Clarifying Communication Competencies through an Interdisciplinary Approach to Communication Pedagogy

Mary Mino[*]

The increased focus on assessment has resulted in a greater demand and pressure for communication programs to validate that students have learned and can apply communication competencies. However, for the most part, communication educators have offered no well-defined guidelines or systematic approaches that have been endorsed unequivocally. Although literature has described Relationship Enhancement (RE) as an extremely successful approach for improving oral communication, it has not been studied by the majority of communication educators. Through its nine basic skills, the RE Approach offers specific guidelines that systematically operationalize how to communicate effectively. This essay shares integrative research that develops a rationale for an interdisciplinary approach to communication pedagogy. Specifically, this research suggests taking two significant communication constructs, rhetorical sensitivity and communication competence, and using one or both in combination with RE when teaching these competencies. This interdisciplinary approach can improve students' understanding of effective oral communication both in theory and in practice which, in turn, can lead to successful communication assessment outcomes.

Keywords: communication competencies, rhetorical sensitivity, communication competence, the reticence training program, the relationship enhancement approach, relationship enhancement skills, effective oral communication, assessment outcomes

Communication programs consist of multiple areas of study, such as basic public speaking, rhetorical theory and criticism, and instructional, organizational, interpersonal, intercultural, gender, and group communication. Although these areas differ, their common thread involves emphasizing the significance of oral communication *competence*. Over the years, administrators have evaluated the programs offered at various academic institutions. In order to corroborate for these administrators communication's centrality, in many cases, the National Communication Association has shared with them comprehensive research that accentuates the value of communication study (see, specifically, Morreale, Osborn, & Pearson, 2000). However, U.S. college and university administrators are currently focusing greater attention on institutional assessment and require a more comprehensive in-house substantiation (see specifically, Morreale, Backlund, Hay, & Moore, 2011). Consequently, assessments of communication programs have become more rigorous.

Justifying through assessment the significant and positive quantifiable academic outcomes of programs of study and these programs' courses has become essential for attracting students, for receiving the kind of support programs need to operate effectively, and for their courses to remain viable. Specifically, the assessment process requires educators to describe each course in a program and that course's objectives; to explain the specific instructional approaches they employ; to provide the detailed evaluation methods they use; to quantify the changes in students' knowledge and performance; and to report explicitly if the instructional approaches and the evaluation methods

[*]Mary Mino (Ph.D., Pennsylvania State University, 1986) is Interim Co-Director of Academic Affairs and Associate Professor of Communication Arts & Sciences, The Pennsylvania State University, DuBois Campus, College Place, DuBois, PA 15801. The initial version of this essay was presented at the 2011 Eastern Communication Association Conference held in Arlington, Virginia. Dr. Mino studied with Dr. Bernard J. Guerney, Jr. as a postdoctoral student and, in 1990, was certified as a Relationship Enhancement (RE) Program Leader and Supervisor of RE Program Leaders. Any questions communication administrators or educators have about employing the RE Approach for communication study can be directed to her.

these educators employed are successful or not in terms of the quantity of students' positive academic gains.

Spitzberg (2011) has examined the implications of the increased demand for assessment and the resulting pressure it places on communication educators. At the same time, he has acknowledged the "communication discipline" must respond by identifying "core communication competencies," by defining the "set of skills" that represent them, and by verifying that communication educators can "effectively train students" to improve their skills in these competencies (p. 146). However, Spitzberg also believes the demand for assessment creates a "quandary" for the communication discipline. Specifically, communication professionals do not agree about what core communication competencies are or how to assess them (p. 146).

In addition to administrators' need to assess the value of communication study, when enrolled in communication courses, students often want answers to three specific questions: (1) "Why do we need to learn communication theories?" (2) "How are learning these theories useful or valuable?" (3) "How, explicitly, are these theories applied?" The responses to these questions are significant both in the communication classroom and when communication educators answer them in their assessment descriptions. Therefore, employing pedagogical approaches that adapt best to student audiences and result in significant communication performance gains is necessary.

With the goals of improving both communication pedagogy and assessment, this research shares multiple theories and integrates them. Specifically, the Relationship Enhancement (RE) Approach, which is grounded in psychology and pedagogy, is connected to rhetorical sensitivity and communication competence. This research posits that the RE Approach can be incorporated successfully in a variety of communication courses as a way to translate one or both of these concepts' theoretical framework(s) into practical application. Consequently, communication educators can provide administrators with an integrated theory-grounded means of outcomes assessment.

Undergraduate Student Attitudes about Oral Communication

Undergraduate students' attitudes about interacting with others are dependent on personal experiences and beliefs about what communication competence entails. Students may have been taught to communicate by ineffective role models in the home or at school. They may believe that their ability to interact with others occurs naturally as part of their speech developmental process, that good speakers are born with that ability, that they understand already how to communicate effectively or, they may not think much, if any, about the importance of effective oral communication.

The National Communication Association's publication, "Guidelines" (1991, 2007), that focuses on oral communication training in kindergarten through twelfth grade has supported that oral communication skills are extremely essential, yet neglected. Furthermore, even if undergraduate students gain experience in communication-related activities in high school or for other organizations, engaging in these activities does not necessarily prepare them for the basic course (Pearson, Child, Herakova, Semlak, & Angelos, 2010).

In addition to students' unpreparedness for the basic course, university administrators have cited other important concerns. Specifically, while enrolled, students appear to be disinterested, fail to attend class, or are unwilling to study the course material (Morreale, Hugenberg, & Worley, 2006). Further, despite basic course instructors' perceived clarity when sharing course objectives and discussing the components of presentational speaking, students still may not understand the basic course's purpose. Morreale, Worley, & Hugenberg's (2009) research revealed that when the course ended, instructors reported students remained uncertain about the course's objectives. In short, basic course instructors' initial attempts to illustrate for students the purpose and objectives of

communication study in what is typically undergraduate students' first communication course are often lost. Therefore, communication educators must continually focus on designing, discovering, and employing pedagogical approaches that motivate students to learn communication theory, to understand the value of communication competencies, and to apply communication skills effectively to increase academic gains and improve assessment outcomes not only in the basic course but in all undergraduate communication courses.

