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ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study was to investigate the effects of certain individual difference variables--communication apprehension, self esteem, and Machiavellianism--on communication intent and behavior in terms of Fishbein and Ajzen's model of behavioral intent. In order to assess these relationships both before and after an influence attempt, a specific behavioral situation was created in which undergraduate speech students were given the opportunity to attend or not to attend a "speech workshop" in which participants were required to deliver a brief speech to the group.

The manipulation was an oral persuasive message urging subjects to sign up for the workshop. Subjects then made a written commitment to attend or not to attend the workshop. Actual attendance at the workshop was also noted.

Findings indicated that the Fishbein and Ajzen model could predict this kind of single act communication behavior. It was also found that although communication apprehension was a significant predictor of this behavior within this population, self esteem and Machiavellianism were not.
"That personality characteristics serve as important and essential qualifiers for more general statements concerning social behavior" is a widely accepted notion (Marlowe and Gergen, 1969, p. 590). The development of an adequate theory of behavior will ultimately depend, therefore, on the full integration of personality constructs into that theory of behavior. It follows that such a theory must be able to account for the effects of specific personality characteristics on different types of behavior. Of particular interest to communication researchers are those personality characteristics which "serve as important and essential qualifiers" for speaker behavior. Recently Fishbein and Ajzen (1975) have developed a theory of behavior which not only can account for the effects of personality characteristics on behavior, but which also specifies the manner in which these personality characteristics affect the internal mediating (psychological) processes which determine or influence behavior. Using their theoretical framework, the present study attempted to examine how relevant personality characteristics affect the psychological processes which determine a person's willingness to participate in a person-to-group communication both before and after an attempt to influence him. Specifically, the study was concerned with the willingness of undergraduate speech students to participate in a "speech workshop" created by the experimenter with the assistance of the Faculty of the Department
of Speech and Theatre at Southeastern Louisiana University. The study was begun, therefore, with two major goals: the application of current psychological theory to speaker behavior, and the clarification of the role of some individual difference variables in speaker tendencies.

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Fishbein and Ajzen's Theory of Behavior

The foundation of Fishbein and Ajzen's conceptual framework is provided by the distinctions made among four major constructs—belief, attitude, intention, and behavior. Their major concern, however, is with the relations among these constructs. Therefore, the following discussion will be concerned with these distinctions, that is, how the constructs differ, and with these relationships, that is, how they function with respect to one another within the conceptual framework.

Constructs

Belief

The fundamental construct in Fishbein and Ajzen's theory is that of belief. Corresponding to the cognitive component in traditional theory, beliefs represent the information a person has about an object. Specifically, a belief links an object with some attribute. For example, the belief "that the SST is an airplane" links SST (object) with airplane (attribute). Additionally, each object-attribute link is held with a certain belief strength, that is, the subjective probability that the object is actually associated with the attribute. Continuing the SST-airplane example, the object (SST) and the attribute (airplane) might be held with a subjective probability of 1.0, indicating that the
person believes very strongly that the SST is, indeed, an airplane. The totality of a person's belief about an object is determined by the sum of the attributes linked to the object multiplied by the subjective probability with which the person holds these object-attribute links.

**Attitude**

The affective component discussed in traditional attitude theory corresponds to Fishbein and Ajzen's attitude construct. Whereas belief is viewed as an object-attribute link, attitude refers to a person's favorable or unfavorable evaluation of the attribute. For example, the attitude with respect to the belief "that the SST is an airplane" is contingent upon the individual's evaluation of the attribute, that is, whether he thinks airplanes (attribute) are good or bad. Therefore, attitude must be measured on a bi-polar evaluative scale of the semantic differential type. The totality of a person's attitude toward some object is equal to the number of beliefs he holds with respect to that object multiplied by his evaluation of those object-attribute links. This concept may be expressed as follows:

$$A_o = \sum_{i=1}^{n} b_i e_i$$

where,

- $A_o$ is attitude toward the object,
- $b_i$ is beliefs about the object,
- $e_i$ is the subjective evaluation of those beliefs,
- and $n$ is the number of beliefs.

Peak (1955), Rosenberg (1956), Fishbein (1963), and others have provided empirical support for this conception of attitude. This
attitude construct forms one of the bases for predicting behavioral intentions.

Intention

Just as beliefs form the basis of attitudes, attitudes form one of the bases of intentions, the conative component. A person's intention to perform a specific behavior is a function of two factors: his attitude toward performing the act (A_{act}), and his normative beliefs about what relevant others think he should do with respect to performing the act multiplied by his motivation to comply with those beliefs [NB(Mc)]. It should be noted that the attitudinal component which forms one of the bases for predicting intent is not an attitude toward some object, but is the individual's attitude toward performing the specific behavior in question. For example, a person's intention to smoke marijuana is determined not by his attitude toward marijuana in general, but by his attitude toward the act of smoking marijuana and by his beliefs concerning what important others think he should do with respect to smoking marijuana, multiplied by his motivation to comply with those beliefs. This conception of behavioral intent can be expressed algebraically in the following formula:

$$B - BI = [A_{act}]w_0 + [NB(Mc)]w_1$$

where,

- $B$ is overt behavior,
- $BI$ is a person's intention to perform a specific behavior in question,
- $A_{act}$ is a person's attitude toward performing the specific behavior in question,
- $NB$ is the normative belief, that is, the belief that relevant others think he should or should not perform the behavior,
Mc is the person's motivation to comply with the expectations of relevant others, and

\[ w_0 \text{ and } w_1 \] are the beta weights for the linear, multiple regression equation, with their values varying across both behaviors and individuals.

In Fishbein and Ajzen's conception of belief, as well as those of attitude, intention, and behavior, it is important to note that man is viewed as an information processing animal. Specifically, beliefs are formed on the basis of information which is received and processed by the individual. This informational base, then, ultimately determines the formation of attitudes, intentions, and behaviors, thus revealing the hierarchical nature of the constructs.

In addition to Aact and NB(Mc), the formula postulates a third variable that is important for the prediction of behavioral intent—the regression weights, \[ w_0 \text{ and } w_1 \]. These weights indicate for any given behavior whether Aact or NB(Mc) is more important in determining BI. Extending the marijuana example, a regular marijuana smoker's intention to smoke marijuana is usually determined primarily by his attitude toward smoking marijuana. He likes to smoke marijuana and does so. In certain situations, however, his normative beliefs become more important in determining his intentions to smoke marijuana, e.g., in the home of his parents (important others), who feel that he should not engage in smoking marijuana. A number of studies (Fishbein, 1966; Ajzen and Fishbein, 1969, 1970, 1972; Fishbein, et al., 1970; Ajzen, 1971; Hornik, 1970; DeVries and Ajzen, 1971; Carlson, 1968; McArdle, 1972; Darroch, 1971; Glassman, 1971; Jaccard and Davidson, 1972) provide empirical support for this intentional model, that is, they reveal a high multiple correlation between the two predictor variables, Aact and NB(Mc), and the criterion variable, BI.
Behavior

The fourth major construct in Fishbein and Ajzen's theory is behavior, overt observable acts that are studied in their own right. According to the theory, the effect of Aact and NB(Mc) on overt behavior is held to be mediated by BI. Therefore, a high correlation is assumed to exist between a person's intention to perform a certain behavior and the actual performance of that behavior. Empirical support for this high correlation has been provided in several studies (e.g., Ajzen and Fishbein, 1970; Ajzen, 1971; Hornik, 1970; Holman, 1956; McArdle, 1972; Fishbein and Coombs, 1974; Feldman and Fishbein, 1963; Campbell, 1963; King, 1975).

There are three variables which affect the relationship between B and BI: (1) whether the behavior is under the volitional control of the subject; (2) the amount of time which elapses between measurement of intent and observation of the behavior; and (3) whether the behavioral intent is measured at the same level of specificity as the behavior in question. These factors suggest important methodological considerations and will be discussed in a later section. Although a relatively large number of different behaviors has been studied (voting behavior, breast feeding, church attendance, etc.), public speaking behavior has not been explored in these terms.

The preceding discussion of the four essential hypothetical constructs of Fishbein and Ajzen's theoretical structure has attempted to emphasize the necessity of making the distinction, theoretically and operationally, among the constructs. However, as previously stated, each of the constructs is also systematically related to the others. Behavior is mediated by intent, which is a product of attitudes and
beliefs. Further, the theory suggests that each of the constructs is a valid dependent variable, susceptible to investigation. Since the concern of the present study was with how relevant personality characteristics affect intentions to participate in a person-to-group communication behavior, the intent construct was of primary importance.

Hypotheses Concerning the Intent Model

Although it was not the primary purpose of this investigation to provide support for the relationships that Fishbein and Ajzen have found between B, BI, Aact, and NB(Mc), the study was based on these relationships. And even though support for these relationships has been provided in many studies, the validity of the findings in the present study was dependent upon whether these relationships were found to exist. Therefore, with respect to the theory itself, the following hypotheses were made:

H₁: There will be a high positive correlation between B and BI.

H₂: There will be a high positive multiple correlation between the two predictor components of the model (Aact and NB(Mc)) and BI.

Effects of Personality Characteristics on Intention

It will be remembered from the previous discussion of the intent construct that a person's intention to perform any behavior is determined by his attitude toward performing the behavior (Aact) and by his subjective norm (NB(Mc)). Other variables external to the model such as demographic or personality characteristics of the actor can influence intentions only indirectly by influencing either of the two components or their relative weights. Personality characteristics, thus, will
affect BI indirectly if they meet one or more of the following conditions: (1) if they influence the attitudinal component, and that component carries a significant amount of weight in the regression formula; (2) if they influence the normative component, and that component carries a significant amount of weight in the regression formula; or (3) if they influence the relative weights of the two components.

Empirical support for the notion that personality characteristics may influence intention by influencing the relative importance of one of the two weights comes from a study done by Fishbein (1966). He found that the relative importance of the two components in predicting intentions to engage in premarital sexual intercourse was differentially affected by the sex of the subjects. For men, normative social beliefs were more important, carried more weight in the regression equation, in determining their intentions to engage in this behavior. For women, the Aact component was more important.

