9-1-1998

An Examination of International Students' Communication Competence, Communication Apprehension, and Public Speaking Nonverbal Behaviors.

Sarah Catherine Connors

An Examination of International Students' Communication Competence, Communication Apprehension, and Public Speaking Nonverbal Behaviors

A Thesis

Presented to the

Department of Communication

and the

Faculty of the Graduate College

In Partial Fulfillment

of the requirements for the Degree

Masters of Arts

University of Nebraska at Omaha

by

Sarah Catherine Connors

September, 1998

ProQuest LLC.
789 East Eisenhower Parkway
P.O. Box 1346
Ann Arbor, MI 48106 - 1346

THESIS ACCEPTANCE

Accepted for the faculty of the Graduate College, University of Nebraska, in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree Masters of Arts, University of Nebraska at Omaha.

Committee

Name	Department
[signature]	Communication
[signature]	Soc/Anth
[signature]	Communication

[signature]
Chairman

October 15, 1998
Date

An Examination of International Students' Communication Competence, Communication Apprehension, and Public Speaking Nonverbal Behaviors

Sarah Catherine Connors, MA

University of Nebraska, 1998

Advisor: Dr. Robert Carlson

The purpose of this thesis was to explore some of the potential relationships among communication apprehension, communication competence, and nonverbal behaviors of international students on an American campus. The PRCA-24 (Personal Report of Communication Apprehension), and the CCSR (Communication Competence Self-Report Questionnaire) were used as a means of student self report data gathering. Twenty one students from ten difference countries were videotaped as they presented a required speech after completing the self-report questionnaires. The PSNA (Public Speaking Nonverbal Assessment), which looks at the general areas of paralanguage, speaker disposition, eye behaviors and body motion, was then used by five American graduate teaching assistants to evaluate the speeches in terms of the speaker's use of nonverbal behaviors. Results of the data analysis suggest that as a speaker's level of communication apprehension goes up his/her level of communication competence decreases. The results also indicate that there are specific nonverbal behaviors related to a speaker's level of communication competence and communication apprehension but these behaviors are very culture specific.

Acknowledgments

First, I would like to thank my parents, Tom and Gail Connors, for their unending and unconditional support. Thanks for not letting my quit even in the darkest of hours. Your love and support helped me survive the trials of writing this thesis.

I would also like to thank the members of my committee for their help and words of wisdom. Special thanks go to Dr. Robert Carlson. He never let me get discouraged and always stood by my side. Thank you, Dr. Carlson. Dr. Andris Skrejia – thank you for your patience. Dr. Hollis Glaser – thanks for stepping in at the last minute. Finally, Dr. Marshall Prisbell – thank you for your help in the beginnings of this project.

Thanks also go to the Department of Communication graduate teaching assistants. Without your help and support I'd still be working on my thesis.

Finally, a huge thank you goes to all of my family and friends. Thanks for putting up with me and letting me vent.

Table of Contents

List of Appendixes

List of Tables

CHAPTER 1

Introduction

Almost every second of every day is spent communicating, in some way or another. Yet, most of the time it goes unnoticed. This complicated process is such an integral part of daily life that most individuals fail to recognize the complexities.

The communication process becomes even more involved when a person leaves the environment or culture he/she understands and steps into another. This is happening more and more as the world becomes more of a global village. Today more people are spending extended periods of time in and around other cultures.

It is worth noting that cross-cultural communication examines more than just verbal exchanges. Olebe and Koester (1988) explain that research looks at "intents, attitudes, abilities, and behaviors that occur in interactions between culturally different individuals" (p 335). Researchers use the term "intercultural effectiveness" to describe how well an individual communicates with someone from another culture (Cui & van den Berg, 1991; Cui & Awa, 1992; Koester & Olebe, 1988). Intercultural effectiveness is one of many factors that may influence an individual's self and other perceived communication competence, "an impression or judgment formed about a person's ability to manage interpersonal relationships in communication settings" (Rubin & Martin, 1994, p 33).

As the global village becomes the norm in society it is more important than ever that individuals learn how to effectively communicate with individuals from other

cultures. However, this is not always easy because the accepted forms of communication vary from culture to culture.