When teaching communication courses, instructor success is measured primarily by the quality of student performance gains. Typically, students who are motivated are more likely to perform better in any course (Braten & Olaussen, 2005). Specifically, Frymier and Shulman (1995) discovered that when a course's instructional content satisfies students' personal and/or career needs and goals, they perceive information as being relevant. Frymier (2005) also shared students' self-reports that indicated their interactive involvement was associated positively with their course grades. Mino's (2001, 2007) conviction that communication instructors ought to make a pedagogical shift from an instructional to a learning paradigm also reinforces a focus on the relevancy and clear application of theoretical constructs. Specifically, in order to demonstrate communication competence, students must learn theories and apply the specific communication skills the theories demand.

Over the years, in order to assist students in understanding communication competencies, two key constructs, rhetorical sensitivity and communication competence, have been examined in the communication literature. These constructs are typically the implicit or explicit focus in communication classrooms.

Rhetorical Sensitivity and Communication Competence

Hart and Burke (1972) asserted that the rhetorical approach "considers communication as a means to an end, the end being effective persuasion" (p. 75); thus, it "best promises to facilitate communication and effect social cohesion" (p. 75). They also defined "rhetoric in action" (p. 76) by offering characteristics of rhetorical sensitivity. Furthermore, in order to expound on this construct, Hart, Eadie, and Carlson (1975) shared the attitudes and behaviors associated with the highly rhetorically sensitive individual.[1] However, even though these communication scholars have described the characteristics, attitudes, and behaviors that comprise rhetorical sensitivity, they did not recommend behavioral guidelines. Therefore, when operationalizing it, communication educators have been left to their own devices.

Based on his sociolinguistic research, Hymes (1972; see also, Hymes, 1970 citation in Hart et al., 1975) initiated communication competence. He believed that this notion was based on "two things: knowledge (tacit) and (ability for) use" (Hymes, 1972, p. 282). As Hart and his coauthors (1975) expected, communication scholars have focused significant attention on communication competence. Wiemann and Backlund (1980) extended Hymes's (1972) notion of this concept by contending that, when operationalizing it, communicators must demonstrate both knowledge and skills. Since communication competence's inception, communication researchers have studied it consistently.[2] Besides providing evidence that supported previous research on communication competence, Duran and Spitzberg (1995) proposed its cognitive components consist of "planning, presence, modeling, reflection, and consequence cognitions" (p. 270). Their explanation appears to be the best attempt to assist in operationalizing the behaviors associated with this construct for communication educators.

With regard to rhetorical sensitivity and communication competence, highly rhetorically sensitive communicators bring certain attitudes to communication settings. These attitudes constructively inform communicators' behaviors while they interact with others. As a result, rhetorical sensitivity leads to more successful communication outcomes. Based on these effective

communication outcomes, rhetorical sensitivity can be perceived as intrinsic to the study and practice of communication competence, and communication competence can be viewed as fundamental to understanding better the behavioral skills that constitute rhetorical sensitivity.

Despite the communication literature's emphasis on communication behaviors and skills when discussing rhetorical sensitivity and communication competence, no well-defined guidelines or systematic approaches clearly operationalize these communication constructs and about which communication educators agree have been offered. That is, while the communication discipline has focused on the importance of effectively demonstrating the behavioral characteristics or skills that exhibit communication competencies, for the most part, communication educators have depended on informational pedagogical approaches that rely primarily on sharing communication theories and research results. An emphasis on behaviors and skills is important especially now since the communication discipline is under pressure to demonstrate communication competencies and quantify, through assessment, student proficiency when applying them (see, specifically, Morreale, Backlund, Hay, & Moore, 2011; Spitzberg, 2011). One important question for communication professionals then is "How do communication educators translate rhetorical sensitivity's or communication competence's theoretical frameworks in ways that make significant positive differences in students' performance gains?"

Skills Training Approaches

"The function of adjusting ideas to people and of people to ideas" (Bryant, 1953, p. 413) is a fundamental concept when learning and applying communication competencies. Adjusting one's communication has been viewed as particularly important in day-to-day interactions during which conversational turn-taking occurs. For instance, Holba (2010) described one of Robert T. Oliver's contributions to the communication discipline by reviewing his connection between the study of conversation and rhetoric's relationship to communication competence. As she noted, "Oliver has suggested conversation is the key to understanding human nature, which includes human motivation among other things" (p. 56; see also, Oliver, 1961a). Further, according to Holba (2010, p. 57), "Oliver (1961b) made a practical application for the use of conversational rules . . . when he suggested that rules are needed for sociability, that is, getting along with others, but more so because '[g]ood conversation is a meeting of the minds, either in combat or consort, for jousting or for jest' (p. 22)."

In short, rules or guidelines related to or for understanding specifically how to apply appropriate communication competencies are not a new idea; they have been viewed as an important rhetorical consideration for achieving communication competence. Specifically, rules or guidelines comprise skills training approaches. These approaches are successful when helping students understand the significance of learning communication competencies and applying them effectively.

The Reticence Training Program

One striking example of an extremely effective skills training approach is Gerald M. Phillips's Reticence Training Program. This program, housed at The Pennsylvania State University, applies two skills training approaches, Rhetoritherapy (Phillips, 1968)[3] and Oral Interpretation Skills Training (Mino, 1981). [4] These skills training approaches are designed to help reticent students, those individuals who believe they can gain more by remaining silent than they can by participating, improve their communication competencies. Primarily, The Reticence Training Program effectively integrates several interdisciplinary models to decrease reticent students' anxieties about speaking in public and to increase their performance gains.

When assessing The Reticent Training Program's helpfulness regarding Rhetoritherapy and the Oral Interpretation Skills Training Approach, reticent students believed rehearsing and delivering a public speech and an oral interpretation selection were most helpful, goal analysis was consistently helpful, practice was more helpful than instruction, and the instructor's caring and support were instrumental (Keaton, Kelly, & Finch, 2003). On the whole, these skills training approaches have proven to result in perceived and actual positive gains in students' communication competencies.

The Relationship Enhancement (RE) Approach

Although incorporating skills training is a successful approach for communication instruction, surprisingly, beyond the approaches employed in the Reticence Training Program, no other communication skills training approaches that are beneficial for all students have received significant attention. However, the Relationship Enhancement (RE) Approach is defined as an efficient and valid approach when teaching individuals how to communicate. Similar to Rhetoritherapy, which relies on cognitive restructuring, behavioral modification, and the instructional model in its design, the RE Approach not only is based on the "special strengths" of the "psychodynamic, humanistic, behavioral, and interpersonal schools of psychotherapy" (Guerney 1990, p. 117) but also is grounded predominately in the educational model (Guerney, 1977; 1984, 1985).