The second way personality characteristics may indirectly influence intentions is by influencing one or the other of the two internal psychological processes (Aact or NB[Mc]) which determine intentions. Empirical support for this relationship is found in several studies. DeFleur and Westie (1958) found that intentions to be photographed with a Negro were influenced by racial prejudice. Warner and DeFleur (1969) found that intentions to sign a pledge to perform a certain behavior with respect to blacks and to allow that behavior to be made public were influenced by racial prejudice. Sandell (1968), Bishop and Witt (1970), and Triandis (1964) also provided
support for this relationship.

Therefore, according to the theory, and as supported by the empirical evidence, personality characteristics may influence intention indirectly if they influence $A_{act}$, $NB(Mc)$, or their relative weights. The present study attempted to determine the importance of salient personality characteristics in influencing intention to communicate in a person-to-group communication situation.

The Effects of Communication Apprehension, Self Esteem, and Machiavellianism on Intention to Communicate

The assumption out of which many personality/behavior researchers have worked has been that personality characteristics do, indeed, affect social behavior (Marlowe and Gergen, 1969; Mischel, 1973). The intent model suggests, however, that specific behaviors will be affected by these personality characteristics only to the extent that they influence one of the model's three components, i.e., $A_{act}$, $NB(Mc)$, or their relative weights. Thus, by using Fishbein and Ajzen's model, an investigator may discover whether a personality characteristic is related to a specific intention or not, and, if it is related, to what extent. Furthermore, the model can reveal the three possible ways a personality characteristic may affect that specific intention, i.e., by affecting the $A_{act}$ component when that component carries a significant amount of weight in the regression equation, by affecting the $NB(Mc)$ component when that component carries a significant amount of weight in the regression equation, or by affecting the relative weights of the two components. The present investigation was interested in the effects of three personality characteristics—communication apprehension, self esteem, and Machiavellianism—on a
specific communication behavior, delivering a speech before a workshop.

**Communication Apprehension**

Support for the idea that communication apprehension is a significant personality characteristic for communication behavior can be seen throughout the extensive literature. Variously referred to as speech fright, stage fright, speech anxiety, and speech fear, there can be little doubt, as Thompson (1967) has stated, that this phenomenon is probably the problem of greatest concern to beginning speech students.

According to McCroskey and Wheeless (1976), "normal withdrawal from communication" is a common phenomenon and may be a result either of a desire for privacy or to avoid self-disclosure. "Abnormal withdrawal from communication" is a result of one or another of two personality characteristics--either "anomia" (alienation) or "communication apprehension." The first of these personality characteristics is a state marked by a failure to understand or accept society's norms and values. The person suffering from communication apprehension, on the other hand, is an individual "for whom apprehension about participating in communication outweighs any projection of gain from communicating in a given situation" (McCroskey and Wheeless, 1976, p. 80). Many people are communication apprehensives; between ten and twenty percent of the population may suffer from this phenomenon.

That communication apprehension severely disrupts the communication of the person with the problem is a widely held notion, as evidenced by the concern expressed by writers of beginning speech texts (Gray and Braden, 1963; Jeffrey and Peterson, 1971; Baird, Knower, and Becker, 1973; Bormann and Bormann, 1972). These writers usually
develop their ideas about the effect of communication apprehension on communication by discussing its causes and cures. While admitting that the causes of communication apprehension are not fully understood, these writers devote most of their time to the cures. These include: take a speech communication course, practice often, be well prepared, and so on. No writer discusses how communication apprehension affects the psychological processes which go on prior to committing oneself to speak.

The idea that communication apprehension is a significant variable in communication behavior may also be seen in the vast research literature. The research has been concerned with several aspects of communication apprehension, such as types, correlates, sex differences, measurement, and cures. With respect to types of communication apprehension, Gilkinson (1942), Dickens, Gibson, and Prall (1950), and Dickens and Parker (1951) found that "audience perceived, cognitively experienced, and physiological communication apprehension are different, only moderately related phenomena" (Thompson, 1967, p. 209). Findings concerning correlates of communication apprehension and factors affecting it indicate that this variable is a social phenomenon related to prior experiences and to certain personal traits (Chenoweth, 1940; Gilkinson, 1942, 1943; Dickens and Parker, 1951; Low and Sheets, 1951; Clevenger and King, 1961; Bormann and Shapiro, 1962; Bode and Brutten, 1963; Gruner, 1964). The existence of sex differences for communication apprehension was suggested in studies conducted by several researchers (Gilkinson and Knower, 1940; Gilkinson, 1942; Dickens and Parker, 1951). Furthermore, researchers have found that the customary measures of communication apprehension
are generally reliable (Gilkinson, 1942; Dickens, Gibson, and Prall, 1950; Brutten, 1959; Baker, 1964; McCroskey, 1972).

With respect to reducing communication apprehension, experimenters have found that self perceived apprehension usually lessens with practice but may return when the situation is changed (Gilkinson, 1943; Henrikson, 1943; Paulson, 1951; Clevenger, 1959; Bode and Brutten, 1963; Baker, 1964; Gruner, 1964). Thompson's conclusions and recommendations concerning communication apprehension are again relevant. Specifically, he stated that:

extensive research on stage fright, very likely the problem of greatest concern to most undergraduate students in speech classes, largely confirms expectations. The problem, so research indicates, is a social phenomenon related to prior experiences and to certain personal traits. The remedies proposed in beginning textbooks, though probably harmless, are for the most part without experimental foundation. Practice usually lessens self perceived stage fright, but even the advice to rehearse and to speak frequently must be qualified, for a change in the speaking environment is likely to extinguish the gains. Not so negative, though, are the results that lay the foundation for further research. Usable and reliable instruments and procedures for measuring stage fright now exist, and the finding that audience perceived, cognitively experienced, and physiological stage fright are different, only moderately related phenomena provides a needed foundation for designing and interpreting experiments. (Thompson, 1967, pp. 209-210)

More recent research on communication apprehension has been concerned with such problems as: the development of specific measures for communication-bound anxiety (McCroskey, 1970); programs designed systematically to desensitize people with communication apprehension (McCroskey, 1972; Barrick, McCroskey, and Ralph, 1968; Johnson, et al., 1971; McCroskey, Ralph, and Barrick, 1970); the relationship between communication apprehension and motivation (Fisher and Infante, 1973; Giffin and Gilham, 1971; Giffin and Masterson, 1968); and finally,
the development of the "unwillingness to communicate scale" for small group communication behaviors (Burgoon and Burgoon, 1974).

As may be seen from the empirical research on communication apprehension as well as from the comments made by writers of beginning speech texts, communication apprehension is a significant variable which affects communication behavior. However, the manner in which it affects the psychological processes involved in a person's decision to communicate has not been fully explored.

Self Esteem

Self esteem refers to the view a person has of himself in terms of overall worth. According to McCroskey and Wheeless, "People with low self esteem tend to lack confidence in their own ability and to evaluate their own competence negatively on almost any question. They expect failure in their lives, including their communication attempts" (McCroskey and Wheeless, pp. 130-131). Additionally, communication apprehensives frequently have low self esteem. In contrast, the person with high self esteem exhibits a great deal of confidence, expects to succeed, and expects to communicate well.

The majority of research which deals with self esteem and communication has been conducted in terms of persuasibility and conformity. It has been suggested that persons low in esteem tend to see themselves as different from and less worthy than others and are, therefore, more accepting of influence (Lesser and Abelson, 1959). Support for this relationship between self esteem and persuasibility comes from several studies (Janis and Field, 1959; Lesser and Abelson, 1959). Cohen (1959) has taken a somewhat different approach. He has proposed that people who rate themselves high in self esteem use
avoidance defenses, while those who rate themselves low incline toward expressive or sensitizing defenses. Evidence for this relationship has been presented by Cohen (1959), Coppersmith (1959), and Leventhal and Perloe (1962). Recent work by Crowne and Marlowe (1964), however, provides support for the more traditional view presented by Hovland, Janis, and Kelley (1953), i.e., that the person low in self esteem may have a strong need for social acceptance and, thus, be more responsive to wide-ranging cues of social approval.

Consistent with prior research on self esteem, McCroskey and Wheeless (1976) concluded that not only are individuals low in self esteem less willing or likely to engage in communication behaviors, but they are also more susceptible to influence. Specifically, they stated that:

all things being equal . . . people with high self esteem are much less susceptible to outside influence than are people with low self esteem. The reason for this is fairly simple. People with high self esteem see themselves as equal to or superior to most of the people with whom they come in contact and who attempt to influence them. People with low self esteem, however, perceive other people in their environment as more credible and better informed than they are, and as a result tend to be very susceptible to influence from these credible outside people (pp. 355-356).

The implications of these conclusions will be important for the second part of the present study when self esteem will be examined in terms of an influence attempt. How and to what extent self esteem affects an individual's intention to perform a communication behavior is of prime importance for the present section of this paper. As with communication apprehension, the effects of self esteem on the psychological processes involved in making the decision to communicate or not to communicate have not been examined.
Machiavellianism

Although most of the research on Machiavellianism and communication behavior has been done primarily in terms of small group behavior (Burgoon, 1971; Burgoon and Burgoon, 1974), this personality characteristic seems to have implications for all types of communication behaviors, including the person-to-group communication situation. From Christie and Geis, Studies in Machiavellianism, come the relevant characteristics of the high Mach individual: (1) he has a relative lack of emotion in interpersonal relationships, viewing others as objects to be manipulated rather than as individuals with whom one has empathy; (2) he is relatively unconcerned with conventional morality, i.e., he has a utilitarian rather than a moral view of interpersonal interaction; (3) he has a lack of gross psychopathology, i.e., he is more or less normal, if not the epitome of mental health; and (4) he has a generally low ideological commitment, i.e., he focuses upon getting things done rather than upon long-range ideological goals (Christie and Geis, 1970, pp. 3-4).