Emmert and Emmert (1976) explain that just as the accepted forms of communication vary from culture to culture so do nonverbal behaviors. Matsumoto (1991) states that "we witness nonverbal displays with special meanings unique to ... our own culture or subculture" (p 128). What one individual considers a polite gesture may insult someone from another culture.

Nonverbal behaviors influence many areas of daily life including interpersonal communication, social and leadership perceptions. When the nonverbal behaviors are decoded incorrectly, misunderstandings occur.

Uncertainties concerning the meaning and interpretation of nonverbal behaviors in the context of cross cultural communication may be a source of great apprehension for individuals, especially international students. The present study proposes to explore some of the potential relationships among communication competence, communication apprehension, and nonverbal behaviors of international students.

Review of Literature

It is important to first understand what cross culture communication research examines. Olebe and Koester (1989) explain that the research focuses "on intents, attitudes, abilities, and behaviors that occur in interactions between culturally different individuals" (p 335). When examining international students it is important to have some understanding of the differing cultural aspects they must face on a daily basis. The following information will shed some insight into those differences.

Cross Cultural Communication

Like many things in life, one's culture is often taken for granted. It is something that people deal with everyday and yet do not consciously examine. That is unfortunate because culture, especially in communication, is a very critical concept. When examining communication cross culturally, a few common themes are particularly important.

It is through socialization that individuals learn the accepted patterns of behavior which are based on the values, norms, and rules of the culture. These lessons will influence an individual's communication style for the rest of his/her life. It should be mentioned that while the styles of communication differ across cultures, they also differ within cultures (Gudykunst et al., 1996).

Individualism/Collectivism. A large part of how a person communicates interculturally is dependent on the type of culture from which he/she comes. Culture is where a person learns how to act in situations as well as interpreting others behaviors. Previous research has identified two types of culture: individualistic and collective.

Individualism refers to a culture that places the emphasis on the individual's wants and needs instead of those of the group. Collectivism, on the other hand, emphasizes the group over the individual. Here, it is the group and one's cooperation within that group which is important (Kim, 1994; Gudykunst et al., 1996; Bhawuk & Brislin, 1992; Agar, 1994; Kim et al., 1994; Kim, Sharkey & Singelis, 1995; Lieberman, 1994).

Through socialization, members of an individualistic culture learn what values are important to the culture. In addition, members learn how they are expected to view themselves. On the other hand, members of a collectivistic culture learn what values are important to the group and how the group will view them in return (Gudykunst et al., 1996). It is important to note that cultures are not strictly individualistic or collective. All cultures have characteristics of both so members take a little from each perspective (Gudykunst et al., 1996).

High/Low Context. Going hand in hand with individualistic and collective cultures is the concept of high and/or low context. This concept examines the way in which messages are worded and received in individualistic and collective cultures. High context communication places emphasis on the meaning of the message with the meaning imbedded in the culture (Gudykunst et al., 1996; Agar, 1994, Lieberman, 1994). Low context communication then places the emphasis of the message in the wording of the message (Gudykunst et al., 1996; Agar, 1994). Here the senders want the wording to be as explicit and direct as possible.

Lieberman (1994) discusses the four distinctions between high context and low context. To begin, verbal messages are very important to the low context culture. It is in these messages that shared information is coded so all can understand it. Second, those in the low context environment who rely on verbal messages are seen as less credible and attractive by high context individuals. Next, those in high context cultures are better at reading nonverbal behaviors and the environment around them. Finally, individuals in high context environments expect others to be "able to understand the unarticulated communication" (Lieberman, 1994, p 8). It is for this reason that people in high context environment do not speak as much as those in low context environments (Lieberman, 1994)

In general, high context communication is found more often in collectivistic cultures while low context communication is found more often in individualistic cultures (Gudykunst et al., 1996). Lieberman (1994) gives a good example of where countries are in regard to their high/low context. High context cultures include the Japanese, Arab, Greek and Spanish. Low context cultures include the German Swiss, U.S., and French. The English and Italian fall somewhere in the middle.

