problem I am pursuing is that although the technology for providing state-of-the-art teleconferences and interactive telecourses is available, many programs are viewed as unacceptable because the presenter was ineffective. The purpose of this study is to identify the personality characteristics of television presenters that a panel of experts believes are the most important for delivering high quality instructional television. I will be determining what importance the experts assign to ten selected personality characteristics of a television presenter and determining whether the experts agree in their perception of a presenter's effectiveness.

The fifteen panel members, selected for their expertise in instructional television, represent the areas of management, production, training, coordination, and presenting. As their evaluation scores will be averaged, no association will be made between a particular panel member and the evaluation he/she submitted. All the names of the panel members will be kept confidential.

The study will be completed by December 1. If you wish a copy of the results, please check that option on the last sheet stapled to the evaluation forms.

We all agree that changing technology and more demanding viewers create a need in continuing education for investigating the improved delivery of programs. Hopefully this study will add to that bank of knowledge.

I can't thank you enough for your assistance.

Sincerely,

Joyce Nichols

PRESENTER EVALUATION

Instructions:

This should be a quick reaction to each of the presenters you will be seeing on videotape.. Below is an example of a nine-step rating scale. Each scale is composed of opposite meaning adjectives and presented in this form:

confident	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	nervous

In the above example, if you feel that the presenter was **extremely** confident, you would circle a number near the "confident" end of the scale. If you think he/she was **quite** confident, you would check the space next to the end. If you think he/she was only **slightly** confident, you would check a space closer to the middle. If you think that the presenter was **neither** confident or nervous or if you think that these adjectives **do not apply**, check the middle number (#5).

Do not skip any scales.
Do not circle more than one number on a line.
Work fast. Give first reactions.

PRESENTER #1

profound	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	shallow
personal	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	impersonal
clear	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	hazy
easy to take notes	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	hard to take notes
dynamic	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	static
intimate	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	remote
brilliant	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	mediocre
relaxed	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	tense
sincere	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	insincere
friendly	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	hostile
interesting	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	boring
direct	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	evasive
poised	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	ill-at-ease
stimulating	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	deadening
communicative	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	inarticulate
assertive	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	restrained
witty	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	stolid
controlled	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	impulsive

PRESENTER #4

profound	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	shallow
personal	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	impersonal
clear	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	hazy
easy to take notes	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	hard to take notes
dynamic	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	static
intimate	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	remote
brilliant	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	mediocre
relaxed	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	tense
sincere	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	insincere
friendly	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	hostile
interesting	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	boring
direct	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	evasive
poised	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	ill-at-ease
stimulating	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	deadening
communicative	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	inarticulate
assertive	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	restrained
witty	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	stolid
controlled	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	impulsive

PRESENTER #5

profound	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	shallow
personal	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	impersonal
clear	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	hazy
easy to take notes	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	hard to take notes
dynamic	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	static
intimate	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	remote
brilliant	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	mediocre
relaxed	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	tense
sincere	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	insincere
friendly	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	hostile
interesting	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	boring
direct	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	evasive
poised	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	ill-at-ease
stimulating	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	deadening
communicative	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	inarticulate
assertive	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	restrained
witty	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	stolid
controlled	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	impulsive

PRESENTER #2

profound	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	shallow
personal	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	impersonal
clear	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	hazy
easy to take notes	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	hard to take notes
dynamic	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	static
intimate	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	remote
brilliant	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	mediocre
relaxed	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	tense
sincere	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	insincere
friendly	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	hostile
interesting	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	boring
direct	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	evasive
poised	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	ill-at-ease
stimulating	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	deadening
communicative	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	inarticulate
assertive	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	restrained
witty	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	stolid
controlled	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	impulsive

PRESENTER #3

profound	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	shallow
personal	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	impersonal
clear	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	hazy
easy to take notes	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	hard to take notes
dynamic	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	static
intimate	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	remote
brilliant	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	mediocre
relaxed	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	tense
sincere	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	insincere
friendly	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	hostile
interesting	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	boring
direct	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	evasive
poised	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	ill-at-ease
stimulating	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	deadening
communicative	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	inarticulate
assertive	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	restrained
witty	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	stolid
controlled	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	impulsive