Experimental results tend to confirm Christie's original Mach parameters. Christie has reviewed several studies which indicate that: (1) no significant relationship exists between Machiavellianism and intelligence, political preference, ideology, or psychopathology; (2) the generally unflattering opinion of others and a cynical view of people were confirmed; and (3) the positive relationships with measures of hostility and the negative ones with social desirability were also confirmed (Christie and Geis, 1970, pp. 47-50).
With respect to Machiavellianism and communication, McCroskey and Wheeless stated that:

Not only are high Machs willing to manipulate other people, but they also tend to be very successful at such manipulations, and, further, they seem to enjoy such attempts. The impact of this personality type on communication is probably obvious. The high Mach communicates with willful intent to influence other people and does so with glee. An important corollary of the Mach orientation toward communication is that the Mach tends to show little concern for morality and has little emotional involvement in the communication encounters in which she or he is engaged (1976, p. 129).

In terms of persuasibility, Christie and Geis characterize high Machs as having "the cool syndrome," being resistant to social influence, oriented toward cognitions, and intending to initiate and control structure in interpersonal circumstances. Low Machs are referred to as "the soft touch," very susceptible to social influence, oriented toward persons, and accepting and following structure.

Another pattern which Christie and Geis detected in the literature revolves around the following ideas: (1) that high and low Machs are equally persuaded by factual information or rational arguments; (2) that lows but not highs are also moved by sheer social pressure; and (3) that although lows seem to be more susceptible in live face-to-face interaction, they are also moved by written communications representing the beliefs or wishes of others (p. 296).

As indicated in the preceding discussion, Machiavellianism may affect communication behavior in its own peculiar way. However, as with communication apprehension and self esteem, the manner in which this personality characteristic affects the psychological processes involved prior to committing oneself to perform a person-to-group communication is not clear.
Hypotheses Concerning the Effects of Communication Apprehension, Self Esteem, and Machiavellianism On Communication Intent

As has been noted in the reviews of literature on communication apprehension, self esteem, and Machiavellianism, these variables affect communication behavior. In light of these relationships, one may make several assumptions about these personality characteristics and communication behavior based on Fishbein and Ajzen's model of intent. Given that a high correlation exists between B and BI, when certain methodological considerations are met, the following hypotheses were made:

\[ H_3: \text{B (signing up for the speech workshop) and BI (intention to sign up) will be negatively correlated with communication apprehension.} \]

\[ H_4: \text{B and BI will be positively correlated with self esteem.} \]

\[ H_5: \text{B and BI will be positively correlated with Machiavellianism.} \]

Fishbein and Ajzen's model can take the researcher one step further, however, in understanding how these personality characteristics influence B and BI. They maintain that any variable external to the model of intent, such as personality characteristics, will influence BI, and thus B, only to the extent that it influences one of the following: (1) Aact, when that component carries a significant amount of weight in the regression equation; (2) NB(Mc), when that component carries a significant amount of weight in the regression equation; or (3) the relative weights of the two components. Again, based on the reviews of literature dealing with these personality characteristics, several hypotheses may be made with respect to:
Communication Apprehension—The literature on communication apprehension reveals that apprehensives are individuals for whom "apprehension about participating in communication outweighs any projection of gain from communicating in a given situation" (McCroskey and Wheeless, 1976, p. 80). Therefore, it seems logical to hypothesize that communication apprehension affects B and BI indirectly by affecting Aact. Hence the following hypothesis was made:

\[ H_6: \text{Communication apprehension will be negatively correlated with Aact.} \]

Self Esteem—The literature on self esteem indicates that people low in self esteem "expect failure in . . . their communication attempts" (McCroskey and Wheeless, 1976, pp. 130-131). It follows, then, that self esteem affects B and BI indirectly by affecting Aact. Therefore, with respect to self esteem, the following hypothesis was made:

\[ H_7: \text{Self esteem will be positively correlated with Aact.} \]

Machiavellianism—The literature on Mach indicates that "the high Mach communicates with willful intent to influence other people and does so with glee" (McCroskey and Wheeless, 1976, p. 129). Therefore, like communication apprehension and self esteem, Mach influences B and BI indirectly by influencing Aact. Thus, the following hypothesis was made:

\[ H_8: \text{Machiavellianism will be positively correlated with Aact.} \]
The Effects of Communication Apprehension, Self Esteem, And Machiavellianism on Intention to Communicate After an Influence Attempt

 Whereas the first part of this study was concerned with the operations of personality characteristics on the determinants of intent, the second purpose was to examine the relationships between these personality characteristics and the amount of change in $A_{act}$ and $B_I$ as a result of an oral persuasive message formulated in accord with Fishbein and Ajzen's basic principle of change. Before specific relationships are hypothesized, however, it is first necessary to: (1) identify this principle of change; (2) examine whether intentions can be changed using this principle; (3) determine how one goes about changing intentions; and (4) examine the effect of personality characteristics on amount of intent change.

Fishbein and Ajzen's Principle of Change

It should be remembered that basic to Fishbein and Ajzen's theory of behavior is the idea that man is a rational, information-processing animal, and, as such, he forms beliefs that objects have attributes by actually observing these relationships, by having someone tell him that these relationships exist, or by inferring relationships from other beliefs. The results of these processes are called primary beliefs. Furthermore, for each construct in Fishbein and Ajzen's theory--beliefs, attitudes, intentions, and behaviors--there are primary beliefs which are relevant to that particular construct. Therefore, an attempt to change one of these constructs, in the final analysis, must be directed at the primary beliefs which are relevant to that particular construct. This notion
forms the basis for Fishbein and Ajzen's basic principle of change.

**Empirical Support for the Principle of Change**

The notion that intentions can be changed by a persuasive communication has received empirical support. Ajzen and Fishbein (1972) were able to change the behavioral intentions of subjects to invest money in a hypothetical building project by using a persuasive message. Ajzen (1971) was able to change intentions to play the Prisoner's Dilemma game a certain way as a result of a persuasive communication. Additionally, McArdle (1972) was able to change intentions of alcoholics to sign up for an alcoholic treatment unit as a result of a persuasive communication formulated in accord with Fishbein and Ajzen's basic principle.

**The Manner in Which Intentions Can be Changed**

Two factors must be known in order to change intent, i.e., which of the determinants of intent (\(A_{act}\) or \(NB(Mc)\)) is more important in determining the specific behavior under consideration, and, secondly, the primary beliefs which underlie that determinant. The first factor can be determined by employing the multiple regression statistic. The second factor can be determined by a free elicitation procedure designed to identify those primary beliefs which underlie either of the two components. The primary beliefs which form the basis of the \(A_{act}\) component are related to the costs or consequences associated with performing the behavior in question. Primary beliefs which underlie the \(NB(Mc)\) component, on the other hand, may be the norm itself, or they may be the beliefs about the expectations of relevant referents, their attitudes, their behaviors, or their power. In summary, then,
for any investigation concerned with changing intentions, the
problem is twofold--to identify which component is a better predictor
of the intention under consideration, and then to identify the primary
beliefs which underlie that component.

Hypotheses Concerning the Effects of
Communication Apprehension, Self Esteem,
And Machiavellianism on Communication Intent
After an Influence Attempt

It was previously stated that personality characteristics can
influence intention if they are significantly related to one of the
determinants of the intention, when that determinant carries the most
weight, or if they influence the relative importance of the two weights.
It was hypothesized earlier in this paper that three personality
characteristics--communication apprehension, self esteem, and
Machiavellianism--will be significantly related to BI, or intention to
communicate in a person-to-group situation. It seems to follow, then,
that if these relationships exist, these same personality characteristics
should continue to influence BI and Aact after an influence attempt.
Therefore, these same personality characteristics should be signifi-
cantly related to the amount of change that can be induced by a per-
suasive communication in the Aact component and subsequently in BI.
Based on these assumptions, the following hypotheses were made:

\( H_9 \): Communication apprehension will be negatively
correlated with the amount of change in Aact.

\( H_{10} \): Communication apprehension will be negatively
correlated with the amount of change in BI.

\( H_{11} \): Self esteem will be positively correlated with the
amount of change in the Aact component.
\( H_{12} \): Self esteem will be positively correlated with the amount of change in BI.

\( H_{13} \): Machiavellianism will be positively correlated with the amount of change in Aact.

\( H_{14} \): Machiavellianism will be positively correlated with the amount of change in BI.

The following chapter presents the methodology used in applying the Fishbein and Ajzen theory to examine more closely the nature of communicative behavior. The investigation sought to shed more light on the nature of public speaking determinants and the behavioral probabilities concerning those who choose to engage or not to engage in person-to-group communication.
Chapter 2

METHODOLOGY

Pilot Research

In order for an influence attempt to be effective, it must produce change in the salient primary beliefs which underlie the specific dependent variable under consideration. Since the dependent variable of concern to the present study was beginning speech students' intention to communicate in a person-to-group situation, of immediate concern was the identification of the primary beliefs which underlie the specific determinants of this intention. Therefore, the investigator conducted a pilot study to identify the underlying primary beliefs of both Aact and NB(Mc).

Fishbein and Ajzen (1975) suggested that, under most circumstances, a small number of beliefs (five to nine) serve as the determinants of any given dependent variable. This notion is consistent with previous research on attention span, apprehension, and information processing (Miller, 1956; Woodworth and Schlosberg, 1954; and Mandler, 1967). Furthermore, Fishbein and Ajzen maintained that a person's beliefs about a given action (Aact component) can be elicited in a free-response format by asking him to list the consequences or outcomes of performing the behavior in question. Similarly, a person's beliefs about social norms (NB component) can be elicited in a free-
response format by asking the subject to list the people whose opinions would influence his decision to perform the behavior in question. It has been argued elsewhere (Fishbein, 1967; Kaplan and Fishbein, 1969) that salient beliefs are elicited first, and thus, consistent with the considerations above, beliefs elicited beyond the first nine or ten are probably not salient for the individual. Therefore, as a general rule of thumb, Fishbein and Ajzen recommended that the first five to nine beliefs elicited be used. To determine modal salient beliefs for a given population, a representative sample of the population could be asked their beliefs about their attitudes toward the behavior and their normative beliefs about the behavior. The most frequently elicited beliefs may be considered the modal salient beliefs for the population (Fishbein and Ajzen, 1975, pp. 218-219). Consistent with these recommendations and with previous research (Fishbein, 1963; Kaplan and Fishbein, 1969; Jaccard and Davidson, 1972), a free elicitation procedure was used to determine modal salient beliefs.