When teaching the RE Approach's skills, a systematic instructional process is employed. This process includes clearly explaining the approach's nine basic skills; illustrating how to apply each skill; consistently employing exercises that include logs, goal setting, goal implementation, goal reports, and role plays for practice and for use in real life to practice the skills regularly; facilitating the skills both individually and as a whole; and consistently evaluating how effectively each skill is applied.[5]

Through the RE Approach's instructional process, students constantly examine their views about communication and their specific positive and negative communication patterns. During these self-assessments and while practicing their skills, students recognize they can successfully replace ineffective communication behaviors with effective ones. They experience how fully comprehending and applying these skills proficiently affects their personal and professional interactions directly and positively. Consequently, students become motivated to continue to improve their communication skills. At the end of this instruction, they experience considerable communication gains.

Extensive empirical and descriptive research has examined the RE Approach's pedagogical effectiveness. Specifically, this research has confirmed that RE Skills can be used successfully by any communicator in virtually every situational context (Guerney, 1984). Ginsberg (2004) has reinforced that the RE Approach is an extremely effective and a consistently "versatile" approach (p. 230). Studies that have examined learning and using this approach have verified repeatedly its significance in improving individuals 'communication competencies.[6] As research has indicated, the RE Approach is extremely beneficial when the instructional goal is to attain significant positive communication outcomes.

Relationship Enhancement (RE) Skills

The heart of the RE Approach consists of learning and applying its nine basic skills. Guerney (1989) offers an overview of these skills which include Empathic (Listening), Expressive (Speaking), Discussion-Negotiation (Conversing), Problem-Conflict Resolution, Self-Change, Helping Others Change, Teaching or Facilitation, Generalization, and Maintenance. In order for communication educators to understand these skills and their specific connection to communication competencies, each skill is described in turn.

1. The Empathic (Listening) Skill. The Empathic Skill is described first to emphasize listening's crucial role in the oral communication process. It also illustrates for students how to understand better the needs of others and results in more immediate, frequent, honest, significant, and intimate communication behaviors from others. By using this skill, students learn to gain a deeper understanding of and respect for another person's perspectives in terms of his or her thoughts, opinions, intentions, views, and aspirations.

In order to empathically respond effectively, students learn to improve their listening ability by putting themselves in the speaker's place and taking his or her position concerning a person or situation. First, the empathic responder listens attentively to the speaker, focuses on his or her mood, and assesses how he or she is feeling about the subject being described. The empathic responder also asks himself or herself several questions, such as "What would I be thinking?" "What would I be feeling?" "What would I want?" "What would I consider doing?" "What conflicts would I be experiencing?" Based on these questions, the speaker formulates an accurate empathic response.

At the same time, the empathic responder focuses predominately on what the speaker has not said in so many words and, rather than restating the exact word(s) the speaker used to share his or her thoughts, the empathic responder substitutes his or her own words to share with the speaker his or her conflicts, wishes, feelings, thoughts, or what he or she does or does not want to do. This information also is communicated by the empathic responder declaratively and expressively through the appropriate nonverbal cues. These cues reflect the speaker's state of mind concerning the subject being discussed. Finally, the empathic responder does not have to agree with a speaker's communication content but must make it clear to the speaker that his or her viewpoint or perceptions are understood.

In order to assess the quality of the empathic response, the speaker must acknowledge that the empathic responder has recognized and values the speaker's feelings. If the speaker makes any corrections concerning his or her feelings or any other perceptions, views, desires, wishes, or conflicts that are communicated, the empathic responder must accept the empathic responder's corrections immediately and without reservation and provide the appropriate empathic response that makes the applicable changes needed to capture these feelings.

2. The Expressive (Speaking) Skill. This skill helps "expressers" or speakers communicate with others by subjectively and assertively sharing their views, perceptions, conflicts, or problems more promptly, positively, and with less anxiety in relation to their own views, goals, and needs. Specifically, the Expressive Skill enables students to clarify their perceptions by sharing them in ways that avoid defensiveness, anxiety, conflict, and hostility, resulting instead in mutual understanding and cooperation.

The student learns how to be specific about his or her feelings concerning a person or situation without making value judgments, such as "a good friend would be ….," without using generalizations, like "you do this all the time" or "you never ….," or without employing negative terms related to character, personality, or motives like, "you are unhealthy, messy, immoral, lazy, or abnormal." Instead, statements are conveyed based on the expresser's subjective perceptions, wishes, memories, and feelings about behaviors, for example, "In my view, when you ….," "I would appreciate it if you ….," "In the past, I remember you ….," or "I am unhappy when you …." Moreover, at the earliest possible time, the speaker should state his or her positive and relevant feelings, assumptions, and attitudes that are significant to the issue and share clearly what the expresser wants the other to do, how this behavior would make the speaker feel, and what benefits to the relationship would result.

3. The Discussion-Negotiation (Conversing) Skill. The Discussion-Negotiation Skill teaches and fosters effective conversational turn-taking. Specifically, both the speaker and the listener are viewed as equal conversational partners. This skill enables students to maintain the most positive emotional climate when communicating their views, problems, or conflicts; to avoid needless or detrimental digressions; and to bring discussions quickly to the individuals' core issues.

This skill also describes specific guidelines and cues for "mode switching" or understanding the appropriate times in the conversation to become the expresser (speaker) or the empathic responder (listener). First, either the speaker or the listener may request a mode switch. Second, before becoming the speaker, the listener must provide an empathic response. Third, the speaker must approve the quality and accuracy of the empathic response.

Mode switching cues are implemented (1) when either the speaker or the listener is experiencing significantly stronger emotions (especially negative ones) that must be expressed immediately; (2) when the speaker has communicated all of his or her most important thoughts, feelings, or suggestions for resolving an issue, or when he or she wants to know the listener's views, beliefs, or suggestions concerning the subject of discussion; (3) when the listener, through an empathic response, has accurately communicated the speaker's deepest feelings about an issue; (4) when the listener's thoughts or feelings about the issue interfere in any way with his or her ability to be empathic; or (5) when the listener can share additional information that has the potential to affect positively the speaker's perceptions about an issue or to help resolve a problem.

