

Researched Persuasive Writing and Speaking

Dress Code	Official HOSA uniform or business professional attire			
SLC Orientation	Event explained to the competitors and individual time cards handed of Students will return to the event room at least 5 minutes before their allotted time.			
Round # 1 (Digital Submission of Research Paper)	The research paper should be submitted as a PDF to Montana HOSA by deadline; Number of advancing competitors will be determined by criteria met in Round One and space available for Round Two.			
Round # 2 (The Speech)	 The speech may or may not be worded exactly as written in the researched written paper. The main ideas must remain the same but the competitor may elaborate in the speech. Both the paper and the speech must be on the topic of: "Should GLP-1 agonists have open access for anyone who wishes to use it?" Speech may be up to 4 minutes in length 			
Scoring	Scores from the research paper and the speech will be combined for a total score.			

Event Summary

Researched Persuasive Writing and Speaking allows HOSA members to gain the knowledge and skills required to research a health issue, prepare written documentation supporting a thesis, and present information orally. This competitive event requires competitors to develop a speech and written paper, either for or against the provided annual health topic.

Topic for 2024-2025:

Should GLP-1 agonists have open access for anyone who wishes to use it?

The Research Paper - Pre-judged Digitally

The research paper will include the following four (4) pages:

- A. Page 1
- B. Pages 2 and 3
- C. Page 4+ (or more if reference list takes up multiple pages)

Title Page: Create a title page, including the following: Event name, Competitor Name, HOSA Division, HOSA Chapter #, School Name, Chartered Association, Title of Paper including Topic Stance, Title page centered, <u>One page only</u>. (A creative design or pictures may be used but will not affect the score.)

Body of Paper formatting:

- A. Pages are one-sided, typed
- B. 12 pt. Arial font, double-spaced, in English
- C. 1" margins on 8 $\frac{1}{2}$ " x 11" paper
- D. Running header with last name, & name of the event, on the top left side of each page (not counting title page)
- E. Include the page number on the top right side of each page (not counting the title page)

Title Page Body of paper Reference page(s) **Reference Page:** List the literature cited to guide the written paper and speech. American Psychological Association (APA) is the preferred resource in Health Sciences. *Points will be awarded for compiling a clean, legible reference page(s), but the formatting of the reference page(s) is not judged.*

No plagiarism is allowed & work must be the competitors per the GRR's.

REQUIRED Digital Uploads

The following item(s) **MUST** be uploaded to the HOSA Digital Upload System by the Montana HOSA Deadline: The Research Paper – as a pdf file

Detailed instructions for uploading materials can be found at: <u>https://hosa.org/competitive-event-digital-uploads/</u>

The Speech

The speech may or may not be worded exactly as written in the researched written paper. The main ideas must remain the same, but the competitor may elaborate in the speech.

NOTE: Competitors may choose to bring their paper to the SLC competition to reference during the speech, but no points are awarded on the rating sheet for doing so.

Use of index card notes during the speech is permitted. Electronic notecards (on a tablet, smartphone, laptop, etc.) are allowed but may not be shown to judges. Props may **NOT** be used.

The speech may be up to four (4) minutes in length. The timekeeper shall present a flash card advising the competitor when one (1) minute remains. The competitor will be stopped and dismissed when the four minutes are up.

Competitor Must Provide:

- Competitor uploads the paper to the HOSA Digital Upload System by deadline
- Index cards or electronic notecards (optional)