PRESENTER #6

profound	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	shallow
personal	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	impersonal
clear	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	hazy
easy to take notes	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	hard to take notes
dynamic	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	static
intimate	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	remote
brilliant	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	mediocre
relaxed	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	tense
sincere	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	insincere
friendly	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	hostile
interesting	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	boring
direct	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	evasive
poised	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	ill-at-ease
stimulating	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	deadening
communicative	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	inarticulate
assertive	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	restrained
witty	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	stolid
controlled	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	impulsive

PRESENTER #7

profound	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	shallow
personal	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	impersonal
clear	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	hazy
easy to take notes	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	hard to take notes
dynamic	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	static
intimate	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	remote
brilliant	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	mediocre
relaxed	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	tense
sincere	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	insincere
friendly	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	hostile
interesting	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	boring
direct	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	evasive
poised	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	ill-at-ease
stimulating	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	deadening
communicative	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	inarticulate
assertive	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	restrained
witty	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	stolid
controlled	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	impulsive

Your Name:_____

Position:_____

Institution/Organization:_____

Please give an overall rating to the presenters for their total effectiveness.

	Excellent/ Average/ Poor				
Presenter #1	**5**	**4**	**3**	**2**	**1**
Presenter #2	**5**	**4**	**3**	**2**	**1**
Presenter #3	**5**	**4**	**3**	**2**	**1**
Presenter #4	**5**	**4**	**3**	**2**	**1**
Presenter #5	**5**	**4**	**3**	**2**	**1**
Presenter #6	**5**	**4**	**3**	**2**	**1**
Presenter #7	**5**	**4**	**3**	**2**	**1**

Would you like a copy of the results sent to you in January?
[ ] yes **[ ] no**

Additional Comments:

APPENDIX B

PANEL OF EXPERTS' SCORES FOR PRESENTERS

SCORES FOR PRESENTER

No. 1

Panel Member	Characteristics 1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
A	7.75	9.00	9.00	9.00	8.50	9.00	8.00	9.00	5.00	9.00
B	4.75	2.50	6.00	8.00	7.00	3.00	5.00	6.00	1.00	7.00
C	6.75	6.00	8.00	8.00	8.00	7.00	6.00	8.00	4.00	8.00
D	6.75	7.00	8.00	9.00	8.00	7.00	6.50	7.00	3.00	8.00
E	4.75	5.50	8.00	8.00	6.50	7.00	4.50	7.00	5.50	6.50
F	6.25	8.50	8.00	8.00	8.50	8.00	9.00	9.00	7.00	8.00
G	7.75	9.00	9.00	9.00	8.50	8.00	9.00	9.00	8.00	8.00
H	8.00	9.00	8.00	9.00	8.50	9.00	8.00	9.00	6.00	9.00
I	7.25	6.50	7.00	6.00	8.00	7.00	7.50	7.00	5.50	6.00
J	6.00	9.00	5.00	9.00	9.00	9.00	9.00	9.00	5.00	9.00
K	7.25	8.00	8.00	8.00	8.00	8.00	8.00	8.00	7.00	7.50
L	6.50	7.00	7.00	9.00	8.00	9.00	7.50	6.00	6.00	7.00
M	7.75	8.00	8.00	9.00	8.50	8.00	6.00	7.00	5.00	5.50
N	7.00	8.50	5.00	9.00	8.00	9.00	8.50	9.00	7.50	9.00
Totals	94.50	103.50	95.00	109.00	113.00	108.00	102.50	110.00	75.50	107.50
Mean Scores	6.75	7.39	6.78	7.70	8.07	7.70	7.30	7.85	5.39	7.67