Subjects in the pilot study were members of several sections of the same introductory public speaking course from which the experimental subjects were drawn. The experimenter described the speech workshop to the pilot subjects and asked them to decide, on the basis of that information, whether they would be likely to participate in such a workshop, given the specific experimental situation, also described to the pilot subjects. Following these procedures the first of two questionnaires was distributed. The first questionnaire was designed to elicit primary beliefs salient to the Aact component. Specifically, subjects were asked to "list as many consequences/out-
comes (costs and rewards) as you can of participating in this workshop." Subjects were also asked their evaluation and belief strength for these consequences. These instruments are contained in Appendix A.

The second questionnaire was designed to elicit the relevant referents for participating in this workshop. Specifically, subjects were asked to "list the people or sets of people whose opinions would influence your decision to participate in this workshop." For each referent listed, subjects also indicated what they thought that referent's expectations were with regard to his participation, how important these referents were in determining their decisions, and how much they wanted to comply with the expectations of these referents (see Appendix A).

From these questionnaires and consistent with Fishbein and Ajzen (1975), a list of modal salient beliefs for both the Aact component and the NB(Mc) component was obtained by counting the most frequently elicited beliefs. It should be noted that the same free elicitation procedure was conducted on several selected subjects from the actual experimental sample in an effort to validate the modal salient beliefs obtained in the pilot research. These subjects were eliminated from the experimental sample and asked to assist in the experiment. These validated modal salient beliefs, which are enumerated subsequently, were used to formulate the persuasive message, which is found in Appendix G.

Subjects

The subjects were approximately 125 undergraduate students
enrolled in sections of an introductory class in public speaking at Southeastern Louisiana University. These subjects represented the entire population of students taking beginning public speaking during the summer, 1977, semester at the University.

Procedure

The experimental period extended over the first three weeks of the University semester and involved four stages—pretest, treatment, posttest, and observed behavior, the workshop ($B_2$).

Stage I: Pretesting

Step A—On the first day of class, subjects were given written information about a speech workshop (see Appendix C). The workshop was to be sponsored by the Department of Speech and Theatre, to be held on a specified day and time, approximately three weeks in the future. According to the handout, the "Speech 211 Workshop," as it was called, was being held in order to allow the students to evaluate their speaking ability in comparison to that of members of other sections of the class. Attendance was said to be voluntary, but it was made clear that all of the course instructors would be present. Participants were required to deliver a 60 second speech of self introduction to the group. Also on the first day, each of the instructors, who were confederates in the study, administered a general questionnaire, included in which were measures of self esteem, Machiavellianism, and other informational items.

Step B—One week later, the instructors administered another questionnaire under the guise of trying to determine the number of
probable participants in the workshop. This questionnaire was actually a pretest measure of the following:

1. Subjects' behavioral intentions (BI) with respect to signing up for the workshop
2. Subjects' attitudes toward signing up (Aact)
3. Subjects' normative beliefs for each referent (NB) with respect to signing up
4. Subjects' motivation to comply (Mc) with what significant others think they should do
5. McCroskey's PRCA, a measure of communication apprehension

These pretest questionnaires are found in Appendix E.

Stage II: Treatment

Six days after the treatment, on the day preceding the scheduled workshop, the treatment was administered. In each section of the public speaking class, subjects were randomly assigned to message or no-message conditions. The no-message or control subjects were given the posttest and signup instruments, that is, they immediately proceeded to Stage III. The persuasive message subjects heard a live persuasive message in which they were urged to attend the workshop.

The persuasive message was formulated in accord with Fishbein and Ajzen's basic principle of change. Nine modal salient beliefs were revealed by the pilot study to be significant for this behavior among this population. Subjects had indicated that "Participating in the Speech 211 Workshop" would: (1) make them better public speakers, (2) help them to make a better grade and do better generally in the public speaking classes, (3) improve their relationship with the class instructor, (4) reduce their "stage fright," although a few
pilot subjects had indicated a temporary increase in stage fright as a probable consequence of addressing the group at the workshop, (5) give them an advantage over non-participants, (6) give them an opportunity to meet new people, (7) cause their instructors to think them more interested in the class and concerned about their speaking, (8) give them beneficial public speaking experience, and (9) be worth the time required. These nine primary beliefs were linked in the persuasive message to "signing up for the workshop." The message was constructed so as to be informal and brief, yet persuasive.

The speaker was a female doctoral candidate in speech communication with extensive public speaking and teaching experience. Having been introduced on the information sheet as a faculty member from another university and director of the workshop, she delivered the treatment message in an informal but as uniform as possible a manner.

Stage III: Posttesting

Immediately after hearing the speech, subjects in the message condition were asked to fill out a posttest questionnaire which consisted of the following measures:

1. BI with respect to signing up
2. Aact, or attitude toward signing
3. NB with respect to signing up
4. A signup sheet (B) on which subjects were asked to indicate whether they would or would not come to the workshop

Subjects were told that although participation in the workshop was voluntary and not a course requirement, the signup sheet was a commitment and that the names would be checked at the workshop. The no-message subjects completed the same instruments and were given the
same information but no message. These instruments are contained in Appendix F.

Stage IV: The Workshop \( (B_2) \)

The workshop was conducted as scheduled. It served both as the logical conclusion to the study and as a measure of observed behavior. Those attending were asked to sign a roll, thus comprising an additional variable, actual participation behavior \( (B_2) \). The experimenter conducted the workshop, which began with a complete debriefing of the subjects. Following a question period, the workshop was then conducted as advertised, with reported beneficial results by those attending. Debriefing of the non-participants was done by the instructors in their classes on the following day. The following chapter presents the results of the statistical analysis of the collected data along with a discussion of the findings.
The first step in analysis of the data was a multiple linear regression performed on pretest results, using Aact and NB(Mc) scores as predictor variables and BI as the dependent variable. This and the subsequent analyses were performed utilizing an IBM 370/158 computer system and selected procedures from SAS 76. As Fishbein and Ajzen's theory suggests, both Aact and NB(Mc) were statistically significant predictors of BI. Specifically, the subjects' attitude toward the act was the better predictor, significant at the .0001 level of confidence. NB(Mc) was a less significant predictor of BI, with a .0184 level of confidence. The two components together accounted for 16 percent of the variance in BI. Based on these findings, the persuasive messages were aimed at the subjects' attitude toward performing the act, the more important component for this behavior.

Results

Specifically, the following hypotheses were tested:

$H_1$: The hypothesis of a high positive correlation between B and BI was tested using point biserial correlation. As indicated in Table 1, the hypothesis was confirmed at the .0001 level of confidence with a correlation of .40.
TABLE I

Correlations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Communication Apprehension</th>
<th>Self Esteem</th>
<th>Machiavelianism</th>
<th>Behavior (Pt. Biserial)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BI</td>
<td>-.41**</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>.40**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aact</td>
<td>-.30**</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aact Dif</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>-.31**</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BI Dif</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>-.15</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behavior (Pt. Biserial)</td>
<td>.20*</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.005</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*P < .05
**P < .01
$H_2$: The hypothesis of a high multiple correlation between the two components (Aact and NB[Mc]) and BI was tested using multiple correlation. The hypothesis was confirmed at the .0001 level of confidence with $R = .40$.

$H_3$: The hypothesis of a negative correlation between communication apprehension and both B and BI was tested using point biserial correlation and Pearson product-moment correlation respectively. As Table 1 indicates, communication apprehension and signup behavior were significantly correlated at .029 level of confidence with a correlation of -.20. The correlation of -.41 between communication apprehension and intent to sign up was significant at the .0001 level of confidence. On the basis of these findings, Hypothesis 3 was confirmed.

$H_4$: As indicated in Table 1, the hypothesized correlations between self esteem and B and BI were tested using point biserial and Pearson correlations. The hypothesis was not confirmed.

$H_5$: Table 1 reveals identical tests of the hypothesized positive correlations between Machiavellianism and B and BI. These hypotheses were not confirmed. However, a point biserial correlation between Machiavellianism and $B_2$ revealed a positive correlation of .20, significant at the .02 level of confidence.

$H_6$: The hypothesis of a negative correlation between communication apprehension and Aact was tested using a Pearson product-moment correlation. As shown in Table 1, the hypothesis was confirmed at the .0001 level of confidence with $r = -.41$.

$H_7$: The hypothesized relationship between self esteem and Aact was not confirmed.
Similarly, as indicated in Table 1, the hypothesized relationship between Machiavellianism and Aact was not confirmed.

The hypothesis that communication apprehension would be negatively correlated with the amount of change in Aact (AactDif) brought about as a result of a persuasive message was tested using a Pearson product-moment correlation. As Table 1 indicates, the hypothesis was not confirmed.

The hypothesis that communication apprehension would be negatively correlated with the amount of change in BI (BIDif) brought about as a result of a persuasive message was tested using both a Pearson product-moment correlation (see Table 1) and in a 2 x 2 analysis of variance following a median split procedure to separate communication apprehensives into highs and lows. The median score on a scale of 20 to 100 was 64. Tables 1 and 2 indicate these findings. The hypothesis was not confirmed. Although the message group differed significantly from the control group ($F = 12.75$) at the .0006 level of confidence, the high and low communication apprehensives showed no significant difference.

The hypothesis of a positive correlation between self esteem and AactDif was not confirmed. On the contrary, a significantly negative correlation ($r = -.31$) was found to exist.