4. The Problem-Conflict Resolution Skill. The Problem-Conflict Resolution Skill teaches students how to apply effective Discussion-Negotiation Skills to resolve specific issues. In short, students learn to discuss their own and others' conflicts or problems and to work out creative solutions that maximize mutual need and gratification, and, consequently, are likely to be the most realistic and enduring.

Initially, both the speaker and the listener have the opportunity to decide whether they need more time to consider the problem or whether it can be discussed immediately. If either person needs to consider the problem for a longer time period, a specific date and time in the near future at which to meet and to engage in the problem-solving process is negotiated.

Primarily, the Problem-Conflict Resolution Skill helps students learn to express their most significant feelings regarding an issue, to describe their perceptions about a problem, and to suggest a feasible solution or solutions. Using Expressive, Empathic, and Discussion-Negotiation Skills, the Problem-Conflict Resolution Skill teaches students to best meet their needs and the needs of the person or persons involved in the problem-solving process by employing creativity and by avoiding a short term or a quick fix remedy, but rather by agreeing on the practical solution that will work for both parties over time.

Further, the Problem-Conflict Resolution Skill helps the student learn to avoid negative attitudes or generalities and to plan specific behaviors or suggest agreed upon reminders about who will do what, how often, when, and where. Additionally, both parties consider if reminders would be useful and, if so, use them to describe specifically who will do the reminding and under which circumstances they are most appropriate. Moreover, any exceptional circumstances are defined under which it would be difficult to follow the agreement. These exceptions are discussed and the any changes are negotiated. Finally, a specific appointment time is scheduled in the near future to allow both individuals to evaluate realistically whether the solution(s) is feasible and solve(s) the problem or if any modifications are necessary to meet better both individuals' needs.

5. The Self-Changing Skill. The Self-Changing Skill enables students to apply Discussion-Negotiation and Problem-Solution Skills by making an agreement with another that helps the student implement simple or more difficult changes in his or her attitudes, feelings, or behaviors in

order to accomplish a personal goal. Self-changing is defined as a gradual process and considers mistakes and errors as part of the learning experience. That is, communication "misfires" present the student with opportunities for reflection, analysis, and improvement.

Expressive skills are employed to gain another person's active help and support in the self-changing process and to offer reminders about the desired behavioral change. The student who is making the change must avoid becoming defensive or making excuses when the individual helping with that personal change offers the agreed-upon reminders. Expressive skills are emphasized as a means of communicating positive feelings about the other, who helps the student to change; to show appreciation for the assistance offered during the self-changing process; to emphasize to the person helping the importance of providing positive reinforcement; and to assist the person helping make the most skilled positive expressive statement as the student works toward achieving his or her desired goal. If the student does not make progress during the self-changing process, Discussion-Negotiation is used to reevaluate the goal and agreed upon adjustments are implemented to help accomplish the student's objective.

6. The Helping-Others Change Skill. By implementing Discussion-Negotiation and Problem-Solving Skills, the Helping-Others Change Skills aids in learning to assist others with whom students have a minor or major issue or problem make simple or more difficult changes in their attitudes, feelings, or behaviors so that interpersonal agreements and objectives can be implemented effectively.

Applying the Problem-Conflict Resolution Skill leads to a firm and clear verbal agreement. The student employs his or her Discussion-Negotiation Skills to specify the nature and circumstances of any agreed-upon reminders. Reminders are not viewed as irritations or criticisms; instead, they are defined as helpful suggestions that enable the student to achieve his or her goal. Expressive Skills are used to "catch the other being good" or to assist the person involved in the helping-other change process share his or her frustrations or disappointments. Praise is used as reinforcement that encourages both parties to continue to work toward the desired goal. If either person fails to make the desired changes that are negotiated, the goal is reevaluated.

7. The Teaching or Facilitation Skill. The Teaching or Facilitation Skill helps students learn to monitor themselves and others and to apply RE Skills effectively during their daily interactions. Facilitation Skills enable students to modify for the better their own or others' speaking and listening behaviors. This skill encourages students to follow RE guidelines and to apply these communication skills most effectively through consistent demonstration and reinforcement.

8. The Generalization Skill. The Generalization Skill helps students train themselves to integrate all of the RE skills regularly and consciously in order to communicate most effectively in their daily lives. Students observe others in a variety of communication contexts. In these situations, they evaluate whether or not the skills were applied, how effectively they were used, or, if the skills were not implemented, students assess whether or not applying the skills would have affected in any way the communication outcomes.

The student also applies the skills in a variety of places and circumstances to analyze and strengthen his or her skills. Mistakes are viewed as a means of reflection and learning in order to avoid making the same errors in future communication encounters. Reminders, such as notes or a repositioned object at home or at work, help the student remember to practice RE, to apply the skills, and to implement goal setting and goal implementation to enrich relationships. In addition, the student anticipates circumstances when RE skills can and should be used and plans to use the skills in these situations, assesses daily how well he or she employed the skills, and evaluates where,

when, or how the skills could have been applied to prevent a conflict, to solve a problem, to share ideas, or to enhance a relationship.

9. The Maintenance Skill. The Maintenance Skill teaches students the importance of applying all of the skills over time. This skill emphasizes for students that effective oral communication is an ongoing lifelong learning process. Students regularly monitor their RE skills, continue to appreciate the benefits of using the skills, persist in planning and rehearsing the skills, ask others to help monitor skills, and consistently review and apply RE in all contexts as a continual part of the communication process.

RE's Pedagogical Implications for Communication Educators

Rhetorical sensitivity, communication competence, and Relationship Enhancement are comparable in their foci on describing the appropriate attitudes, knowledge, and behaviors that reflect communication competencies. However, only RE offers explicit skills that demonstrate each communication construct in practice. Thus, RE has pedagogical value for communication educators.

At first glance, communication instructors may define the RE Approach as most appropriate for or relevant when teaching interpersonal or family communication courses. Most obviously, RE can be designed and offered as an interpersonal communication skills training course that focuses exclusively on learning and applying RE Skills. Additionally, in the typical interpersonal or family communication course, the instructor can integrate one or more RE skills to explain, to reinforce, or to apply these courses' concepts, thus clarifying how to communicate interpersonally more effectively.

However, RE Skills also can be integrated pedagogically in a variety of other communication courses. Specifically, instructors can include a RE Skill or Skills as a unit of study, a discussion point, or an application method.[7] For example, the RE Approach's Empathic, Expressive, Discussion-Negotiation, and/or Problem-Conflict Resolution Skills can provide ways to assist in operationalizing rhetorical sensitivity. Thus, students of rhetoric can better appreciate this concept and can experience rhetorically sensitive behaviors in action.