Cultural Adaptation Process. Some researchers have gone one step further by putting the necessary skills for cross cultural communication into categories. Koester and Olebe (1988) state that in order to be considered competent in intercultural communication a person needs to have the "abilities to deal with psychological stress, to

communicate effectively, and to establish interpersonal relationships" (p 235). The skills listed above fall into these three categories.

Cui and Awa (1992) and Cui and van den Berg (1991) believe that in order to effectively communicate interculturally a person's cognitive (language, as well, as interpersonal skills), affective (empathy) and behavioral (social interaction with others) communication skills should be interrelated both "conceptually and empirically" (Cui & Awa, 1992, p 314).

Hannigan (1990) perhaps says it best when stating that "high levels of social skills" (p 94) are an important element in successful cross cultural communication. The skills that are important in a person's own culture often carry over into others. It is the degree of importance placed on those skills that differs from culture to culture and not the skills themselves.

This review has examined the cross-cultural communication process but has not yet looked at how one adapts to dealing with other cultures on a daily basis. Anderson (1994) believes that there are four models that describe the cultural adaptation process.

The first model, and the most dominant, is called the "recuperation model" and focuses on culture shock. It is believed that as a person recovers from culture shock it is this recovery period which enables the person to adjust to a new setting (Anderson, 1994). The second model looks at cross cultural adaptation as a learning process. As a person adapts he/she learns the parameters of the setting and eventually learns the social skills necessary to be successful (Anderson, 1994). A third model, called "equally linear",

is the middle ground of the first two models. This model states that cultural adaptation is a step-by-step journey of learning from total ignorance and shock to understanding and participation (Anderson, 1994). The final model views the journey as one of cognitive "sensitivity". In this process the individual is not only learning but "evolving" in the ways the he/she responds to the environment (Anderson, 1994).

Misunderstandings. If misunderstandings occur daily between people who have no cultural differences, is there any hope of reducing the number of misunderstandings between people who do have cultural differences? The answer is yes. Wiseman et al. (1989) believe that some of the problem is found in the attitudes that individuals of one culture hold about cultures other their own. These attitudes may influence the positive or negative impression one holds of another culture and its people. Misunderstandings may arise due to those impressions. Holtgraves (1992) goes on to say that misunderstandings may be the result of "cultural and subcultural assumptions" and that the "differences in such assumptions may lie at the heart of cross-cultural differences" (p 155).

Schneller (1989) takes another approach. He states many misunderstandings in cross cultural communication occur, not because of impressions one holds of another culture, but when words are understood in one way and nonverbal behaviors are decoded in another. Schneller (1989) goes on to say that complete communication fluency is achieved through the understanding of the "verbal, the paralinguistic, and the kinesic" (p 466). A working knowledge of these three aspects of communication may have the ability to reduce misunderstandings that often occur in cross cultural communication.

International Students

International students are becoming common on many college campuses around the United States. In the 1989-1990 school year alone there were as many as 400,000 international students from mostly Asian countries (Zimmermann, 1995). Further research indicates that over 20% of graduate students in the United States are international students, especially at the top business schools (Wan et al., 1992 & Zimmermann, 1995). Wan et al. (1992) contend that, after completing their education, international students must "transfer the knowledge and skills they learn in U.S. classrooms to their home countries" (p 608). Further research indicates that in addition to the skills and techniques international students learn "they will likely [take home] some new attitudes and values which they have absorbed as a results of the experience" (Kumagai, 1977, p 40).

Research has shown that for most international students, studying in the United States is a struggle. Zimmermann (1995) goes on to state that "studying in the United States involves more than simply taking classes (p 322). For many "the new educational environment is so confusing, ambiguous, and overwhelming that they tend to wrap themselves up in their academic struggles and appear indifferent to other aspects of academic life on campus" (Wan et al., 1992, p 620). Wan et al. (1992) further contend that strong English skills and some sort of social support network help make the transition from their home country to the United States less painful.

The term "social difficulty" has been used to describe "the normal day-to-day challenges that characterize attempts to maintain physical and emotional well-being in communication encounters with people from a different country" (Olaniran, 1996, p 72). International students experience this "social difficulty" due to being unfamiliar with the host culture. This causes them to "become disoriented and unable to control, comprehend and interact with the host culture" (Olaniran, 1996, p 72).