As in $H_{10}$, both correlational and causal statistical procedures were used to test the hypothesized relationship between self esteem and BIDif. A Pearson product-moment correlation revealed no significant relationship ($r = -.15$). As indicated in Table 3, a 2 x 2 analysis of variance revealed a significant difference between message and control subjects ($F = 12.76$), but no significant
### TABLE II

Analysis of Variance on Change in Behavioral Intention for MSAPPR

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variation</th>
<th>d.f.</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>202.22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treatment</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>31.14</td>
<td>31.14</td>
<td>12.75**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSAPPR</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treatment x MSAPPR</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>31.23</td>
<td>15.61</td>
<td>6.39*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>170.63</td>
<td>2.44</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*P < .005
**P < .001

Treatment - Influence attempt versus no influence attempt

MSAPPR - High communication apprehension versus low communication apprehension
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variation</th>
<th>d.f.</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>202.22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treatment</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>31.14</td>
<td>31.14</td>
<td>12.76**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSESTEEM</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>0.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treatment x MSESTEEM</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>31.39</td>
<td>15.70</td>
<td>6.43*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>170.75</td>
<td>2.44</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*P < .005
**P < .001

Treatment - Influence attempt versus no influence attempt

MSESTEEM - High self esteem versus low self esteem
difference between high and low self esteem subjects, as determined by a median split procedure. The median score on a scale of 1 to 6 was 5. The hypothesis was not confirmed.

\( H_{13} \): Table 1 indicates that the hypothesized relationship between Machiavellianism and AactDif was not confirmed.

\( H_{14} \): As in \( H_{10} \) and \( H_{12} \), both a Pearson product-moment correlation and a 2 x 2 analysis of variance were conducted to determine the hypothesized positive relationship between Mach and BIDif. As shown in Tables 1 and 4, no relationship was revealed (\( r = .07 \)) between Mach and BIDif, although, again, the treatment did have a significant effect (\( F = 12.84 \)) at the .0006 level of confidence. The high and low Mach subjects did not differ significantly with respect to the amount of change of BI they demonstrated following the message. The median score on a scale of 40 to 160 was 88.

**Discussion**

Before the present results are interpreted, two factors should be noted. First, the generalizability of the findings are somewhat restricted by the nature of the population from which the subjects were drawn. Although the experimental sample included the entire population of beginning speech students at the University during that semester, subjects ranging in age from seventeen to fifty-five, the conclusions to be drawn may only be relevant for beginning speech students. Additionally, the high levels of confidence at which especially several of the correlational research hypotheses were confirmed must be viewed with consideration to the large overall number of subjects included.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variation</th>
<th>d.f.</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>202.22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treatment</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>31.14</td>
<td>31.14</td>
<td>12.84**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSMACH</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.29</td>
<td>1.29</td>
<td>0.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treatment x MSMACH</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>32.43</td>
<td>16.21</td>
<td>6.68*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>170.10</td>
<td>2.43</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*P < .005
**P < .001

Treatment - Influence attempt versus no influence attempt

MSMACH - High Machiavellianism versus low Machiavellianism
As was stated earlier, the main purpose of the present study was not to test the Fishbein and Ajzen model. However, the study's two hypotheses which dealt with the model's ability to predict speech behavior were confirmed. These findings are viewed as evidence for the ability of the intent model to predict communication behavior of this kind. In this situation, a person's intention to communicate can be viewed as highly correlated with his performing or not performing the communication behavior. The more he intends to communicate, the more likely he is to do so. Further, the person's intention to communicate, and therefore his actual communication behavior, can be seen as a function both of his attitude toward performing the specific behavior and of his normative social beliefs concerning the behavior, with the former being of greater importance. In summary, then, single act communication behaviors of this kind can be predicted using the intent model.

Hypotheses 3-8 dealt with the supposed relationships between communication apprehension, self esteem, and Machiavellianism and both intent and behavior. The findings indicated that, as predicted, communication apprehension was negatively correlated with both dependent variables. That is, the more communication apprehensive the subject was, the less likely he was to intend to participate in the behavior, or actually to perform the behavior. A high negative correlation was also found to exist between a subject's level of communication apprehension and his attitude toward performing the act. This finding may also be viewed as support for the model, which suggests that an individual difference variable of this kind will influence BI only to the extent that it influences one of the
components (Aact or NB(Mc)). As anticipated, the negative correlation between communication apprehension and NB(Mc) was also significant, but less so. One possible conclusion, then, may be that communication apprehension is a significant variable in this behavior.

With respect to the relationship between Machiavellianism and this behavior, several hypotheses were tested. The findings seem to indicate that Machiavellianism is not related to any of the model's components, and is, therefore, not a significant variable for this behavior. However, the interesting additional finding of a significant correlation between Mach and Bz may suggest further research. Mach was found not to be related to the signup behavior, yet significantly correlated with the observed behavior, that is, the higher Mach a person was, the more likely he was to attend the workshop, whether he had intended to participate or not. Subsequent research may clarify this suggested relationship.

The findings indicated that self esteem was not a significant predictor of this behavior. A significant negative correlation was found to exist between self esteem and Machiavellianism, however, providing support for past research with these variables. Since self esteem was not found to be correlated with any of the model's components, it is not viewed as a significant personality variable for this kind of person-to-group communication behavior.

The remaining hypotheses in the present study dealt with the possible relationships between these individual differences and the model's components in the presence of an oral persuasive message. Although the persuasive treatments were found to be significant in the changing of behavioral intent, the effects of the individual
difference variables were not as hypothesized. Communication apprehension and Machiavellianism were found to be unrelated to the propensity of a person to be persuaded by a message advocating the behavior in question. Surprisingly, self esteem was found to have a significant negative correlation with the change in Aact brought about by the message. In other words, the higher a person's self esteem, the less likely he was to change his attitude toward performing the behavior. This seems to confirm, for this behavior at least, the traditional idea of the person high in self esteem being low in persuasibility. That is, the more highly a person thinks of himself, the less likely he may be to change his attitude toward performing a certain act. It should again be noted, however, that the median score on self esteem was 5 measured on the standard 6-interval scale. High self esteem was considered to be a score of 5 or 6, while low self esteem was designated as a score of 4 or less. This unusual clustering of subjects near the high end of the self esteem scale may have made the findings somewhat atypical.

As any public speaking teacher knows, communication apprehension is a significant variable in communication behavior. As mentioned earlier, however, most speech texts deal with the causes and cures of this ubiquitous phenomenon, rather than attempting to explain it. The results of this study indicate that this curious form of state anxiety can be explored from another perspective, and it is hoped that further interest in this heuristic communication variable may be engendered by this study. It is interesting to note that the workshop participants voiced unanimous concern with their "stage fright" and virtually every student indicated the crucial nature of
of the phenomenon. Perhaps further investigation will provide better, more efficient measures for speech students to understand and deal with this problem.

As has been stated, the present study was seen as an attempt to relate current psychological theory to person-to-group communication behavior, that is, to attempt further clarification of the psychological processes which determine or influence whether a person will communicate or not communicate when given the opportunity. Fishbein and Ajzen's constructs appear to represent an effort toward more specific operationalization of these mediating processes. Further, the results of the present study indicate the possible value of this approach for communication researchers. It must be noted, however, that the kind of research setting employed in this study is not without its problems. Additionally, the application of Fishbein and Ajzen's model suggests difficulty in measurement and methodology which may explain, in part, the general reticence of communication researchers to embrace this kind of approach. It is felt, however, that an understanding of the underlying psychological processes is necessary to any behavioral model which views man as a rational animal, and an information processor, with behavior principally subject to the person's volitional control.
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APPENDIX A

PILOT RESEARCH

Instructions to Subjects in the Pilot Research

Subjects were urged to be as thoughtful and honest as possible. They were asked to imagine themselves as they were on the first day of class and to put themselves into a hypothetical situation. Specifically they were told:

Imagine that on the first day of your speech class your instructor gave you an information sheet about a speech workshop, for all beginning speech students, which would be held in approximately three weeks at a specified date, time and place. The primary purposes of the workshop, according to the information sheet, would be to give you a chance to evaluate yourselves in terms of other beginning speech students and to give you some outside advice and help with your speaking problems. The information sheet also tells you that the workshop will be informal and that the instructors of all the beginning speech classes will be there, although no credit will be given, nor will participation or failure to participate affect your grade in this class. Approximately ten days later, your instructor asks you if you will participate in the workshop. Now, based on this information, decide whether you would or would not participate in the workshop.

After the subjects had had time to make their decisions, the first ques-
tionnaire, designed to assess the primary beliefs underlying the Aact component, was distributed. Subjects were told:

Based on the decision you made, complete the following questionnaire in terms of the reasons underlying that decision, that is, if you decided to participate, what were your reasons for doing so, and vice versa. You do not have to list as many reasons as there are numbers listed. We are interested only in your honest beliefs about the consequences (costs and rewards you perceive) of participating in this workshop. Assume that the phrase "Participating in this workshop will . . ." precedes each consequence that you list.

After subjects had completed this sheet, two other pages, designed to assess their attitudes toward the workshop and their levels of belief strength, were distributed. The meaning and the mechanics of filling out each scale were explained. Subjects then proceeded to evaluate each consequence they had listed as well as to indicate how strongly they believed each of the consequences was actually associated with the behavior.

Upon completion of the Aact questionnaire, subjects were given the first page of the questionnaire designed to assess the relevant referents for the NB(Mc) component. Subjects were asked to list those people, if any, whose opinions would influence their decisions to participate or not participate. When the subjects had finished this page, three other pages were given to them along with the following instructions:

Now that you have listed those people whose opinions might influence your decision to participate or not to participate,
we would like some additional information. On page two, please indicate whether you think the people you listed believe you ought to go to this workshop. On page three indicate how important each person's opinion is to you, and on the fourth sheet indicate how motivated you are to do what these people want you to do.

Upon completion of the two questionnaires, the subjects were thanked for their cooperation, and the study was described to those who were interested.
Assessment of Primary Beliefs for the Aact Component

List as many consequences/outcomes (costs and rewards) as you can of participating in this workshop.