RESEARCHED PERSUASIVE WRITING AND SPEAKING

Section # _____ Competitor # _____

Division: _____ SS _____ PS/C Judge's Signature ______

One PDF File of the completed paper Uploaded Online*: Yes ____ No

A. Written	Excellent	Good	Average	Fair	Poor	JUDGE SCORE
Paper	10 points	8 points	6 points	4 points	0 points	SCORE
1. Opening Statement	The writer grabs attention of the reader. The introduction is creative, imaginative, and thoughtful. The thesis clearly revealed and well-structured for the paper—forecasts body of paper memorably and effectively.	The writer somewhat grabs the reader's attention. The thesis is stated and appropriate for the paper. The forecast body so the audience knows the main points in brevity.	The audience is reading with some engagement. The thesis needs strength or structure. Forecast incomplete.	The attention device is unrelated to the topic. Thesis missing OR forecast statement missing.	Paper not submitted OR attention device is missing. Thesis inappropriate or missing AND forecast is missing or indistinguishable.	
2. Coverage of Assigned Event Topic and Quality of Information	The information included high-quality details that support the topic in a thorough manner. Research was in-depth and beyond the obvious, revealing new insights. Overall, the coverage of the assigned topic was excellent.	Information included sufficient detail relevant to the topic. Research seemed to be in-depth. The coverage of the assigned topic was good.	The quality of the information was limited to support the topic. The competitor provided an average amount of coverage on the assigned topic.	Some information provided was relevant to the topic. Research provided was mostly surface-level and the competitor missed key points.	Paper not submitted OR information was unreliable and interfered with ability of the audience to understand the speech. Research was irrelevant to the assigned topic.	
3. Originality	Writing reflects the original thoughts of the author and extends a creative or unique idea, question or concept on the topic. No evidence of plagiarism.	Writing reflects the original thoughts of the author and provides some unique ideas on the topic. No evidence of plagiarism.	Some original thoughts are provided by the author. Creativity is experimented with on the topic. No evidence of plagiarism.	Limited originality is provided by the author on the topic. No evidence of plagiarism.	Paper not submitted OR There was evidence of plagiarism.	
4. Conclusion	Conclusion is concise and summarizes supporting points: restates the thesis in a new way. The reader is satisfied with the conclusion and is left with something to think about.	Conclusion is mostly concise and summarizes the supporting points. The reader is indifferent with the conclusion of the essay.	Conclusion provides a summary of supporting points: it does not restate the thesis.	Conclusion may be attempted but does not summarize or restate thesis.	Paper not submitted OR no conclusion is apparent in the essay.	
A. Written	Excellent	Good	Average	Fair	Poor	JUDGE SCORE
Paper	20 points	15 points	10 points	5points	0 points	
5. Persuasiveness	The paper was exceptionally persuasive and convincing. The competitor provided well-researched evidence that reinforced their position on the topic.	The paper was persuasive and provided good reasons to agree with the competitor's point of view.	The paper was somewhat persuasive and provided some reasons to agree with the competitor's point of view.	The paper provided limited evidence of competitor's point of view and was not very persuasive.	Paper not submitted OR the paper was not persuasive and did not provide evidence to support the competitor's point of view.	

A. Written	Excellent	Good	Average	Fair	Poor	JUDGE SCORE
Paper	5 points	4 points	3 points	2 points	0 points	JOORE
6. Title Page	Title Page includes Competitor Name, HOSA Division, HOSA Chapter #, School Name, State/Chartered Assoc, Title of Paper including Topic Stance, Title page centered, One page.	N/A	N/A	N/A	Paper not submitted OR title page does not include all requirements OR is not present.	
7. Transitions	Writing has voice and is easily read aloud. Appropriate transitions are used to move from one supporting detail to the next. Word choice and syntax offer surprise, clarity and "just right" wording.	Writing has some voice and is easily read aloud. Transitions are used, but better wording could have been used.	Vocabulary or writing style needs further development in sentence variety, word choice, and fluency. Some basic transitions used.	Sentences are short, fragmented or run-ons. Flow of essay is hard to follow. Few to no transitions are used.	Paper not submitted OR no flow to writing. Difficult for reader to follow. No transitions used	
8. Grammar	Zero (0) grammatical errors found in this essay.	1-2 grammatical errors were found in this essay. They do not detract from the general flow of the essay.	3-4 errors were found in the essay, and they detract from the overall flow of the essay.	There are 5-6 grammatical errors present which detract from the overall meaning and flow of the essay.	Paper not submitted OR more than 6 errors were found in this essay. The errors are glaring, and the essay is difficult to read.	
9. Spelling & Punctuation	Zero (0) errors in spelling and punctuation were found in this essay.	1-2 errors in spelling or punctuation were found in this essay.	3-4 errors in spelling or punctuation in this essay.	5 errors in spelling or punctuation were found in this essay.	Paper not submitted OR more than 5 errors in spelling or punctuation were documented within the essay.	
10. Formatting	 Pages: Are one-sided, typed, Use 12 pt. Arial font, double-spaced, in English, Are 1" margins on 8 ¹/₂" x 11" paper, Use running header with last name, event on top left, and page number top right side of each page (not counting title page). e. Are no more than two for body of paper 	N/A	N/A	N/A	Paper not submitted OR all requirements are not met.	
11. Reference Page	The reference page is included with the paper.	N/A	N/A	N/A	Paper not submitted OR no reference page is included.	
					literateat	