In the basic public speaking course, usually the only oral communication course in which students enroll unless they are communication studies majors or minors, (Mino, 2007), RE Skills can be employed to emphasize for students communication competence's significance. For example, RE's Empathic Skill reinforces the importance of listening in the communication process and demonstrates the effective behaviors associated with it. The basic course instructor also can connect how communication competence's and the RE Approach's components are directly related to learning presentational speaking skills. In turn, the instructor can describe how communication competencies, which are reflected in the RE Approach's Expressive, Empathic and Discussion-Negotiation Skills, are consistently employed in day-to-day interactions.

Further, the RE Approach can be used to underscore for basic course students that solving problems occurs constantly, that effective persuasion requires communication skills, and that having these skills (Problem-Solving and Helping Self and Other Change Skills) and using them well are essential. RE Skills can be employed to reinforce the significance of pre-, immediate, ongoing, and post-audience analysis and each concept's important role in learning effective presentational speaking. At the same time, the instructor can connect for students, through RE's Generalization and Maintenance Skills, the crucial role audience analysis plays in students' daily lives. Particularly, instructors can discuss how analyzing and adapting to listeners are critical communication competencies during each oral communication encounter; they can emphasize that employing audience analysis and adaptation is an ongoing lifelong learning process.

Moreover, one or all of the RE Skills can be shared by instructors in other courses where the instructional objectives include communication competencies, such as learning to listen effectively (Empathic Skill), sharing viewpoints successfully (Expressive, Empathic, and Discussion Negotiation Skills), helping the self or the other change his or her perspective or behavior positively (Helping Self or Other Changing Skills), discussing and/or negotiating productively the types of changes desired (Discussion-Negotiation Skill), or finding the most constructive solutions for minor or major conflicts (Problem-Solution Skill). Thus, instructors who teach courses in discussion and negotiation, persuasion, group, intercultural, organizational, and gender communication, for example, can benefit from integrating some or all of the RE Approach into that particular communication course.

In all, by defining RE as one approach that teaches effective oral communication skills, and by integrating one or more RE Skills in order to operationalize either rhetorical sensitivity or communication competence, or both, instructors can be more specific concerning each construct's purpose, usefulness, and value. This additional clarity on the part of instructors not only can translate for students into a comprehensive understanding of communication competencies both in theory and in practice but also can result in a greater potential for them to exhibit significant positive performance gains. Subsequently, these student performance gains can be reported as successful assessment outcomes and confirm communication study's significance for university administration.

Conclusion

Rhetorical sensitivity, communication competence, and the Relationship Enhancement Approach have all centered on improving oral communication. One of the goals of Hart and Burke's (1972) concept of rhetorical sensitivity was to bridge the research in the area of rhetoric (typically the domain of the "public") to the interpersonal realm. Humans are "rhetorical creatures" when they interact with others. Rather than viewing the goals of oral communication through the lens of "skills training," Hart et al. (1975) advocated seeing how an individual could be "sensitive" to the other by creating reciprocity. Therefore, it appears, the RE Approach, as the literature describes it, promotes reciprocity much in the same way. Like rhetorical sensitivity, communication competence describes the attitudes, the behaviors, and the skills necessary when sharing ideas and emphasizes adapting to listeners while doing so. The RE Approach also teaches the communication components both of these concepts convey. However, unlike rhetorical sensitivity and communication competence, this approach translates these components into practical application.

Since teaching communication competencies effectively is a communication educator's primary goal and institutional assessment determines largely how well this goal is achieved, exploring pedagogical approaches that can increase students' positive performance outcomes must be an instructional priority. Integrating the RE Approach into communication studies can produce two desired results, (1) improving students' understanding of communication competencies and (2) better assisting students when demonstrating explicitly how to apply them. Thus, when placed in a communication professional's hands, the RE Approach has the potential to contribute significantly to communication studies in ways that enhance communication instruction and strengthen assessment outcomes. Accordingly, this approach can benefit communication educators, their students, and the discipline. At the same time, sharing the RE Approach with communication professionals has the potential to result in additional research contributions in the areas in which this approach has been examined previously. Therefore, at the very least, the RE Approach deserves communication professionals' thoughtful attention.

Notes

[1] Hart and Burke (1972) viewed a rhetorically sensitive person as one who:

> (1) tries to take role-taking as part of the human condition, (2) attempts to avoid stylized human verbal behavior, (3) is characteristically willing to undergo the strain of adaptation, (4) seeks to distinguish between all information and information acceptable for communication, and, (5) tries to understand that an idea can be rendered in multi-formed ways. (pp. 75-76)

In their essay, "Rhetorical Sensitivity and Communication Competence," Hart, Eadie, and Carlson (1975) described rhetorical sensitivity as "a way of viewing the world of human interaction, a mindset that some of us apply to our everyday communication decisions." (p. 4).They also recognized that "the development of a method of assessing rhetorical sensitivity would contribute in important ways to the study of communication competence" (p. 8). Consequently, their development of and their research related to the "RHETSEN scale" which discriminated "between highly sensitive and highly insensitive individuals" (p. 7), resulted in a more comprehensive definition of rhetorical sensitivity and the attitudes and behaviors associated with it.

[2] Some scholars have examined communication competence's specific behavioral components (Almeida, 2004; Canary & Spitzberg, 1987; Coker & Burgoon, 1987; Duran & Spitzburg, 1995; McCroskey, 1982, 2007; Milhouse, 1993; Spitzberg, 1991; Spitzberg & Cupach, 1984, 1989; Weimann & Backland, 1980) while other researchers have examined primarily its cognitive dimensions (Coker & Burgoon, 1987; Milhouse, 1993; Spitzberg & Cupach, 1984, 1989). Canary and McGregor Istley (2008) and Spitzberg (1991, 2006) have not only discussed knowledge and skills when describing communication competence but also have considered the effects of the communicator's motivation.

[3] Rhetoritherapy (Phillips, 1968, 1980; Phillips & Sokoloff, 1979), which incorporates cognitive structuring and behavioral modification techniques, helps reticent students understand communication competencies and apply them (See also, Kelly, 1989; Kelly & Keaton, 1992; Keaton, Kelly, & Finch, 2000, 2003; Kelly, Phillips, & Keaton, 1995). Reticent students learn that, regardless of their degree of anxiety, they must communicate well in order to achieve their personal and professional goals.