1.

2.

3.

4.

5.

6.

7.

8.

9.

10.

11.

12.

13.

14.

15.

16.
For each consequence you listed, indicate your evaluation of that consequence on the appropriate scale below by placing a check mark (✓) in the position which most closely reflects your evaluation of that consequence. For example, consequence number 1 will be rated on the scale numbered "1"; consequence number 2 will be rated on the scale numbered "2"; etc.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Consequence Number</th>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Evaluation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>good</td>
<td><em><strong><strong><strong><strong>:</strong></strong>____:</strong></strong></em><em><strong>:</strong></em><em><strong><strong>:</strong></strong></em>___:bad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>good</td>
<td><em><strong><strong><strong><strong>:</strong></strong>____:</strong></strong></em><em><strong>:</strong></em><em><strong><strong>:</strong></strong></em>___:bad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>good</td>
<td><em><strong><strong><strong><strong>:</strong></strong>____:</strong></strong></em><em><strong>:</strong></em><em><strong><strong>:</strong></strong></em>___:bad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>good</td>
<td><em><strong><strong><strong><strong>:</strong></strong>____:</strong></strong></em><em><strong>:</strong></em><em><strong><strong>:</strong></strong></em>___:bad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>good</td>
<td><em><strong><strong><strong><strong>:</strong></strong>____:</strong></strong></em><em><strong>:</strong></em><em><strong><strong>:</strong></strong></em>___:bad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>good</td>
<td><em><strong><strong><strong><strong>:</strong></strong>____:</strong></strong></em><em><strong>:</strong></em><em><strong><strong>:</strong></strong></em>___:bad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>good</td>
<td><em><strong><strong><strong><strong>:</strong></strong>____:</strong></strong></em><em><strong>:</strong></em><em><strong><strong>:</strong></strong></em>___:bad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>good</td>
<td><em><strong><strong><strong><strong>:</strong></strong>____:</strong></strong></em><em><strong>:</strong></em><em><strong><strong>:</strong></strong></em>___:bad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>good</td>
<td><em><strong><strong><strong><strong>:</strong></strong>____:</strong></strong></em><em><strong>:</strong></em><em><strong><strong>:</strong></strong></em>___:bad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>good</td>
<td><em><strong><strong><strong><strong>:</strong></strong>____:</strong></strong></em><em><strong>:</strong></em><em><strong><strong>:</strong></strong></em>___:bad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>good</td>
<td><em><strong><strong><strong><strong>:</strong></strong>____:</strong></strong></em><em><strong>:</strong></em><em><strong><strong>:</strong></strong></em>___:bad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>good</td>
<td><em><strong><strong><strong><strong>:</strong></strong>____:</strong></strong></em><em><strong>:</strong></em><em><strong><strong>:</strong></strong></em>___:bad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>good</td>
<td><em><strong><strong><strong><strong>:</strong></strong>____:</strong></strong></em><em><strong>:</strong></em><em><strong><strong>:</strong></strong></em>___:bad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>good</td>
<td><em><strong><strong><strong><strong>:</strong></strong>____:</strong></strong></em><em><strong>:</strong></em><em><strong><strong>:</strong></strong></em>___:bad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>good</td>
<td><em><strong><strong><strong><strong>:</strong></strong>____:</strong></strong></em><em><strong>:</strong></em><em><strong><strong>:</strong></strong></em>___:bad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>good</td>
<td><em><strong><strong><strong><strong>:</strong></strong>____:</strong></strong></em><em><strong>:</strong></em><em><strong><strong>:</strong></strong></em>___:bad</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
For each consequence you listed, indicate how strongly you believe (that
is, how probable you think it is) that each of the consequences you
listed is, indeed, a consequence of participating in this workshop. Rate
consequence number 1 on the first scale (number 1); consequence number 2
on the second scale (number 2); and so on. Place a check (✓) in the
position which most closely reflects the strength with which you hold
this belief.

1. probable

2. probable

3. probable

4. probable

5. probable

6. probable

7. probable

8. probable

9. probable

10. probable

11. probable

12. probable

13. probable

14. probable

15. probable

16. probable
Assessment of Relevant Referents for the NB(Mc) Component

List as many people or sets of people (relevant referents) as you can whose opinion(s) would influence your decision as to whether you would participate in this workshop or not.

1.

2.

3.

4.

5.

6.

7.

8.

9.

10.

11.

12.

13.
For each person or set of persons named, indicate what you think they think you should do with regard to participating in this workshop by placing a check (✓) in the blank which most closely reflects your feelings. Number 1 on the list of people should correspond to scale number 1 on this questionnaire. For example:

expects me to participate in this workshop.

(whomever you listed as no. 1)

probable _______:_______:_______:_______:_______:_______ improbable

1. probable _______:_______:_______:_______:_______:_______ improbable

2. probable _______:_______:_______:_______:_______:_______ improbable

3. probable _______:_______:_______:_______:_______:_______ improbable

4. probable _______:_______:_______:_______:_______:_______ improbable

5. probable _______:_______:_______:_______:_______:_______ improbable

6. probable _______:_______:_______:_______:_______:_______ improbable

7. probable _______:_______:_______:_______:_______:_______ improbable

8. probable _______:_______:_______:_______:_______:_______ improbable

9. probable _______:_______:_______:_______:_______:_______ improbable

10. probable _______:_______:_______:_______:_______:_______ improbable

11. probable _______:_______:_______:_______:_______:_______ improbable

12. probable _______:_______:_______:_______:_______:_______ improbable

13. probable _______:_______:_______:_______:_______:_______ improbable
For each person or set of persons, indicate how important that person or set of persons is (are) in determining your decision to participate in this workshop by placing a check (✓) in the blank which most closely reflects your feelings. Number 1 on the previous questionnaire should correspond to scale number 1 on this questionnaire.

1. extremely important
2. extremely important
3. extremely important
4. extremely important
5. extremely important
6. extremely important
7. extremely important
8. extremely important
9. extremely important
10. extremely important
11. extremely important
12. extremely important
13. extremely important

- extremely not important at all
- not important at all
For each person or set of persons named, indicate how much you want to comply with their expectations about your participating in this workshop by placing a check (✓) in the blank which most closely reflects your feelings. Number 1 on the list of people should correspond to scale number 1 on this questionnaire. For example:

How much do you want to do what ________________________________ expects you (whomever you listed as no. 1) to do?

want very much to ______:______:______:______:______:______:______:______:______/ want very much not to

want very much to ______:______:______:______:______:______:______:______:______/ want very much not to

want very much to ______:______:______:______:______:______:______:______:______/ want very much not to

want very much to ______:______:______:______:______:______:______:______:______/ want very much not to

want very much to ______:______:______:______:______:______:______:______:______/ want very much not to

want very much to ______:______:______:______:______:______:______:______:______/ want very much not to

want very much to ______:______:______:______:______:______:______:______:______/ want very much not to

want very much to ______:______:______:______:______:______:______:______:______/ want very much not to

want very much to ______:______:______:______:______:______:______:______:______/ want very much not to

want very much to ______:______:______:______:______:______:______:______:______/ want very much not to

want very much to ______:______:______:______:______:______:______:______:______/ want very much not to

want very much to ______:______:______:______:______:______:______:______:______/ want very much not to

want very much to ______:______:______:______:______:______:______:______:______/ want very much not to

want very much to ______:______:______:______:______:______:______:______:______/ want very much not to

want very much to ______:______:______:______:______:______:______:______:______/ want very much not to

want very much to ______:______:______:______:______:______:______:______:______/ want very much not to

want very much to ______:______:______:______:______:______:______:______:______/ want very much not to

want very much to ______:______:______:______:______:______:______:______:______/ want very much not to

want very much to ______:______:______:______:______:______:______:______:______/ want very much not to

want very much to ______:______:______:______:______:______:______:______:______/ want very much not to

want very much to ______:______:______:______:______:______:______:______:______/ want very much not to

want very much to ______:______:______:______:______:______:______:______:______/ want very much not to

want very much to ______:______:______:______:______:______:______:______:______/ want very much not to

want very much to ______:______:______:______:______:______:______:______:______/ want very much not to

want very much to ______:______:______:______:______:______:______:______:______/ want very much not to

want very much to ______:______:______:______:______:______:______:______:______/ want very much not to

want very much to ______:______:______:______:______:______:______:______:______/ want very much not to

want very much to ______:______:______:______:______:______:______:______:______/ want very much not to

want very much to ______:______:______:______:______:______:______:______:______/ want very much not to

want very much to ______:______:______:______:______:______:______:______:______/ want very much not to

want very much to ______:______:______:______:______:______:______:______:______/ want very much not to

want very much to ______:______:______:______:______:______:______:______:______/ want very much not to

want very much to ______:______:______:______:______:______:______:______:______/ want very much not to

want very much to ______:______:______:______:______:______:______:______:______/ want very much not to

want very much to ______:______:______:______:______:______:______:______:______/ want very much not to

want very much to ______:______:______:______:______:______:______:______:______/ want very much not to

want very much to ______:______:______:______:______:______:______:______:______/ want very much not to

want very much to ______:______:______:______:______:______:______:______:______/ want very much not to

want very much to ______:______:______:______:______:______:______:______:______/ want very much not to

want very much to ______:______:______:______:______:______:______:______:______/ want very much not to

want very much to ______:______:______:______:______:______:______:______:______/ want very much not to

want very much to ______:______:______:______:______:______:______:______:______/ want very much not to

want very much to ______:______:______:______:______:______:______:______:______/ want very much not to

want very much to ______:______:______:______:______:______:______:______:______/ want very much not to

want very much to ______:______:______:______:______:______:______:______:______/ want very much not to

want very much to ______:______:______:______:______:______:______:______:______/ want very much not to

want very much to ______:______:______:______:______:______:______:______:______/ want very much not to

want very much to ______:______:______:______:______:______:______:______:______/ want very much not to