OVERALL SCORE: 4.6

SCORES FOR PRESENTER

No. 2

Panel Member	Characteristics 1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
A	6.00	4.00	7.00	4.00	4.00	5.00	5.50	4.00	5.00	4.00
B	4.00	1.50	8.00	2.00	1.00	1.00	2.50	1.00	1.50	1.50
C	3.75	2.50	3.00	4.00	4.00	3.00	4.50	1.00	2.00	2.00
D	5.00	3.50	7.00	5.00	5.50	1.00	5.50	2.00	5.00	3.00
E	2.00	1.00	7.00	5.00	1.00	2.00	4.50	1.00	2.50	1.50
F	3.50	3.00	4.00	5.00	2.50	2.00	5.00	1.00	3.00	1.50
G	5.50	1.00	9.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	5.00	1.00	4.50	2.00
H	2.00	1.00	4.00	1.00	1.00	2.00	2.00	1.00	3.00	4.00
I	3.25	1.50	3.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	5.00	1.00	3.00	2.00
J	3.50	2.00	5.00	2.00	1.00	1.00	5.00	1.00	3.00	2.00
K	3.75	1.50	5.00	1.00	1.00	2.00	4.00	2.00	2.00	2.50
L	4.75	4.00	4.00	4.00	2.50	3.00	4.50	2.00	4.50	3.50
M	5.75	3.50	3.00	4.00	3.00	4.00	5.00	2.00	4.50	5.00
N	3.25	2.00	8.00	3.00	1.50	1.00	5.50	1.00	3.50	1.00
Totals	56.00	32.00	77.00	43.00	31.50	25.00	63.50	21.00	47.00	33.50
Mean Scores	4.00	2.20	5.50	3.07	2.25	1.78	4.53	1.50	3.35	2.39

OVERALL SCORE: 1.4

SCORES FOR PRESENTER

No. 3

Panel Member	Characteristics 1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
A	8.25	8.00	8.00	7.00	7.00	7.00	8.00	7.00	7.50	8.00
B	8.75	8.00	8.00	8.00	8.00	7.00	8.50	4.00	8.00	8.00
C	6.75	4.50	5.00	5.00	4.00	4.00	6.00	5.00	4.50	5.00
D	6.50	4.50	7.00	6.00	3.00	5.00	7.00	5.00	6.50	6.00
E	5.50	2.50	7.00	3.00	2.50	4.00	5.50	2.00	4.50	3.50
F	5.00	2.50	7.00	5.00	4.00	1.00	4.00	2.00	3.50	2.50
G	8.50	8.00	8.00	6.00	1.00	7.00	9.00	3.00	7.00	8.50
H	3.25	2.00	4.00	3.00	1.00	3.00	4.50	1.00	4.00	3.50
I	6.50	4.50	7.00	3.00	6.50	3.00	7.00	3.00	4.50	5.00
J	6.50	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.50	4.00	7.50	5.00	6.00	6.00
K	5.25	4.50	5.00	5.00	5.00	4.00	5.50	5.00	4.00	3.50
L	7.75	7.00	6.00	7.00	6.00	6.00	6.00	6.00	6.00	7.00
M	8.50	6.00	7.00	7.00	5.00	4.00	5.50	4.00	6.00	6.00
N	4.75	4.00	5.00	4.00	1.00	3.00	5.50	2.00	3.50	4.50
Totals	91.75	71.00	89.00	74.00	59.50	62.00	81.50	54.00	75.50	77.00
Mean Scores	6.55	5.07	6.35	5.28	4.25	4.42	5.82	3.85	5.39	5.50

OVERALL SCORE: 3.0

SCORES FOR PRESENTER

No. 4

Panel Member	Characteristics 1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
A	6.00	3.00	6.00	6.00	4.00	4.00	3.50	3.00	4.00	4.00
B	8.25	7.50	7.00	8.00	7.00	7.00	7.50	5.00	6.50	8.00
C	4.00	4.00	3.00	3.00	3.50	3.00	4.50	3.00	3.50	3.00
D	6.00	3.00	7.00	5.00	3.50	2.00	5.50	3.00	4.50	4.50
E	4.50	3.00	7.00	4.00	2.50	4.00	4.00	3.00	4.50	4.00
F	4.75	2.00	7.00	5.00	1.50	2.00	3.50	1.00	3.50	2.00
G	2.25	2.00	9.00	4.00	1.00	1.00	4.50	2.00	2.50	3.00
H	3.50	2.50	3.00	4.00	2.00	3.00	4.00	2.00	4.00	4.00
I	4.00	4.00	6.00	5.00	3.00	2.00	5.00	3.00	5.00	4.00
J	8.75	7.50	9.00	8.00	9.00	7.00	9.00	8.00	8.00	9.00
K	6.50	6.00	6.00	6.00	5.00	5.00	7.00	5.00	5.00	5.50
L	6.25	4.00	7.00	8.00	5.50	4.00	4.50	3.00	6.00	4.00
M	6.75	7.00	7.00	8.00	7.00	5.00	8.00	6.00	5.50	8.00
N	6.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	4.50	6.00	6.00	2.00	6.00	7.00
Totals	77.50	60.50	89.00	79.00	59.00	55.00	76.50	49.00	68.50	70.00
Mean Scores	5.53	4.32	6.35	5.64	4.21	3.92	5.46	3.50	4.89	5.00