B. Speech	Excellent	Good	Average	Fair	Poor	JUDGE
Content	15 points	12 points	9 points	6 points	0 points	SCORE
1. Introduction	The competitor	The competitor	The competitor	The	The competitor	
	grabs the	draws in the	provides an	introduction	does not provide	
	attention of the	audience with	average	provided by the	an introduction	
	audience in a	their	introduction of	competitor	that draws in the	
	way that is	introduction and	the topic and	lacks attention	audience and	
	creative,	piques their	slightly sparks	to detail and	captures their	
	imaginative and thoughtful. The	interest to want to learn more.	the interest and attention of the	connection to the overall	attention.	
	thesis statement	The thesis	audience.	point of the		
	is clearly	statement		speech.		
	revealed and	connects to				
	well-structured	body of the				
0.0	for speech.	speech.	The surveillage of	0	1. f	
2. Overall	Information included	Information included	The quality of the information	Some information	Information was unreliable	
coverage of assigned	high-quality	sufficient detail	was limited to	provided was	and interfered	
event topic	details that	relevant to the	support the	relevant to the	with ability of the	
and quality of	support the	topic. Research	topic. The	topic.	audience to	
information.	event topic in a	seemed to be	competitor	Research	understand the	
	thorough	in-depth. The	provided an	provided was	speech.	
	manner.	coverage of the	average amount	mostly	Research was	
	Research was in-depth and	assigned topic was good.	of coverage on the assigned	surface-level and the	irrelevant to the assigned topic	
	revealed new	was good.	topic.	competitor	and the	
	insights. Overall,		topio.	missed key	competitor	
	the coverage of			points of the	missed the point	
	the assigned			assigned topic.	of the topic.	
	topic was					
3. Conclusion	excellent.	The competitor	The competitor	The competitor	Review of the	
3. Conclusion	The competitor reviews the	The competitor reviews the	The competitor reviews the	The competitor is missing a	thesis and main	
	thesis and main	thesis and main	thesis and main	review of the	points are	
	points of speech	points of	points clearly.	thesis or main	missing from the	
	in a memorable	speech in a	Underwhelming	points. The	conclusion.	
	and effective	clear way that	conclusion.	conclusion was		
	way that provides an	provides an		hard to follow.		
,		adequate flow				
		leading to the				
	effective flow	leading to the				
		leading to the conclusion.				
B. Speech	effective flow leading to the conclusion. Excellent	conclusion.	Average	Fair	Poor	JUDGE
Content	effective flow leading to the conclusion. Excellent 20 points	conclusion. Good 15 points	10 points	5 points	0 points	JUDGE SCORE
Content 4.	effective flow leading to the conclusion. Excellent 20 points The speech is	conclusion. Good 15 points The speech	10 points The speech was	5 points The speech	0 points The speech was	
Content	effective flow leading to the conclusion. Excellent 20 points The speech is exceptionally	conclusion. Good 15 points The speech was persuasive	10 points The speech was somewhat	5 points The speech provided	0 points The speech was not persuasive	
Content 4.	effective flow leading to the conclusion. Excellent 20 points The speech is exceptionally persuasive and	conclusion. Good 15 points The speech was persuasive and provided	10 points The speech was somewhat persuasive and	5 points The speech provided limited	0 points The speech was not persuasive and did not	
Content 4.	effective flow leading to the conclusion. Excellent 20 points The speech is exceptionally	conclusion. Good 15 points The speech was persuasive	10 points The speech was somewhat	5 points The speech provided	0 points The speech was not persuasive	
Content 4.	effective flow leading to the conclusion. Excellent 20 points The speech is exceptionally persuasive and convincing. The	conclusion. Good 15 points The speech was persuasive and provided good reasons	10 points The speech was somewhat persuasive and provided some	5 points The speech provided limited evidence of competitor's point of view	0 points The speech was not persuasive and did not provide evidence	
Content 4.	effective flow leading to the conclusion. Excellent 20 points The speech is exceptionally persuasive and convincing. The competitor provided well-researched	conclusion. Good 15 points The speech was persuasive and provided good reasons to agree with	10 points The speech was somewhat persuasive and provided some reasons to agree with the competitor's	5 points The speech provided limited evidence of competitor's point of view and was not	0 points The speech was not persuasive and did not provide evidence to support the	
Content 4.	effective flow leading to the conclusion. Excellent 20 points The speech is exceptionally persuasive and convincing. The competitor provided well-researched evidence that	conclusion. Good 15 points The speech was persuasive and provided good reasons to agree with the competitor's	10 points The speech was somewhat persuasive and provided some reasons to agree with the	5 points The speech provided limited evidence of competitor's point of view and was not very	0 points The speech was not persuasive and did not provide evidence to support the competitor's point	
Content 4.	effective flow leading to the conclusion. Excellent 20 points The speech is exceptionally persuasive and convincing. The competitor provided well-researched evidence that reinforced their	conclusion. Good 15 points The speech was persuasive and provided good reasons to agree with the competitor's	10 points The speech was somewhat persuasive and provided some reasons to agree with the competitor's	5 points The speech provided limited evidence of competitor's point of view and was not	0 points The speech was not persuasive and did not provide evidence to support the competitor's point	