This approach teaches students to view communication as a rhetorical act that focuses primarily on invention, disposition, style, memory, and delivery. Students employ these canons to learn how to select, to organize, to develop, and to deliver the messages that give them the most difficulty sharing and that they want to and need to communicate effectively. These students receive considerable additional help from the instructor preparing their specific communication goals, such as greeting and making small talk with a person they want to get to know better or asking an important question in a class. Reticent students plan carefully specific communication goals, and, when ready, execute and report on them. The outcomes of these goals are shared with the instructor through goal reports and instructional feedback for improvement is provided. In short, through Rhetoritherapy, students learn to replicate effective oral communication skills in a variety of personal and professional contexts.

[4] Since reticent students typically experience higher levels of anxiety when thinking about, preparing for, or delivering a speech than do average basic course students, becoming less anxious and more effective presenters also are important components of The Reticence Training Program. In 1980, Mary Mino initiated The Oral Interpretation Skills Training Approach for the program (Mino, 1981). This skills training approach relies on the educational model. The approach teaches students basic oral interpretation techniques, such as focus, locus, and placement. Students select the poetry or prose they will practice, learn oral interpretation skills, and rehearse their selections. During rehearsals, the instructor focuses on improving students' vocal and physical delivery. In addition, practicing and performing these selections allow students to share someone else's ideas while speaking in public before delivering their own speeches.

When evaluating the effectiveness of this approach, there were two significant findings. First, the improved vocal and physical cues students learn while practicing and presenting their oral interpretation selections are often transferred when these students deliver their own speaking assignments. Second, reticent students' self-reports indicated performing their oral interpretation selections before their speeches decreased their anxieties when they delivered them (Mino 1989).

[5] For example, RE Skills have been employed with family members (Coufal & Brock, 1979; Ginsberg, 1977, 1995, 2004; Ginsberg & Vogelsong, 1977; Grando & Ginsberg, 1976; Guerney, 1982, 1983; Guerney, 1988; Guerney & Guerney, 1988; Guerney, Guerney, & Cooney, 1985; Morello & Factor, 1980; Ridley, Avery, Harrell, Leslie, & Dent, 1981; Ridley & Bain, 1983; Vogelsong, 1978), students (Waldo, 1981, 1984, 1985, 1989), unmarried and married couples (Gibin, Sprenkle, & Sheehan, 1985; Jesse & Guerney, 1981; Rapport, 1976; Snyder & Guerney, 1993) and executives, staff members, and clients (Accordino & Guerney, 1993; Guerney, Guerney, & Sebes, 1984; Waldo & Harman, 1993). When individuals communicate about divorce (Avery & Thiessen, 1982; Guerney & Jordon, 1980; Thiessen, Avery, & Joanning, 1980), drugs and alcohol (Matter, McAllister, & Guerney, 1984; Waldo & Guerney, 1983), and violence

(Guerney, Waldo, & Firestone, 1987; Waldo, 1988), the RE Approach also has been studied and substantiated. However, the RE Approach's effectiveness is supported most strongly in award-winning meta-analytic research study that involved more than three thousand couples and over a dozen approaches. Empirical studies of the maintenance of individual gains found over the time periods examined revealed far greater improvement with the RE approach than with any of the other approaches studied (Gibin, Sprenkle, & Sheehan, 1985).

[6] For a more detailed explanation of the exercises included when employing the RE Approach, see the forthcoming chapter: M. Mino, Relationship Enhancement, (RE) as an approach for improving health and wellness, attaining interpersonal gratification, and communicating positively. In M. Pitts & T.J. Socha (Eds.), *Positive communication in health and wellness* (Vols. 1-2). New York: Peter Lang Publishing/USA.

[7] Because communication instructors are familiar with trying a variety of approaches in the classroom, studying and understanding the descriptions of RE Skills and employing this approach by incorporating RE Skills Training into communication study can be accomplished successfully with practice. Since instructors are familiar with the appropriate course content for their specific communication subject areas, the information for pedagogical applications should cause no difficulty. However, instructors who want more information about the RE Approach or its skills can contact the National Institute of Relationship Enhancement (NIRE, www.nire.org). Here, communication educators can learn more about the approach or find a RE Program Leader near their academic institution from whom to request assistance when discussing and/or integrating RE.

References

Accordino, M. P., & Guerney, B. J., Jr. (1993). Effects of Relationship Enhancement on community residential rehabilitation staff and clients. *Psychosocial Rehabilitation Journal. 17*, 131-144.

Almeida, E. P. (2004). A discourse analysis of student perceptions of their communication competence. *Communication Education*, *53*, 357-364.

Avery, A. W., & Thiessen, J. D. (1982). Communication skills training for divorcees. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1*, 203-205.

Braten, I., & Olaussen, B. S. (2005). Profiling individual differences in student motivation: A longitudinal cluster-analytic study in different academic contexts. *Contemporary Educational Psychology*, *30*, 359-396.

Bryant, D. C. (1953). Rhetoric: Its function and its scope. *Quarterly Journal of Speech, 39,* 401-424.

Canary, D., & MacGregor Istley, M. (2008). Differences that make a difference in assessing student communication competence. *Communication Education*, *57*, 41-63.

Canary, D. J., & Spitzberg, B. H. (1987). Appropriateness and effectiveness perceptions of conflict strategies. *Human Communication Research, 14*, 93-118.

Coker, D. A., & Burgoon, J. K. (1987). Trait vs. state: A comparison of dispositional and situation measures of interpersonal communication competence. *Western Journal of Communication, 47*, 364-379.

Coufal, J. D., & Brock, G. W. (1979). *Parent-child relationship enhancement: A skills training approach.* In N. Stinnett, B. Chesser, & J. Defrain (Eds.), Building family strengths: Blueprint for action (Vol. 2), London: University of Nebraska Press.

Duran, R. L., & Spitzberg, B. H. (1995). Toward the development and validation of a measure of cognitive communication competence. *Communication Quarterly, 43*, 259-275.

Frymier, A. B (2005). Students' classroom communication effectiveness. *Communication Quarterly, 53*, 197-212.

Frymier, A. B., & Shulman, G. M. (1995). What's in it for me? Increasing content relevance to enhance students' motivation. *Communication Education*, *44*, 40-50.