OVERALL SCORE: 2.78

SCORES FOR PRESENTER

No. 5

Panel Member	Characteristics 1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
A	9.25	8.50	8.00	8.00	8.00	7.00	7.50	8.00	7.50	8.00
B	8.75	7.50	7.00	9.00	7.50	7.00	8.00	8.00	7.00	8.00
C	8.00	7.50	9.00	8.00	8.50	8.00	8.00	7.00	8.00	7.50
D	8.25	8.00	7.00	8.00	8.00	9.00	8.00	7.00	7.00	8.00
E	7.55	8.00	7.00	8.00	7.00	8.00	5.50	6.00	6.00	4.00
F	8.75	8.00	3.00	9.00	7.50	9.00	8.00	8.00	6.50	6.50
G	8.75	8.50	8.00	8.00	9.00	8.00	9.00	6.00	8.00	8.50
H	4.50	3.50	3.00	4.00	3.50	4.00	4.00	2.00	5.00	4.50
I	7.00	7.00	7.00	7.00	8.00	6.00	8.00	6.00	6.50	7.50
J	8.00	7.50	9.00	9.00	9.00	7.00	5.00	6.00	8.00	7.00
K	7.25	7.50	7.00	7.00	7.50	6.00	7.00	5.00	6.00	6.00
L	7.50	8.50	7.00	8.00	7.50	8.00	7.50	8.00	7.50	8.00
M	8.00	9.00	7.00	8.00	8.00	7.00	7.50	5.00	7.00	6.00
N	6.25	7.50	7.00	7.00	5.00	5.00	6.50	7.00	7.50	6.00
Totals	107.75	106.50	96.00	108.00	111.00	99.00	99.50	89.00	97.50	95.50
Mean Scores	7.69	7.60	6.85	7.71	7.92	7.07	7.10	6.35	6.96	6.82

OVERALL SCORE: 4.42

SCORES FOR PRESENTER

No. 6

Panel Member	Characteristics 1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
A	9.00	8.50	9.00	6.00	9.00	7.00	8.50	8.00	8.00	8.00
B	9.00	8.00	5.00	9.00	9.00	7.00	9.00	5.00	8.00	7.50
C	8.50	8.00	9.00	5.00	9.00	6.00	8.50	4.00	8.00	5.00
D	6.50	6.00	7.00	8.00	8.00	5.00	7.00	5.00	6.00	6.50
E	7.25	7.50	8.00	7.00	7.50	7.00	7.50	5.00	7.00	7.00
F	7.25	4.50	8.00	7.00	7.00	6.00	6.50	3.00	7.50	4.00
G	9.00	8.50	9.00	9.00	9.00	9.00	9.00	5.00	8.00	9.00
H	8.25	8.50	9.00	9.00	9.00	7.00	9.00	6.00	7.00	7.50
I	6.75	7.00	7.00	7.00	8.00	4.00	7.50	5.00	6.00	6.00
J	6.75	5.00	5.00	7.00	7.00	5.00	5.50	3.00	6.00	5.00
K	6.00	5.00	6.00	5.00	6.50	6.00	6.50	5.00	5.50	6.00
L	7.25	8.00	7.00	7.00	9.00	8.00	7.50	8.00	5.50	7.00
M	8.25	8.00	7.00	8.00	9.00	7.00	8.00	6.00	7.50	8.00
N	7.75	7.50	8.00	8.00	7.50	7.00	6.00	5.00	6.50	7.00
Totals	107.50	100.00	104.00	102.00	114.50	91.00	106.00	73.00	96.50	91.50
Mean Scores	7.67	7.14	7.42	7.28	8.17	6.50	7.57	5.21	6.89	6.53