Content 4.	effective flow leading to the conclusion. Excellent 20 points The speech is exceptionally persuasive and convincing. The competitor provided well-researched evidence that reinforced their position on the	conclusion. Good 15 points The speech was persuasive and provided good reasons to agree with the competitor's	10 points The speech was somewhat persuasive and provided some reasons to agree with the competitor's	5 points The speech provided limited evidence of competitor's point of view and was not very	0 points The speech was not persuasive and did not provide evidence to support the competitor's point	
Content 4. Persuasiveness	effective flow leading to the conclusion. Excellent 20 points The speech is exceptionally persuasive and convincing. The competitor provided well-researched evidence that reinforced their position on the topic.	conclusion. Good 15 points The speech was persuasive and provided good reasons to agree with the competitor's point of view.	10 points The speech was somewhat persuasive and provided some reasons to agree with the competitor's point of view.	5 points The speech provided limited evidence of competitor's point of view and was not very persuasive.	0 points The speech was not persuasive and did not provide evidence to support the competitor's point of view.	SCORE
Content 4. Persuasiveness C. Speech	effective flow leading to the conclusion. Excellent 20 points The speech is exceptionally persuasive and convincing. The competitor provided well-researched evidence that reinforced their position on the topic. Excellent	conclusion. Good 15 points The speech was persuasive and provided good reasons to agree with the competitor's point of view. Good	10 points The speech was somewhat persuasive and provided some reasons to agree with the competitor's point of view.	5 points The speech provided limited evidence of competitor's point of view and was not very persuasive. Fair	0 points The speech was not persuasive and did not provide evidence to support the competitor's point of view.	SCORE
4. Persuasiveness	effective flow leading to the conclusion. Excellent 20 points The speech is exceptionally persuasive and convincing. The competitor provided well-researched evidence that reinforced their position on the topic. Excellent 5 points	conclusion. Good 15 points The speech was persuasive and provided good reasons to agree with the competitor's point of view. Good 4 points	10 points The speech was somewhat persuasive and provided some reasons to agree with the competitor's point of view. Average 3 points	5 points The speech provided limited evidence of competitor's point of view and was not very persuasive. Fair 2 points	0 points The speech was not persuasive and did not provide evidence to support the competitor's point of view.	SCORE
C. Speech Delivery	effective flow leading to the conclusion. Excellent 20 points The speech is exceptionally persuasive and convincing. The competitor provided well-researched evidence that reinforced their position on the topic. Excellent	conclusion. Good 15 points The speech was persuasive and provided good reasons to agree with the competitor's point of view. Good	10 points The speech was somewhat persuasive and provided some reasons to agree with the competitor's point of view.	5 points The speech provided limited evidence of competitor's point of view and was not very persuasive. Fair	0 points The speech was not persuasive and did not provide evidence to support the competitor's point of view. Poor 0 points	SCORE
Content 4. Persuasiveness C. Speech Delivery 1. Voice Pitch, tempo, volume,	effective flow leading to the conclusion. Excellent 20 points The speech is exceptionally persuasive and convincing. The competitor provided well-researched evidence that reinforced their position on the topic. Excellent 5 points The competitor's	conclusion. Good 15 points The speech was persuasive and provided good reasons to agree with the competitor's point of view. Good 4 points The competitor spoke loudly and clearly	10 points The speech was somewhat persuasive and provided some reasons to agree with the competitor's point of view. Average 3 points The competitor could be heard most of the time.	5 points The speech provided limited evidence of competitor's point of view and was not very persuasive. Fair 2 points Judges had difficulty hearing	0 points The speech was not persuasive and did not provide evidence to support the competitor's point of view. Poor 0 points The competitor's voice is too low or monotone.	SCORE
Content 4. Persuasiveness C. Speech Delivery 1. Voice Pitch, tempo,	effective flow leading to the conclusion. Excellent 20 points The speech is exceptionally persuasive and convincing. The competitor provided well-researched evidence that reinforced their position on the topic. Excellent 5 points The competitor's voice was loud enough to hear. The competitor	conclusion. Good 15 points The speech was persuasive and provided good reasons to agree with the competitor's point of view. Good 4 points The competitor spoke loudly and clearly enough to be	10 points The speech was somewhat persuasive and provided some reasons to agree with the competitor's point of view. Average 3 points The competitor could be heard most of the time. The competitor	5 points The speech provided limited evidence of competitor's point of view and was not very persuasive. Fair 2 points Judges had difficulty hearing /understanding	0 points The speech was not persuasive and did not provide evidence to support the competitor's point of view. Poor 0 points The competitor's voice is too low or monotone. Judges struggled	SCORE