Gibin, P., Sprenkle, D. H., & Sheehan, R. (1985). Enrichment outcome research: A meta-analysis of premarital, marital, and family interventions. *Journal of Marital and Family Therapy, 11*, 257-271.

Ginsberg, B. G. (1977). Parent-adolescent relationship development program. In B.G. Guerney, Jr. (Ed.), *Relationship Enhancement: Skills training programs for therapy, problem prevention, and enrichment* (pp. 227-267). San Francisco, CA: Jossey Bass.

Ginsberg, B. G. (1995). Parent-Adolescent Relationship Program (PARD): Relationship Enhancement Therapy with adolescents and their families (fathers and sons). *Psychotherapy, 32*, 108-112.

Ginsberg, B. G. (2004). *Relationship Enhancement family therapy*: Relationship Enhancement Press: Doylestown, PA.

Ginsberg, B. G., & Vogelsong, E. L. (1977). Premarital relationship improvement by maximizing empathy and self-disclosure: The PRIMES program. In Guerney, Jr. (Ed.), *Relationship Enhancement: Skills training programs for therapy, problem prevention, and enrichment* (pp. 268-287). San Francisco CA: Jossey Bass.

Grando, R., & Ginsberg, B. G. (1976). Communication in the father-son relationship: The Parent Adolescent Relationship Development Program. *The Family Coordinator, 4*, 465-473.

Guerney, B. G., Jr. (1977). *Relationship Enhancement: Skills Training programs for therapy, problem prevention, and enrichment.* San Francisco, CA: Jossey Bass.

Guerney, B. G., Jr. (1982). Relationship Enhancement. In E. K. Marshall & P.D. Kurtz (Eds.), *Interpersonal helping skills.* San Francisco, CA: Jossey Bass.

Guerney, B. G., Jr. (1983). Marital and family Relationship Enhancement therapy. In P. Keller & L. Ritt (Eds.*), Innovations in clinical practice: A sourcebook,* (Vol. III), (pp. 40-53). Sarasota Florida: Professional Resource Exchange.

Guerney, B. G., Jr. (1984). Relationship Enhancement Therapy and training. In D. Larson (Ed.), Teaching psychological skills: *Models for giving psychology away* (pp. 99-134). Beverly Hills CA: Sage.

Guerney, B. G. Jr. (1985). The medical vs. the educational model as a base for family therapy research. In L .L. Andreozzi, & R. F. Levant (Eds.), *Integrating research and clinical practice.*(pp. 71-79). Rockville MD: Aspen Systems Corporation.

Guerney, B. G., Jr. (1988). Family Relationship Enhancement: A skills training approach. In L.A. Bond & B. M. Wagner (Eds.*), Families in transition: Primary prevention programs that work* (pp. 99-134).Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications.

Guerney, B. G., Jr. (1989*). Relationship Enhancement manual.* State College, PA: IDEALS.

Guerney, B. G., Jr. (1990). Creating therapy and growth inducing systems: Personal mooring, landmarks and guiding stars. In F. W. Kaslow (Ed.), *Voices in family psychology.* (pp.114-138). Newbury Park: Sage Publications.

Guerney, B. G., Jr., & Guerney, L. (1988). Building relationship enhancement in family and parafamily teams. In D.H. Olsen, (Ed.), *Family perspectives in child and youth services* (pp. 49-64). Binghamton, NY: The Haworth Press, Inc.

Guerney, B. G., Jr., Guerney, L., & Cooney, T. (1985). Marital and family problem prevention and enrichment programs. In L. L'Abate (Ed.), *Handbook of family psychology and therapy* (pp.1179-1217). Homewood IL: The Dorsey Press.

Guerney, B. G., Jr., Guerney, L., & Sebes, J. M. (1984). Promoting family wellness through the educational system. In R .D. Mace (Ed), *Preventing in family services: Family wellness* (pp. 214-230). Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publication.

Guerney, B. G., Jr., & Jordon, L. (1980). Children of divorce—A community support group. *Journal of Divorce, 2*, 283-293.

Guerney, B. G., Jr., Waldo, M., & Firestone, L. (1987). Wife-battering: A theoretical construct and case report. *The American Journal of Family Therapy, 15*, 34-43.

Guidelines for developing oral communication curriculum in kindergarten through twelfth grade. (1991). Annandale, Virginia: Speech Communication Association.

Guidelines for developing oral communication curriculum in kindergarten through twelfth grade. (2007). Washington, D. C.: National Communication Association.

Hart, R. P., & Burke, D. M. (1972). Communication and social interaction. *Communication Monographs, 39,* 75-91.

Hart, R. P., Edie, W., & Carlson, R. (1975). Rhetorical sensitivity and communication competency, 1-43. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Speech Communication Association. Retrieved at Educational Research Information Center (ERIC), www.eric.ed.gov.

Holba, A. M. (2010). Motivation, conversation, and interiority: Robert T. Oliver points to communication and leisure. *The Pennsylvania Scholars Series,* 52-65.

Hymes, D. M. (1970). On communication competence. Philadelphia. Cited in Hart, R. P., Edie, W., & Carlson, R. (1975).

Hymes, D. M. (1972). On communication competence. In J.B. Pride & J. Holmes (Eds.), *Sociolinguistics* (pp. 269-294). NY: Penguin Books.

Jesse R., & Guerney, B. G., Jr. (1981). A comparison of Gestalt and Relationship Enhancement treatments with married couples. *The American Journal of Family Therapy, 9,* 31-41.

Keaton, J. A., Kelly, L., & Finch, C. (2000). Effectiveness of the Penn State Reticence Program in changing beliefs associated with reticence. *Communication Education, 49,* 134-145.

Keaton, J. A., Kelly, L., & Finch C. (2003). Students' perceptions of the helpfulness of The Pennsylvania State University's Reticence Program components. *Communication Research Reports, 20*, 151-160.

Kelly, L. (1989). Implementing a skills training approach for reticent communicators. *Communication Education, 38*, 85-101.

Kelly, L., Duran, R. L., & Stewart, J. (1990). Rhetoritherapy revisited: A test of its effectiveness as a treatment for communication problems. *Communication Education, 39*, 207-226.

Kelly L., & Keaton, J. A. (1992). A test of the effectiveness of the Reticence Program at The Pennsylvania State University. *Communication Education, 41*, 361-374.

Kelly, L., Phillips, G. M., & Keaton, J. A. (1995). *Teaching people to speak well: Training and remediation of communication reticence.* Cresskill NJ: Hampton Press.