want very much to ______:______:______:______:______:______:______:______:______/ want very much not to

want very much to ______:______:______:______:______:______:______:______:______/ want very much not to

want very much to ______:______:______:______:______:______:______:______:______/ want very much not to

want very much to ______:______:______:______:______:______:______:______:______/ want very much not to

want very much to ______:______:______:______:______:______:______:______:______/ want very much not to

want very much to ______:______:______:______:______:______:______:______:______/ want very much not to

want very much to ______:______:______:______:______:______:______:______:______/ want very much not to

want very much to ______:______:______:______:______:______:______:______:______/ want very much not to

want very much to ______:______:______:______:______:______:______:______:______/ want very much not to

want very much to ______:______:______:______:______:______:______:______:______/ want very much not to

want very much to ______:______:______:______:______:______:______:______:______/ want very much not to

want very much to ______:______:______:______:______:______:______:______:______/ want very much not to

want very much to ______:______:______:______:______:______:______:______:______/ want very much not to

want very much to ______:______:______:______:______:______:______:______:______/ want very much not to

want very much to ______:______:______:______:______:______:______:______:______/ want very much not to

want very much to ______:______:______:______:______:______:______:______:______/ want very much not to

want very much to ______:______:______:______:______:______:______:______:______/ want very much not to

want very much to ______:______:______:______:______:______:______:______:______/ want very much not to

want very much to ______:______:______:______:______:______:______:______:______/ want very much not to

want very much to ______:______:______:______:______:______:______:______:______/ want very much not to

want very much to ______:______:______:______:______:______:______:______:______/ want very much not to

want very much to ______:______:______:______:______:______:______:______:______/ want very much not to

want very much to ______:______:______:______:______:______:______:______:______/ want very much not to
APPENDIX B

GUIDELINES AND INFORMATION FOR CONFEDERATES (INSTRUCTORS)

Guidelines

I. With respect to the general methodology, there are two vital elements which relate to the participation of the confederates (instructors):

A. Uniformity of information— in response to students' inevitable questions about the workshop, the instructors must give the same information; and,

B. Authenticity of the situation—excepting the experimenter and the confederates, everyone involved must think that the workshop and its attendant measures are real, and the experimental nature of the project must be concealed.

II. With respect to the specific information which confederates will give:

A. Generally, be vague but interested— as the cover story suggests, we (the instructors) are interested in the results of the workshop, but we are more or less waiting to find out exactly how it will be conducted.

B. Regarding questions about the workshop itself, it will be:

1. Informal;
2. Voluntary;
3. Without grades or instructors' critiques;
4. Attended by instructors and 211 students; and,
5. Not a factor in the grading of the course.

C. The speech which every attendee will give will be:

1. A sixty-second speech of self-introduction;
2. Presented in front of the entire group;
3. Done with or without notes and a podium, as the student wishes;
4. Similar to or possibly the same as the introductory speech done in class; and,
5. Possibly worthy of an extra practice or two.
III. With respect to your participation, I am extremely grateful and will try to minimize your trouble in every way possible. I will be at school for each of the early questionnaire days and will take care of getting the instruments to you and picking them up after each class, or in whatever manner you prefer. The treatment day will be moderately confusing, but I hope to make it as easy on everyone as I can. Thanks a lot.
Confederate Information Form

I. The purpose of the study is to predict, according to Fishbein and Ajzen's theory of behavior, whether, depending upon certain receiver and message criteria:

A. Beginning speech students will intend to perform a certain public speaking behavior; and, whether

B. Those intentions can be changed by an oral persuasive message.

II. The experiment will consist of four general stages:

A. Stage One—preliminary instruments:

1. A basic information sheet about the workshop handed out by instructors to all 211 students during the first days of class. Instructors should answer students' questions generally, according to the accompanying guidelines; and,

2. Receiver criteria survey administered to all students, beginning on the first or second day of class. Instructors will explain that these instruments are routinely administered to beginning speech students as part of the course.

3. Both of these preliminary instruments should be given to late registrants, etc., in order to maximize the eventual number of subjects in the study.

B. Stage Two—experimental pretest:

1. A brief questionnaire relating to subjects' intentions to participate in the workshop; and,

2. A brief questionnaire relating to subjects' communication apprehension about the behavior.

C. Stage Three—treatment day:

1. Instructors will conduct class as usual, but will not hear speeches.

2. Class members will be taken to another room, where they will hear a persuasive message. Students will not return to the classroom but will be dismissed after the treatment.

D. Stage Four—the workshop. Experimenter will debrief and thank subjects. The workshop will be conducted as described.
Because students in basic public speaking classes often want to know how their speaking compares, not only to their fellow classmates' but to members of other sections as well, several college and universities have conducted "speech workshops"—informal meetings in which students get to see how their colleagues' speaking compares to their own. These voluntary, ungraded sessions have proved successful in many schools.

To see if SLU speech students would benefit from this kind of program, the Department of Speech and Theatre will sponsor a "Speech 211 Workshop" to be held at 2:00 P.M. on Thursday, June 16, in room 141 of the Humanities Building.

Those who come to the workshop will deliver a brief (sixty-seconds) speech of self introduction similar to the first speech you will do in class during the first week. Although the 211 teachers (Dr. Welford, Dr. Woodard, and Mrs. Borden) will be attending the workshop, whether you do or do not wish to come and speak will not affect your grade in the class.

An instructor from the Speech Department at Louisiana State University, who has directed similar programs at other universities, will organize and conduct the workshop. She will be passing around a sign up sheet in your class prior to the workshop.
APPENDIX D

STUDENT INFORMATION AND ATTITUDE QUESTIONNAIRE

Student Information Questionnaire

In order to obtain an overall profile on the students taking Speech 211, I would like for you to provide the following information about yourself:

Name: ________________________________________________________________

Social Security Number: ________________________________________________

Sex (check one): Male ___ Female ___

Age: _________________________________________________________________

College Classification (circle one):

- Freshman
- Sophomore
- Junior
- Senior
- Graduate

Previous Experience in Speaking (circle one):

- High School: None 1/2 a year 1 year 2 years more than two years
- College: None 1/2 a year 1 year 2 years more than two years
Student Attitude Questionnaire

Below are statements regarding feelings about communicating with other people. Indicate the degree to which the statements apply to you by circling whether you:

(1) strongly agree (SA); (2) agree (A); (3) are undecided (U);

(4) disagree (D); or (5) strongly disagree (SD) with each statement.

There are no right or wrong answers. Work quickly and record your first impression.

1. I look forward to an opportunity to speak in public. SA A U D SD

2. My hands tremble when I try to handle objects on the platform. SA A U D SD

3. I dislike to use my body and voice expressively. SA A U D SD

4. My thoughts become confused and jumbled when I speak before an audience. SA A U D SD

5. I have no fear of facing an audience. SA A U D SD

6. Although I am nervous just before getting up, I soon forget my fears and enjoy the experience. SA A U D SD

7. I face the prospect of making a speech with complete confidence. SA A U D SD

8. Although I talk fluently with friends I am at a loss for words on the speaking platform. SA A U D SD

9. I feel relaxed and comfortable while speaking. SA A U D SD

10. I always avoid speaking in public if possible. SA A U D SD

11. I enjoy preparing a talk. SA A U D SD

12. My posture feels strained and unnatural. SA A U D SD

13. I am fearful and tense all the while I am speaking before a group of people. SA A U D SD

14. I find the prospect of speaking mildly pleasant. SA A U D SD
15. I look forward to expressing my opinion at meetings.  

16. While participating in a conversation with a new acquaintance I feel very nervous. 

17. Conversing with people who hold positions of authority causes me to be fearful and tense. 

18. I would enjoy presenting a speech on a local TV show. 

19. I feel that I am more fluent when talking to people than most other people are. 

20. I am tense and nervous while participating in group discussions.
Below are statements regarding the way you feel about certain aspects of yourself. Respond to each statement by circling the most appropriate letter depending on the amount of agreement or disagreement.

SA means strongly agree
A means agree
D means disagree
SD means strongly disagree

There are no right or wrong answers; please try to be as honest as you can.

1. I feel that I'm a person of worth, at least on an equal plane with others. SA A D SD
2. I feel that I have a number of good qualities. SA A D SD
3. All in all, I am inclined to feel that I am a failure. SA A D SD
4. I am able to do things as well as most other people. SA A D SD
5. I feel I do not have much to be proud of. SA A D SD
6. I take a positive attitude toward myself. SA A D SD
7. On the whole, I am satisfied with myself. SA A D SD
8. I wish I could have more respect for myself. SA A D SD
9. I certainly feel useless at times. SA A D SD
10. At times I think I am no good at all. SA A D SD
Listed below are a number of statements. Each represents a commonly held opinion and there are no right or wrong answers. You will probably agree with some items and disagree with others. We are interested in the degree to which you agree or disagree with these opinion statements.

Read each statement carefully. Then indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree by circling the number following each statement.

If you agree strongly, circle 3
If you agree somewhat, circle 2
If you agree slightly, circle 1

If you disagree slightly, circle -1
If you disagree somewhat, circle -2
If you disagree strongly, circle -3

If you find that the numbers to be used in answering do not adequately indicate your opinion, use the one which is closest to the way you feel.

1. Never tell anyone the real reason you did something unless it is useful to do so.
   3  2  1  -1 -2 -3

2. The best way to handle people is to tell them what they want to hear.
   3  2  1  -1 -2 -3

3. One should take action only when sure it is morally right.
   3  2  1  -1 -2 -3

4. Most people are basically good and kind.
   3  2  1  -1 -2 -3

5. It is safest to assume that all people have a vicious streak and it will come out when they are given a chance.
   3  2  1  -1 -2 -3

6. Honesty is the best policy in all cases.
   3  2  1  -1 -2 -3

7. There are no excuses for lying to someone else.
   3  2  1  -1 -2 -3

8. Generally speaking, men won't work hard unless they're forced to.
   3  2  1  -1 -2 -3
9. All in all, it is better to be humble and honest than to be important and dishonest.