Content 4. Persuasiveness C. Speech Delivery 1. Voice Pitch, tempo, volume,	effective flow leading to the conclusion. Excellent 20 points The speech is exceptionally persuasive and convincing. The competitor provided well-researched evidence that reinforced their position on the topic. Excellent 5 points The competitor's voice was loud enough to hear. The competitor varied rate &	conclusion. Good 15 points The speech was persuasive and provided good reasons to agree with the competitor's point of view. Good 4 points The competitor spoke loudly and clearly enough to be understood.	10 points The speech was somewhat persuasive and provided some reasons to agree with the competitor's point of view. Average 3 points The competitor could be heard most of the time. The competitor attempted to	5 points The speech provided limited evidence of competitor's point of view and was not very persuasive. Fair 2 points Judges had difficulty hearing /understanding much of the	0 points The speech was not persuasive and did not provide evidence to support the competitor's point of view. Poor 0 points The competitor's voice is too low or monotone. Judges struggled to stay focused	SCORE
Content 4. Persuasiveness C. Speech Delivery 1. Voice Pitch, tempo, volume,	effective flow leading to the conclusion. Excellent 20 points The speech is exceptionally persuasive and convincing. The competitor provided well-researched evidence that reinforced their position on the topic. Excellent 5 points The competitor's voice was loud enough to hear. The competitor varied rate & volume to	conclusion. Good 15 points The speech was persuasive and provided good reasons to agree with the competitor's point of view. Good 4 points The competitor spoke loudly and clearly enough to be understood. The competitor	10 points The speech was somewhat persuasive and provided some reasons to agree with the competitor's point of view. Average 3 points The competitor could be heard most of the time. The competitor attempted to use some	5 points The speech provided limited evidence of competitor's point of view and was not very persuasive. Fair 2 points Judges had difficulty hearing /understanding much of the speech due to	0 points The speech was not persuasive and did not provide evidence to support the competitor's point of view. Poor 0 points The competitor's voice is too low or monotone. Judges struggled to stay focused during most of	SCORE
Content 4. Persuasiveness C. Speech Delivery 1. Voice Pitch, tempo, volume,	effective flow leading to the conclusion. Excellent 20 points The speech is exceptionally persuasive and convincing. The competitor provided well-researched evidence that reinforced their position on the topic. Excellent 5 points The competitor's voice was loud enough to hear. The competitor varied rate & volume to enhance the	conclusion. Good 15 points The speech was persuasive and provided good reasons to agree with the competitor's point of view. Good 4 points The competitor spoke loudly and clearly enough to be understood. The competitor varied rate OR	10 points The speech was somewhat persuasive and provided some reasons to agree with the competitor's point of view. Average 3 points The competitor could be heard most of the time. The competitor attempted to use some variety in vocal	5 points The speech provided limited evidence of competitor's point of view and was not very persuasive. Fair 2 points Judges had difficulty hearing /understanding much of the speech due to little variety in	0 points The speech was not persuasive and did not provide evidence to support the competitor's point of view. Poor 0 points The competitor's voice is too low or monotone. Judges struggled to stay focused	SCORE
Content 4. Persuasiveness C. Speech Delivery 1. Voice Pitch, tempo, volume,	effective flow leading to the conclusion. Excellent 20 points The speech is exceptionally persuasive and convincing. The competitor provided well-researched evidence that reinforced their position on the topic. Excellent 5 points The competitor's voice was loud enough to hear. The competitor varied rate & volume to enhance the speech.	conclusion. Good 15 points The speech was persuasive and provided good reasons to agree with the competitor's point of view. Good 4 points The competitor spoke loudly and clearly enough to be understood. The competitor varied rate OR volume to	10 points The speech was somewhat persuasive and provided some reasons to agree with the competitor's point of view. Average 3 points The competitor could be heard most of the time. The competitor attempted to use some variety in vocal quality, but not	5 points The speech provided limited evidence of competitor's point of view and was not very persuasive. Fair 2 points Judges had difficulty hearing /understanding much of the speech due to	0 points The speech was not persuasive and did not provide evidence to support the competitor's point of view. Poor 0 points The competitor's voice is too low or monotone. Judges struggled to stay focused during most of	SCORE
Content 4. Persuasiveness C. Speech Delivery 1. Voice Pitch, tempo, volume,	effective flow leading to the conclusion. Excellent 20 points The speech is exceptionally persuasive and convincing. The competitor provided well-researched evidence that reinforced their position on the topic. Excellent 5 points The competitor's voice was loud enough to hear. The competitor varied rate & volume to enhance the	conclusion. Good 15 points The speech was persuasive and provided good reasons to agree with the competitor's point of view. Good 4 points The competitor spoke loudly and clearly enough to be understood. The competitor varied rate OR	10 points The speech was somewhat persuasive and provided some reasons to agree with the competitor's point of view. Average 3 points The competitor could be heard most of the time. The competitor attempted to use some variety in vocal	5 points The speech provided limited evidence of competitor's point of view and was not very persuasive. Fair 2 points Judges had difficulty hearing /understanding much of the speech due to little variety in	0 points The speech was not persuasive and did not provide evidence to support the competitor's point of view. Poor 0 points The competitor's voice is too low or monotone. Judges struggled to stay focused during most of	SCORE