Babiker, Cox, and Miller (1980) list four areas that often cause international students difficulties. The first area is communication barriers which result from poor language proficiency and the cultural subtleties of language. Shifting cultural gears focuses on the tug-of-war between accepting new cultural values or keeping those of their home culture. The next area is replacing a social network. These students have left all their family and friends and they need to find a way to replace the support those people have given in the past. Finally, international students must deal with multiple accountability. They often feel a responsibility to their sponsor and advisor in addition to themselves.

Communication Apprehension

Communication apprehension (CA) has become one of the most researched constructs in the speech communication field. It has been estimated that one in five individuals suffer some degree of communication apprehension (Richmond & McCroskey, 1995). CA cuts across all socio-ecomonic lines effecting men and women from all walks of life, ethnic backgrounds and age groups. Communication apprehension

can affect all areas of an individual's life including socialization (Martin & Anderson, 1996; Scott, McCroskey & Richmond, 1978; Ayers, Hopf, Brown & Suek, 1994; and Leary, 1983), and academics (McCroskey & Richmond, 1978). Communication apprehension and its effects play a large role in how an individual, suffering from CA, communicates with and is perceived by others. Martin and Anderson (1996) maintain that individuals suffering from CA often communicate "inappropriately and ineffectively" (p 60).

Communication apprehension is defined as "the fear or anxiety that individuals feel about the generalized situation of one-on-one interactions" (Martin & Anderson, 1996, p 59-60). Scott, McCroskey and Sheahan (1978) contend that "people who experience a high level of communication apprehension are those whose anxiety about or fear of communication with others outweighs projections of gain from such an activity, and are thus more likely to avoid it whenever possible" (p 104). Further research states that individuals suffering communication apprehension often avoid interpersonal communication and when forced to interact do so "inappropriately and ineffectively" (Martin & Anderson, 1996).

Communication apprehension effects not only how individuals communicate with others but also how they are perceived. Overall, high CA's are as seen less immediate, less intimate and less dominate (Burgoon & Koper, 1984). High CA's have been found to talk less, use fewer syllables per word, engage in less information seeking and more repetitions (Ayers et al., 1994). Napieralski, Brooks and Droney (1995) contend that as an

individual's eye contact decreases, he or she is perceived as having higher levels of anxiety. Christenfeld (1995) concludes that CA's who use verbal disfluences are seen as less comfortable, less prepared, less confident, less articulate and more nervous. High CA's also use less eye contact, less nodding and fewer facial expressions (Ayers et al., 1994).

Other nonverbal behaviors which characterize high CA include: self-adapters, twitching, hand/leg shaking and disfluencies (Richmond & McCroskey, 1995). However, the most prevalent example "of anxious behavior is hand rubbing" (Harrigan et al., 1991, p 603).

Nonverbal Communication

It is important to remember that individuals both "infer from and interpret nonverbal behavior" (Emmert & Emmert, 1976, p 168). Thus, nonverbal behaviors are as influential as the verbal message in social interactions. However, nonverbal communication can be hard to interpret and easily misunderstood. This is especially true when looking at nonverbal behaviors and how they relate to culture.

Emmert and Emmert (1976) state that nonverbal behaviors differ in meaning from culture to culture. While the action may be the same "the communicative content [will vary] from culture to culture" (p 168). Matsumoto (1991) puts it very simply when he states that "we witness nonverbal displays with special meanings unique to ... our own culture or subculture" (p 128). It stands to reason that nonverbal behaviors such as nods,

eye contact, handshakes, touch and body position can mean one thing to one person and something entirely different to some else.

Dimensions of Nonverbal Communication. The field of nonverbal communication is an extensive one. There are so many facets of nonverbal behaviors that researchers have divided those facets into three different dimensions: intimacy, immediacy and dominance (Manusov, 1995; Schrader, 1994; Palmer & Simmons, 1995). Palmer and Simmons (1995) believe that these dimensions are important to both the encoding and decoding of nonverbal messages because they imply a shared awareness of meaning.