Matter, M., McAllister, W., & Guerney, B. J., Jr. (1984). Relationship enhancement for the recovering couple: Working with the intangible. *Focus on Family and Chemical Dependency, 7,* 21-40.

McCrosky, J. C. (1982). Communication competence and performance: A research and pedagogical perspective. *Communication Education, 31*, 1-7.

McCroskey, J. C. (2007). Raising the question #8 assessment: Is it just measurement? *Communication Education, 56,* 509-514.

Milhouse, V. H. (1993). The applicability of interpersonal communication competence to the intercultural communication context. In R. L. Wiseman & J. Koester (Eds.), *Intercultural communication competence* (pp.184-204). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Mino, M. (1981). Oral reading as a prelude to public speaking for reticent students. 1-20. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the International Communication Association.

Mino, M. (1989). Communication in the basic course: Implementing oral interpretation as a skills training approach to reticence. *The Pennsylvania Speech Communication Annual,* 75-84.

Mino, M. (2001). Shifting from an instructional to a learning paradigm: Some suggestions for instructors. *Qualitative Research Reports in Communication, 2,* 14-23.

Mino, M. (2007). I already learned how to talk: Why do I need a communication course?" In L.W. Hugenberg, S. Morreale, B. Hugenberg, & D.A. Worley (Eds.), *Basic Communication Course Best Practices: A Training Manual For Instructors* (pp . 9-24). Dubuque IA: Kendall/Hunt Publishing Company.

Morello, P. A., & Factor, D. C. (1980). An educational approach to family therapy: The parent-adolescent relationship development program. *The Ontario Psychologist, 12,* 7-11.

Morreale, S., Backlund, P., Hay, E., & Moore M. (2011). Assessment of oral communication: A major review of the historical development and trends in the movement from 1975 to 2009. *Communication Education, 60,* 255-278.

Morreale, S., Hugenberg, L., & Worley, D. (2006). The basic communication course at U.S. colleges and universities in the 21st century. *Communication Education, 55,* 415-437.

Morreale, S. P., Osborn, M. M., & Pearson, J. C. (2000). Why communication is important: A rationale for the centrality of the study of communication. *Journal of the Association for Communication Administrators, 29,* 1-25.

Morreale, S., Worley, D., & Hugenberg, L. (2009). Follow-up to the NCA basic communication course survey VII: Using learning objectives in the course. *Basic Communication Course Annual, 21,* 91-127.

Oliver, R. T. (1961a). Conversation as a key to the understanding of human behavior. *Today's Speech, 9(3),* 25-28.

Oliver, R. T. (1961b). Conversational rules—Their use and abuse. *Today's Speech, 9(2),* 19-22.

Pearson, J. C., Child, J. T., Herakova, L. L., Semlak, J. L., & Angelos, J. (2010). Competent public speaking: Assessing skill development in the basic course. *Basic Communication Course Annual, 22,* 39-86.

Phillips, G. M. (1968). Reticence: The pathology of the normal speaker. *Speech Monographs, 35,* 39-49.

Phillips, G. M. (1980). On apples and oranges: A reply to Page. *Communication Education, 29,* 105-108.

Phillips, G. M., & Sokoloff, K. (1979). An end to anxiety: Treating speech problems with Rhetoritherapy. *Journal of Communication Disorders, 12,* 385-397.

Rapport, A. F. (1976). Conjugal Relationship Enhancement Program. In D. H. Olsen (Ed.), *Treating relationships* (pp.41-66). Lake Mills, IA: Graphic-Publishing Co., Inc.

Ridley, C. A., Avery, A. W., Harrell, Leslie, L., & Dent, J. D. (1981). Conjugal management: training program in mutual problem solving. *American Journal of Family Therapy, 9,* 23-32.

Ridley C. A., & Bain, A. B. (1983). The effects of premarital Relationship Enhancement on self-disclosure. *Family Therapy, 10,* 13-84.

Snyder, M., & Guerney, B. J., Jr. (1993). Brief couple/family therapy: The Relationship Enhancement Approach. In R. A. Wells & V. J. Granetti (Eds.), *Casebook of brief psychotherapies* (pp.32-48). New York: Plenum Press.

Spitzberg, B. H. (1991). An examination of trait measures of interpersonal competence. *Communication Reports, 4,* 22-29.

Spitzberg, B. H. (2006). Preliminary development of a model and measure of computer-mediated communication (CMC) competence. *Journal of Computer Mediated Communication 11,* 629-666.

Spitzberg, B. H. (2011). The Interactive Media Package for Assessment of Communication and Critical Thinking (IMPACCT). *Communication Education, 60,* 145-173.

Spitzberg, B. H., & Cupach, W. R. (1984). *Interpersonal communication competence.* Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Spitzberg, B. H., & Cupach, W. R., (1989). *Handbook of interpersonal competence research.* NY: Springer.

Thiessen, J., Avery, A. W., &, Joanning, H. (1980). Facilitating post-divorce adjustment through communication skills training. *Journal of Divorce, 4,* 35-44.

Vogelsong, E. L. (1978). Relationship Enhancement Training for children. *Elementary School Guidance and Counseling, 12,* 272-279.

Waldo, M. (1981). Roommate relationships, communication skills, and psychological adjustment in resident halls. *Journal of College and University Student Housing, 11,* 31-35

Waldo, M. (1984). Roommate communication as related to students 'personal and social adjustments. *Journal of College Student Personnel*, 39-44.

Waldo, M. (1985). Improving interpersonal communication in a university residential community. *Humanistic education and development, March*, 126-133.

Waldo, M. (1988). Relationship Enhancement counseling groups for wife abusers. *Journal of Mental Health Counseling, 10*, 37-45.

Waldo, M. (1989). Primary prevention in university residence halls: Paraprofessional-led Relationship Enhancement groups for college roommates. *Journal of Mental Health Consoling, 67*, 465-471.

Waldo, M., & Guerney, B. J., Jr. (1983).Marital Relationship Enhancement Therapy in the treatment of alcoholism. *Journal of Marital and Family Therapy, 9*, 321-323.

Waldo, M., & Harman, M. J. (1993). Relationship Enhancement therapy with borderline personality. *The Family Journal, 9*, 25-30.

Wiemann, J. M., & Backlund, P. (1980). Current theory and research in communication competence. *Review of Educational Research, 50*, 185-199.