OVERALL SCORE: 3.92

SCORES FOR PRESENTER

No. 7

Panel Member	Characteristics 1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
A	9.00	8.00	8.00	7.00	8.00	7.00	8.00	6.00	8.50	7.50
B	8.75	8.00	5.00	9.00	8.00	8.00	9.00	5.00	7.50	8.00
C	7.50	6.00	8.00	5.00	6.50	4.00	6.50	4.00	5.00	3.50
D	8.25	7.00	7.00	7.00	8.00	6.00	8.50	5.00	7.00	7.50
E	6.50	6.00	7.00	6.00	6.50	6.00	6.00	5.00	5.50	7.00
F	8.25	7.50	7.00	8.00	8.00	7.00	7.50	6.00	6.50	6.50
G	7.00	6.50	7.00	6.00	6.00	7.00	6.00	4.00	6.00	6.50
H	5.25	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	2.00	5.00	3.50
I	5.00	5.00	7.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	6.50	2.00	5.00	6.00
J	7.25	5.00	8.00	8.00	6.00	6.00	6.00	7.00	6.50	5.50
K	5.55	5.00	6.00	5.00	4.50	5.00	5.50	4.00	4.50	4.50
L	7.50	6.50	8.00	6.00	7.00	6.00	6.50	4.00	7.00	6.50
M	8.75	7.50	7.00	8.00	6.50	4.00	6.00	4.00	5.00	4.00
N	7.75	7.00	7.00	8.00	7.50	6.00	7.50	7.00	6.50	6.00
Totals	102.25	88.00	96.00	92.00	91.50	81.00	93.50	65.00	85.50	82.50
Mean Scores	7.30	6.28	6.85	6.57	6.53	5.78	6.67	4.64	6.10	5.89

OVERALL SCORE: 3.92

APPENDIX C

PANEL OF EXPERTS' RANKING OF PRESENTERS

RANKING OF PRESENTER

No. 1

Panel Member	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
A	9.00	3.00	7.50	3.00	6.00	3.00	7.50	3.00	10.00	3.00
B	7.00	9.00	4.50	1.00	2.50	8.00	6.00	4.50	10.00	2.50
C	7.00	8.50	3.00	3.00	3.00	6.00	8.50	3.00	10.00	3.00
D	8.00	6.00	3.00	1.00	3.00	6.00	9.00	6.00	10.00	3.00
E	9.00	7.50	1.50	1.50	5.50	3.50	10.00	3.50	7.50	5.50
F	10.00	3.50	6.50	6.50	3.50	6.50	1.50	1.50	9.00	6.50
G	10.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	6.00	8.00	3.00	3.00	8.00	8.00
H	8.00	3.00	8.00	3.00	6.00	3.00	8.00	3.00	10.00	300
I	3.00	7.00	5.00	8.50	1.00	5.00	2.00	5.00	10.00	8.50
J	8.00	4.00	9.50	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	9.50	4.00
K	9.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	10.00	8.00
L	8.00	6.00	6.00	1.50	3.00	1.50	4.00	9.50	9.50	6.00
M	6.00	4.00	4.00	1.00	2.00	4.00	8.00	7.00	10.00	9.00
N	9.00	5.50	10.00	2.50	7.00	2.50	5.50	2.50	8.00	2.50

RANKING OF PRESENTER

No. 2

Panel Member	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
A	2.00	8.00	1.00	8.00	8.00	4.50	3.00	8.00	4.50	8.00
B	2.00	6.00	1.00	4.00	9.00	9.00	3.00	9.00	6.00	6.00
C	4.00	7.00	5.50	2.50	2.50	5.50	1.00	10.00	8.50	8.50
D	5.00	7.00	1.00	5.00	2.50	10.00	2.50	9.00	5.00	8.00
E	5.50	9.00	1.00	2.00	9.00	5.50	3.00	9.00	4.00	7.00
F	4.00	5.50	3.00	1.50	7.00	8.00	1.50	10.00	5.50	9.00
G	2.00	8.00	1.00	8.00	8.00	8.00	3.00	8.00	4.00	5.00
H	5.00	8.50	1.50	8.50	8.50	5.00	5.00	8.50	3.00	1.50
I	4.00	9.00	5.00	7.00	7.00	7.00	1.00	10.00	2.00	3.00
J	3.00	6.00	1.50	6.00	9.00	9.00	1.50	9.00	4.00	6.00
K	3.00	8.00	1.00	9.50	9.50	6.00	2.00	6.00	6.00	4.00
L	1.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	9.00	8.00	2.50	10.00	2.55	7.00
M	1.00	7.00	8.50	5.50	8.50	5.50	2.50	10.00	4.00	2.50
N	4.00	6.00	1.00	5.00	7.00	8.00	2.00	8.00	3.00	8.00