Schrader (1994) goes on to define each of the dimensions. Intimacy is a reflection of positive feelings (liking, trust, attraction) towards another person. The nonverbal behaviors associated with intimacy are: direct eye contact, smiling, facial pleasantness, and proxemic cues (touching and conversational distance).

The immediacy dimension examines the conversational cues of attentiveness, involvement and altercentrism. The nonverbal behaviors associated with this dimension are: kinesic cues (direct eye contact), proxemic cues (closer conversational distance) and vocalic cues (smooth turn-taking) (Schrader, 1994).

Dominance is considered to be a reflection of power and status. The nonverbal behaviors associated with dominance are: vocalic cues (a faster rate and more interruptions), proxemic cues (relaxed posture and the use of a larger space) and kinesic cues (less eye contact and a less pleasant facial expression) (Schrader, 1994).

Another dimension worth noting is nonverbal apprehension. McKnight (1997) defines those behaviors which convey a speakers uneasiness to the audience as nonverbal apprehension. Such nonverbal cues include decreased eye contact, hand twitching, little expressiveness, and longer pauses (McKnight, 1997).

Universal Nonverbal Behaviors. As confusing as nonverbal behaviors can be at times there are some that are universal. For instance, Kenner (1993) states that playing with hair and clothing along with wringing hands are nonverbal behaviors which are associated with stress. He continues with the example of "cupping the hand to the ear" (p 264) so that a person may hear better and resting postures, such as putting hands in pockets. Previous research indicates that head nods, brow raise and smile are all indications that a person is willing to be approached. Givens (1978) further states that actions like smiling, waving and embracing signal that a person is ready to bond.

Face. Of all the common universal nonverbal behaviors face is the most common. People from all cultures, either consciously or unconsciously, use their face to express how they feel. If a person were to suck on a lemon the reaction would be the same regardless of what culture he/she is from. Research suggests that facial expressions are both "culturally-specific" while at the same time being "simultaneously universal" (Matsumoto, 1991; Kenner, 1993).

Matsumoto (1991) believes that facial expressions are so important because they "convey discrete emotions, making them the most specific and precise nonverbal system"

(p 128). He goes on to explain the importance of facial expressions by saying they regulate and illustrate speech while providing social impressions.

Holtgraves (1992) believes that face management theory has the potential to play a large part in cross cultural communication. He believes that the theory allows for cultural differences in interpersonal communication and the different weighing systems of those differences. Holtgraves (1992) further explains that the theory links "face-threat with the major interpersonal dimensions of social interaction" (p 155). This theory has great potential because it accepts that nonverbal cultural differences are weighted differently which is what may cause problems in cross-cultural interpersonal communication.

Mirroring. Nonverbal communication is such an integral part of daily life that nonverbal behaviors are decoded more than they are intentionally expressed. Palmer and Simmons (1995) discovered that the majority of the time people are not aware of the nonverbal behaviors, such as eye contact and body position, that they use. They suggest that the "conventionally shared social meaning often operate at less than conscious levels" (Palmer & Simmons, 1995, p 150). In short, individuals are not aware of using nonverbal behaviors themselves any more than they are of those being used around them.

While a person may not be consciously aware of the nonverbal behaviors being used around him/her those behaviors do exert influence. Individuals often "mirror" (Emmert & Emmert, 1976) others' nonverbal behaviors. This occurs when a person imitates someone else's "nonverbal cue - position of the body, posture, placement of

hands and legs" (Emmert & Emmert, 1976, p 176) in a way that "mirrors" their own. This "mirroring" is one way of letting a person know that you are interested in what he/she is saying.

The concept of "mirroring" nonverbal behaviors is not limited to just interpersonal communication. In fact, Lieberman (1994) argues that nonverbal behaviors have been known to "mirror a culture's self-image" (p 17). She compares American, Arab, and Japanese use of nonverbal behaviors to illustrate her point. The American will, typically, use more direct eye contact and "sweeping gestures". The Arab will increase the use of gestures when dealing with emotional aspects of conversation. While the Japanese, on the other hand, use very few gestures at all and will instead use silence to make their point.