	were			
		1		
í	attempted.	1		1

C. Speech	Excellent	Good	Average	Fair	Poor	JUDGE
Delivery	5 points	4 points	3 points	2 points	0 points	SCORE
2. Stage Presence Poise, posture, eye contact, and enthusiasm	Movements & gestures were purposeful and enhanced the delivery of the speech and did not distract. Body language reflects comfort interacting with audience. Facial expressions and body language consistently generated a strong interest and enthusiasm for the topic.	The competitor maintained adequate posture and non-distracting movement during the speech. Some gestures were used. Facial expressions and body language sometimes generated an interest and enthusiasm for the topic.	Stiff or unnatural use of nonverbal behaviors. Body language reflects some discomfort interacting with audience. Limited use of gestures to reinforce verbal message. Facial expressions and body language are used to try to generate enthusiasm but seem somewhat forced.	The competitor's posture, body language, and facial expressions indicated a lack of enthusiasm for the topic. Movements were distracting.	No attempt was made to use body movement or gestures to enhance the message. No interest or enthusiasm for the topic came through in presentation.	
3. Diction*, Pronunciation* * and Grammar	Delivery emphasizes and enhances message. Clear enunciation and pronunciation. No vocal fillers (ex: "ahs," "uh/ums," or "you-knows"). Tone heightened interest and complemented the verbal message.	Delivery helps to enhance message. Clear enunciation and pronunciation. Minimal vocal fillers (ex: "ahs," "uh/ums," or "you-knows"). Tone complemented the verbal message	Delivery adequate. Enunciation and pronunciation suitable. Noticeable verbal fillers (ex: "ahs," "uh/ums," or "you-knows"). Tone seemed inconsistent at times.	Delivery quality minimal. Regular verbal fillers (ex: "ahs," "uh/ums," or "you-knows") present. Delivery problems cause disruption to message.	Many distracting errors in pronunciation and/or articulation. Monotone or inappropriate variation of vocal characteristics. Inconsistent with verbal message.	
		moodago	Sı	ubtotal Speec	h Points (80):	
					Points (170):	

* Definition of Diction – Choice of words especially with regard to correctness, clearness, and effectiveness. ** Definition of Pronunciation – Act or manner of uttering officially.