RANKING OF PRESENTER

No. 3

Panel Member	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
A	1.00	3.50	3.50	8.50	8.50	8.50	3.50	8.50	6.00	3.50
B	1.00	5.50	5.50	5.50	5.50	9.00	2.00	10.00	5.50	5.50
C	1.00	7.50	4.50	4.50	9.50	9.50	2.00	4.50	7.50	4.50
D	3.50	9.00	1.50	5.50	10.00	7.50	1.50	7.50	3.50	5.50
E	2.50	8.50	1.00	7.00	8.50	5.00	2.50	10.00	4.00	6.00
F	2.50	7.50	1.00	2.50	4.50	10.00	4.50	9.00	6.00	7.50
G	2.50	4.50	4.50	8.00	10.00	6.50	1.00	9.00	6.50	2.50
H	5.00	8.00	2.50	6.50	9.50	6.50	1.00	9.50	2.50	4.00
I	3.50	6.50	1.50	9.00	3.50	9.00	1.50	9.00	6.50	5.00
J	2.00	7.50	7.50	7.50	5.00	10.00	1.00	7.50	3.50	3.50
K	2.00	7.00	4.50	4.50	4.50	8.50	1.00	4.50	8.50	10.00
L	1.00	3.00	7.50	3.00	7.50	7.50	7.50	7.50	7.50	3.00
M	1.00	5.00	2.50	2.50	8.00	9.50	7.00	9.50	5.00	5.00
N	3.00	5.50	2.00	5.50	10.00	8.00	1.00	9.00	7.00	4.00

RANKING OF PRESENTER

No. 4

Panel Member	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
A	2.00	9.50	2.00	2.00	5.50	5.50	8.00	9.50	5.50	5.50
B	1.00	4.50	6.00	2.50	6.00	6.00	4.50	10.00	9.00	2.50
C	2.50	2.5	8.00	8.00	4.50	8.00	1.00	8.00	4.50	8.00
D	2.00	8.50	1.00	4.00	7.00	10.00	3.00	8.50	5.50	5.50
E	2.50	8.50	1.00	5.50	10.00	5.50	5.50	8.50	2.50	2.50
F	3.00	7.00	1.00	2.00	9.00	7.00	4.50	10.00	4.50	7.00
G	6.00	7.50	1.00	3.00	9.50	9.50	2.00	7.50	5.00	4.00
H	5.00	8.00	6.50	2.50	9.50	6.50	2.50	9.50	2.50	2.50
I	6.00	6.00	1.00	3.00	8.50	10.00	3.00	8.50	3.00	6.00
J	5.00	9.00	2.50	7.00	2.50	10.00	2.50	7.00	7.00	2.50
K	2.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	8.50	8.50	1.00	8.50	8.50	6.00
L	3.00	8.00	2.00	1.00	5.00	8.00	6.00	10.00	4.00	8.00
M	7.00	5.00	5.00	2.00	5.00	10.00	2.00	8.00	9.00	2.00
N	3.50	7.00	7.00	7.00	9.00	3.50	3.50	10.00	3.50	1.00