Automaticity. As mentioned earlier, nonverbal behaviors are often used and decoded unconsciously by both the sender and receiver. Researchers Palmer and Simmons (1995) have given this concept a name: "automacticity". "Automaticity" is the "selection of nonverbals requiring little or no cognitive attention of effort" (Palmer & Simmons, 1995, p131). This process involves the use of action packets or action assemblies and schema or scripts which "describe how nonverbals are made part of a cognitive representation of a relational interaction" (Palmer & Simmons, 1995, p 130-131). They go on to describe four different types of automatic processing. The difference between the models lays in the amount of attention given the encoding of the messages.

The first type is called either postconscious or postattentive. In this model "responses result when specific stimuli are cognitively identified" (Palmer & Simmons, 1995, p 131). Palmer and Simmons (1995) further state that the responses are a result of other learned behaviors. When a certain set of nonverbal behaviors are repeated some sort of image is created in the mind of the receiver. This then leads to the receiver connecting the mental image with the nonverbal behaviors whenever they are seen with little or no effort (Palmer & Simmons, 1995). Thus, the more this process takes place, the more automatic it becomes.

Another type of "automaticity" involves cognitive recognition but with a "higher level of abstraction" (Palmer & Simmons, 1995, p 131). In this model, the overall event is important, not the small acts that make it up. The moment-to-moment behaviors are left to the overlearned behaviors mentioned in the previous model. It is the overall communication that requires conscious attention.

The next model is called preconscious or preattentive (Palmer & Simmons, 1995). It substitutes the cognitive assessment and judgment because it states that "some behavioral responses result from direct stimulus response links without any cognitive mediation" (p 132). There is no conscious knowledge being used in face-to-face interactions. In other words, an individual knows what a certain nonverbal behavior means the same way he/she knows how to breathe.

The final model according to Palmer and Simmons (1995) is very simple. It states that nonverbal behaviors are "completely controllable and operate consciously under

certain conditions" (p 132). In this model, it is believed that certain nonverbal behaviors are manipulated for personal gain. For example, a person may increase eye contact and smiling if he/she wants something.

Nonverbal behaviors are an important part of daily life in every culture. They influence interpersonal communication in addition to social and leadership perceptions. Yet, the majority of people are not aware of using or decoding nonverbal behaviors. It is these nonverbal behaviors that often create misunderstandings when they are decoded incorrectly by members of another culture.

Communication Competence

Interpersonal communication competence plays a large role in everyday social interactions. Communication competence can be defined as "an impression or judgment formed about a person's ability to manage interpersonal relationships in communication settings" (Rubin & Martin, 1994, p 33). In other words, communication competence is one person's perception of the appropriateness of another person's communication skills. Impressions of communication competence are based on the observation of certain skills such as expressing and defending one's position, clear articulation, and recognizing misunderstandings (Rubin, 1985). When examining communication competence it would be wise to remember that some people have more accurate perceptions of their communication skills than do others (Rubin, 1985).

Rubin and Martin (1994) suggest that there are ten dimensions of communication competence: self-disclosure, empathy, social relaxation, assertiveness, interaction

management, altercentrism, expressiveness, supportiveness, immediacy, and environmental control.

Self-disclosure refers to "the ability to open up or reveal to others personality elements through communication" (Rubin & Martin, 1994, p 34). It is through self-disclosure that interpersonal relationships are developed. It is important to remember that the self-disclosures should be appropriate for the situation and other people involved (Rubin & Martin, 1994).

Empathy "is feeling *with* the other" (Rubin & Martin, 1994, p 34). Empathy is an emotional reaction to another and results in the understanding of the other's perspective. Empathy also involves reacting from the other's perspective instead of one's own (Rubin & Martin, 1994).

Social relaxation "is a lack of anxiety or apprehension in everyday social interactions" (Rubin & Martin, 1994, p 34). It can be characterized by: low apprehension, a feeling of comfort, and the ability to handle criticism or negative reactions without stress (Rubin & Martin, 1994).

Assertiveness involves "standing up for one's rights without denying the rights of the other" (Rubin & Martin, 1994, p 35). This dimension is more than just communication and enjoyment of the communication. Research suggests that assertiveness is an element of communication style (Rubin & Martin, 1994).