10. When you ask someone to do something for you, it is best to give the real reasons for wanting it rather than giving reasons which carry more weight.

11. Most people who get ahead in the world lead clean, moral lives.

12. Anyone who completely trusts anyone else is asking for trouble.

13. The biggest difference between most criminals and other people is that the criminals are stupid enough to get caught.

14. Most men are brave.

15. It is wise to flatter important people.

16. It is possible to be good in all respects.

17. Barnum was wrong when he said there's a sucker born every minute.

18. It is hard to get ahead without cutting corners here and there.

19. People suffering from incurable diseases should have the choice of being put painlessly to death.

20. Most men forget more easily the death of their father than the loss of their property.
APPENDIX E

PRETEST QUESTIONNAIRE

In order 1) to determine the probable attendance at the Speech Workshop and 2) to assess your attitudes in general about the Workshop, we would appreciate your filling out the following survey. Please answer every question by placing an "X" in the blank which most closely reflects your feelings.

1. How likely is it that you will sign up for the Speech Workshop?

   __________________________ : __________________________ : __________________________
   extremely                quite                     slightly                      undecided                      slightly                quite                     extremely

   unlikely                  unlikely                   unlikely                     likely                        likely                     likely

2. Do you think that signing up for the Speech Workshop is:

   __________________________ : __________________________ : __________________________ : __________________________ : __________________________ : __________________________
   an extremely bad thing to do               a slightly bad thing to do               undecided about whether "signing up" is good or bad               a slightly good thing to do               a good thing to do               an extremely good thing to do

3. Do you think that speaking is:

   __________________________ : __________________________ : __________________________ : __________________________ : __________________________ : __________________________
   an extremely bad thing to do               a slightly bad thing to do               undecided about whether "speaking" is good or bad               a slightly good thing to do               a good thing to do               an extremely good thing to do
4. Do you think that not signing up for the Speech Workshop is:

| an extremely bad thing | a bad thing to do | a slightly bad thing to do | undecided about whether "not signing up" is good or bad | a slightly good thing to do | a good thing to do | an extremely good thing to do |

5. My instructor thinks that I

| definitely | probably | probably | definitely |
| should not | should not | should | should |

OR

My instructor doesn't care whether I speak when given the opportunity or not.

6. My instructor thinks that I

| definitely | probably | probably | definitely |
| should not | should not | should | should |

OR

My instructor doesn't care whether I sign up for the Speech Workshop or not.
7. My classmates think that I _______: _______: _______: _______ speak when given the opportunity.
   definitely probably probably definitely
   should not should not should should
   OR
   My classmates don't care whether I speak when given the opportunity or not.

8. My classmates think that I _______: _______: _______: _______ sign up for the Speech Workshop.
   definitely probably probably definitely
   should not should not should should
   OR
   My classmates don't care whether I sign up for the Speech Workshop or not.

9. My close friends think that I _______: _______: _______: _______ speak when given the opportunity.
   definitely probably probably definitely
   should not should not should should
   OR
   My close friends don't care whether I speak when given the opportunity or not.
10. My close friends think that I ______:_______:_______:_________ sign up for the Speech Workshop.
   definitely probably probably definitely
   should not should not should should
   OR
   My close friends don't care whether I sign up for the Speech Workshop or not.

boyfriend/girlfriend

11. My husband/wife thinks that I ______:_______:_______:_________ speak when given the opportunity.
   definitely probably probably definitely
   should not should not should should
   OR
   My husband/wife doesn't care whether I speak when given the opportunity or not.

boyfriend/girlfriend

12. My husband/wife thinks that I ______:_______:_______:_________ sign up for the Speech Workshop.
   definitely probably probably definitely
   should not should not should should
   OR
   My husband/wife doesn't care whether I sign up for the Speech Workshop or not.
13. Doing what your instructor thinks you should do is:

extremely bad  quite bad  slightly bad  undecided  slightly good  quite good  extremely good

14. Doing what your classmates think you should do is:

extremely bad  quite bad  slightly bad  undecided  slightly good  quite good  extremely good

15. Doing what your close friends think you should do is:

extremely bad  quite bad  slightly bad  undecided  slightly good  quite good  extremely good

16. Doing what your boyfriend/girlfriend or husband/wife thinks you should do is:

extremely bad  quite bad  slightly bad  undecided  slightly good  quite good  extremely good
APPENDIX F

POSTTEST QUESTIONNAIRE

Survey and Opinion Questionnaire

In order 1) to determine the probable attendance at the Speech Workshop and 2) to assess your attitudes in general about the Workshop, we would appreciate your filling out the following survey. Please answer every question by placing an "X" in the blank which most closely reflects your feelings.

1. How likely is it that you will sign up for the Speech Workshop?

   extremely   quite   slightly   undecided   slightly   quite   extremely
   unlikely    unlikely    unlikely    likely     likely    likely

2. Do you think that signing up for the Speech Workshop is:

   an extremely bad thing to do
   a slightly bad thing to do
   undecided about whether "signing up" is good or bad
   a slightly good thing to do
   a good thing to do
   an extremely good thing to do

3. Do you think that speaking is:

   an extremely bad thing to do
   a slightly bad thing to do
   undecided about whether "speaking" is good or bad
   a slightly good thing to do
   a good thing to do
   an extremely good thing to do
4. Do you think that not signing up for the Speech Workshop is:

- an extremely bad thing to do
- a bad thing to do
- a slightly bad thing to do
- undecided about whether "not signing up" is good or bad
- a slightly good thing to do
- a good thing to do
- an extremely good thing to do

5. My instructor thinks that I ___________: speak when given the opportunity.

- definitely should not
- probably should not
- probably should
- definitely should

OR

My instructor doesn't care whether I speak when given the opportunity or not.

6. My instructor thinks that I ___________: sign up for the Speech Workshop.

- definitely should not
- probably should not
- probably should
- definitely should

OR

My instructor doesn't care whether I sign up for the Speech Workshop or not.
7. My classmates think that I ___________:   :   :   :   : speak when given the opportunity.
   definitely probably probably definitely
   should not should not should should

   OR

   My classmates don't care whether I speak
   when given the opportunity or not.

   definitely probably probably definitely
   should not should not should should

   OR

   My classmates don't care whether I sign up
   for the Speech Workshop or not.

   definitely probably probably definitely
   should not should not should should

   OR

   My close friends don't care whether I
   speak when given the opportunity or not.
10. My close friends think that I________:________:________:________ sign up for the Speech Workshop.
   definitely probably probably definitely
   should not should not should should
   OR

   My close friends don't care whether I sign up for the Speech Workshop or not.

11. My husband/wife thinks that I________:________:________:________ speak when given the opportunity.
   definitely probably probably definitely
   should not should not should should
   OR

   My husband/wife doesn't care whether I speak when given the opportunity or not.

12. My husband/wife thinks that I________:________:________:________ sign up for the Speech Workshop.
   definitely probably probably definitely
   should not should not should should
   OR

   My husband/wife doesn't care whether I sign up for the Speech Workshop or not.
13. Doing what your instructor thinks you should do is:

- extremely bad
- quite bad
- slightly bad
- undecided
- slightly good
- quite good
- extremely good

14. Doing what your classmates think you should do is:

- extremely bad
- quite bad
- slightly bad
- undecided
- slightly good
- quite good
- extremely good

15. Doing what your close friends think you should do is:

- extremely bad
- quite bad
- slightly bad
- undecided
- slightly good
- quite good
- extremely good

16. Doing what your boyfriend/girlfriend or husband/wife thinks you should do is:

- extremely bad
- quite bad
- slightly bad
- undecided
- slightly good
- quite good
- extremely good
SIGN UP SHEET FOR THE SPEECH 211 WORKSHOP

THURSDAY, JUNE 16, 1977
ROOM 141
2:00 P.M.

I, ________________________________________, DO or DO NOT (circle one)

PRINT NAME

want to sign up for the Speech 211 Workshop.
I'm from the LSU Speech Department, and I'm in charge of the Speech 211 Workshop tomorrow at 2:00 P.M. I just wanted to talk to you a little about signing up for the Workshop. I realize that signing up for this Workshop will take up some of your free time, however, I think that after you hear about some of the beneficial aspects of this Workshop, you'll agree that the rewards of participating will far outweigh any costs.

I believe that signing up for this Workshop will help you be a better public speaker and thus help you in your 211 class. Your relationship with your instructor should improve, your stage fright should be reduced, and, finally, signing up for the Workshop will give you an opportunity to meet some new people. Let me be more specific.

First, and perhaps most important, signing up for this Workshop should make you a better speaker. There's nothing like getting some practical speaking experience in an informal, relaxed situation where you can look at yourself objectively and compare yourself to other Speech 211 students. Remember, though, there won't be any grades or critiques--absolutely no pressure. This Workshop is designed to be an enjoyable speaking experience.

Second, I believe that those of you who sign up for the Workshop will do better in your 211 class. As a result of signing up for the
Workshop and participating in it, you will probably be able to make your speeches for your 211 class better. You might get some new ideas for speeches or some helpful hints and suggestions from the other speakers who participate. As a result, signing up for the Workshop will certainly give you an advantage over the students in your class who do not sign up.

Third, and this relates to the point I was just making, it is highly probable that your relationship with your 211 instructor will improve if you sign up for the Workshop. I'm sure you already know that all the 211 instructors will be there. They can't help but think that you are interested in the course and concerned about your performance in the class when they see you participating.

The fourth benefit of signing up for the Speech Workshop is a major one for a lot of students. Since the Workshop will be an informal, relaxed situation, your stage fright should be reduced. Thus, you should feel less nervous and more confident about your speaking ability.

Finally, by signing up for the Speech Workshop, you'll have the opportunity to meet some new people. All of the 211 classes will be represented.

So, all things considered, the Workshop will be a learning experience as well as an enjoyable time for all. Therefore, I urge you to sign up for the Speech 211 Workshop.
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