RANKING OF PRESENTER

No. 5

Panel Member	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
A	1.00	2.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	6.00	8.50	5.00	8.50	5.00
B	2.00	6.50	8.00	1.00	6.50	8.00	4.00	4.00	8.00	4.00
C	5.00	8.50	1.00	5.00	2.00	5.00	5.00	10.00	5.00	8.50
D	2.00	5.00	9.00	5.00	5.00	1.00	5.00	9.00	9.00	5.00
E	4.00	2.00	5.50	2.50	5.50	2.00	9.00	7.50	7.50	10.00
F	3.00	5.00	10.00	1.50	7.00	1.50	5.00	5.00	8.5	8.50
G	3.00	4.50	7.50	7.50	1.50	7.50	1.50	10.00	7.50	4.50
H	2.50	7.50	9.00	5.00	7.50	5.00	5.00	10.00	1.00	2.50
I	5.50	5.50	5.50	5.50	1.50	9.50	1.50	9.50	8.00	3.00
J	4.50	6.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	7.50	10.00	9.00	4.50	7.50
K	3.00	1.50	5.00	5.00	1.50	8.00	5.00	10.00	8.00	8.00
L	7.50	1.00	10.00	3.50	7.50	3.50	7.50	3.50	7.50	3.50
M	3.00	1.00	7.00	3.00	3.00	7.00	5.00	10.00	7.00	9.00
N	7.00	1.50	4.00	4.00	9.50	9.50	6.00	4.00	1.50	8.00

RANKING OF PRESENTER

No. 6

Panel Member	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
A	2.00	4.50	2.00	10.00	2.00	9.00	4.50	7.00	7.00	7.00
B	2.50	5.50	9.50	2.50	2.50	8.00	2.50	9.50	5.50	7.00
C	3.50	5.50	1.50	8.50	1.50	7.00	3.50	10.00	5.50	8.50
D	5.50	7.50	3.50	1.50	1.50	9.50	3.50	9.50	7.50	5.50
E	5.00	3.00	1.00	7.50	3.00	7.50	3.00	10.00	7.55	7.50
F	3.00	8.00	1.00	4.50	4.50	7.00	6.00	10.00	2.00	9.00
G	4.00	8.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	10.00	9.00	4.00
H	6.00	5.00	2.50	2.50	2.50	8.50	2.50	10.00	8.50	7.00
I	6.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	1.00	10.00	2.00	9.00	7.50	7.50
J	3.00	7.50	7.50	1.50	1.50	7.50	5.00	10.00	4.00	7.50
K	4.50	9.00	4.50	9.00	1.50	4.50	1.50	9.00	7.00	4.50
L	5.00	3.00	8.00	8.00	1.00	3.00	6.00	3.00	10.00	8.00
M	2.00	4.50	8.50	4.50	1.00	8.50	4.50	10.00	7.00	4.50
N	3.00	4.50	1.50	1.50	4.50	6.50	9.00	10.00	8.00	6.50

RANKING OF PRESENTER

No. 7

Panel Member	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
A	1.00	4.50	4.50	8.50	4.50	8.50	4.50	10.00	2.00	7.00
B	3.00	5.50	9.50	1.50	5.50	5.50	1.50	9.50	8.00	5.50
C	2.00	5.00	1.00	6.50	3.50	8.50	3.50	8.50	6.50	10.00
D	2.00	6.50	6.50	6.50	3.00	9.00	1.00	10.00	6.50	4.00
E	3.50	6.50	1.50	6.50	3.50	6.50	6.50	10.00	9.00	1.50
F	1.00	4.50	6.50	2.50	2.50	6.50	4.50	10.00	8.50	8.50
G	2.00	4.50	2.00	7.50	7.50	2.00	7.50	10.00	7.50	4.50
H	1.00	5.50	5.50	5.50	5.50	5.50	5.50	10.00	2.00	9.00
I	6.50	6.50	1.00	6.50	6.50	6.50	2.00	10.00	6.50	3.00
J	3.00	10.00	1.50	1.50	7.00	7.00	7.00	4.00	5.00	9.00
K	2.50	5.00	1.00	5.00	8.00	5.00	2.50	10.00	8.00	8.00
L	2.00	6.00	1.00	8.50	3.50	8.50	6.00	10.00	3.50	6.00
M	1.00	3.00	4.00	2.00	5.00	9.00	6.00	9.00	7.00	9.00
N	2.00	6.00	6.00	1.00	3.50	9.50	3.50	6.00	8.00	9.50

APPENDIX D

NATIONAL UNIVERSITY TELECONFERENCE NETWORK (NUTN) EVALUATION FORMS FOR UNIVERSITY TELECONFERENCE COORDINATORS

EVALUATION SUMMARY

NATIONAL UNIVERSITY TELECONFERENCE NETWORK

(TITLE)

ORIGINATED BY (INSTITUTION)

Number of Institutions Participating_____ Number of Institutions Reporting_____

Number of Sites Reported_____ Number of Registrations Reported_____

	Low 1	2	3	4	High 5
1. Lead time provided for planning and marketing					
2. Marketing information					
3. Program materials					
4. Presenters:					
a.					
b.					
c.					
d.					
5. Audio quality					
6. Video quality					
7. Interactive components of the conference					
8. Program format					
9. YOUR overall evaluation of the conference					
10. Estimate participants' overall evaluation of conference					
11. Interest in having this program repeated					
a. Within 6 months					
b. Within 1 year					
12. Service to you					
a. NUTN Coordinating Office					
b. Originating institution					

Evaluation Summary
Page 2

13. List reasons your institution decided to participate in this conference.

14. Identify the most positive aspect of the conference.

15. Identify the most negative aspect of the conference.

16. Identify registration fee charged each conference participant.

17. Comment on pricing for this conference.

18. Do you anticipate future uses of a videotape? _____ Yes _____No

19. Identify how future conferences distributed by NUTN might be improved.

20. Additional comments or suggestions (use an extra sheet if needed).

APPENDIX E

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS ON THE EVALUATION FORMS FROM THE PANEL OF EXPERTS

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS

• It is obvious that presenters #5 and #6 are frequently before audiences. The name also makes one expect a good presentation (and possiblY score them higher because of this). Presenter #1 does this for a living and while he is good with people, he's done this often and he comes off superficial.

• This is an excellent evaluative tool. The short presentations, however, made it a little difficult to evaluate the first category - Profound--Shallow.

• I believe that the audience and the purpose of the teleconference has to be taken into consideration. The performance of the presenter also depends on whether there is a live audience or not. Although Presenter #1 seems terrific, I probably couldn't stand more than one of his presentations!

• I think the presenters which performed the best are the same ones who find themselves in front of an audience/camera very often. I also feel a lack of objectivity with the presenters who were automatically recognizable. For example, even though _____ appeared nervous or "fidgety," I scored him higher than a lesser-known who may have exhibited the same nervous behavior.

• An excellent range of presenters! Two external factors which could also affect viewers' perceptions and might even affect presenters' abilities are (1) set design and (2) camera angle and view. Some of the sets were visually uncomfortable for me, e.g., Presenter 1 was separated by space from a second group, or the placement of audience at angles from the camera. The wider camera angles are less intimate and even if the presenter is warm and friendly a shot wider than a medium close up becomes more formal and distant.

• Presenters #1 and #7 talked too fast. Presenter #2 - What a tough assignment to be in that moderator's shoes!

VITA

Joyce A. Elliott Nichols

Candidate for the Degree of

Doctor of Education

Thesis: TELECONFERENCING IN CONTINUING EDUCATION: AN ANALYSIS OF THE PRIMARY PRESENTER'S CHARACTERISTICS AS THEY AFFECT THE OVERALL QUALITY OF A PRESENTATION

Major Field: Occupational and Adult Education

Biographical:

Personal Data: Born in Knoxville, Iowa, March 25, 1940, the daughter of Owen and Elizabeth Elliott.

Education: Received Bachelor of Science degree in Education from Drake University, Des Moines, Iowa, in August 1962; received Master of Science degree at Oklahoma State University in August, 1980; completed the requirements for the Doctor of Education degree at Oklahoma State University in December of 1988.

Professional Experience: High school English Teacher, Southeast Polk Public Schools, Altoona, Iowa, September, 1962 to May 1965; High School English Teacher, Saydel Public Schools, Des Moines, Iowa, September, 1966, to May, 1969; High School English Teacher, Jenks Public Schools, Jenks, Oklahoma, September, 1969, to May, 1979; District Media Director and Television Studio Director, Jenks Public Schools, Jenks, Oklahoma, September, 1979, to May, 1987; Doctoral Internship, National University Teleconference Network, Oklahoma State University, Stillwater, Oklahoma, June 1987, to August, 1987; Teleconference Coordinator, College of Education, Oklahoma State University, Stillwater, Oklahoma, September, 1987, to November, 1987; Program Manager, Arts and Sciences Extension, Oklahoma State University, Stillwater, Oklahoma, November, 1987, to present.