Interaction management is one's "ability to handle ritualistic procedures in everyday conversation" (Rubin & Martin, 1994, p 36). It involves taking turns,

developing conversational topics, negotiating topics to be discussed, and beginning and ending conversation (Rubin & Martin, 1994).

Altercentrism is defined as "interest in others" (Rubin & Martin, 1994, p 36). Altercentrism includes: paying attention to what others have to say, how they say it, adaptation during conversation, perceptiveness to what is and is not said and responsiveness to other's thoughts (Rubin & Martin, 1994).

Expressiveness is "the ability to communicate feelings through nonverbal behaviors" (Rubin & Martin, 1994, p 36). These behaviors include such things as gestures, posture, and facial expressions. It also includes the verbal communication of a person's thoughts and feelings (Rubin & Martin, 1994).

Supportiveness involves the use of communication skills which enable those involved in the interaction to feel "as though they are equals" (Rubin & Martin, 1994, p 36). This dimension also includes communication skills which confirm the other, are not evaluative, not superior, not strategic, not certain, and not controlling (Rubin & Martin, 1994).

Immediacy can be defined as a person "showing others that they are approachable and available for communication" (Rubin & Martin, 1994, p 37). Nonverbal immediate behaviors include: direct eye contact, open stance, forward lean, and pleasant facial expressions. Verbal immediate behaviors include: focusing attention and comments on others and answering questions directly (Rubin & Martin, 1994).

The final dimension of communication competence is environmental control. Environmental control is defined as "demonstrating one's ability to achieve predetermined goals and satisfy needs" (Rubin & Martin, 1994, p 37). This dimension also includes the ability to gain compliance from others, handling conflicts and problem solving (Rubin & Martin, 1994).

Communication competence has been linked to several aspects of interpersonal communication such as satisfaction, pleasure, relaxation motives and affection (Rubin & Martin, 1994). It has been suggested that individuals who are interpersonally competent have the necessary skills and sensitivity to communicate effectively in their relationships (Martin & Anderson, 1995). Researchers also state that "communication strategies and communication traits are a key factor in determining personal satisfaction with...other[s]" (Martin & Anderson, 1995, p 46). Richmond, McCroskey and McCroskey (1989) suggest that communication competence is related to an individual's willingness to communicate which affects his/her decisions in regard to communication.

Intercultural Effectiveness. An important aspect of communication competence to look at when examining cross cultural communication is intercultural effectiveness. The term refers to one's ability to effectively communicate across cultures (Cui & van den Berg, 1991; Cui & Awa, 1992; Koester & Olebe, 1988). In other words, how well does a person interact with someone of another culture or another country? Research has shown that there are three dimensions of intercultural effectiveness. These dimensions focus on a person's ability in dealing with the psychological stress, establishing interpersonal

relationships and communicating effectively (Cui & van den Berg, 1991; Koester & Olebe, 1988). These dimension's may seem independent of each other, however, that is not the case. They interact with each other and create a framework for intercultural communication to take place.

As confusing and intimidating as cross-cultural communication can be at times, several researchers have identified some common skills that have been shown to positively influence the cross-cultural communication process. Fortunately, many of these skills are ones which people often possess and use in their daily lives. Kealey (1989) identified several: flexibility, tolerance, interest in culture, initiative socialibility, open-mindedness, and positive self-image. Cui and Awa (1992) add to the list with patience and tolerance for both ambiguity and uncertainty.

The skills listed above are important not only in regard to intercultural effectiveness but also to communication competence. One needs to have some knowledge of the skills necessary to communicate effectively if he/she hopes to be considered a competent cross cultural communicator.

Statement of Purpose

Communication is a meaningful part of daily life. No matter where a person lives most of the day is spent in the complicated task of communicating with others. The communication process becomes even more complex when examining ideas such as communication apprehension, nonverbal communication and communication competence in a cross cultural communication context. The purpose of this study is to examine aspects of these relationships.

As the world becomes more of a global village, the question of how well a person communicates with someone of another culture is becoming more important. The more communicatively competent an international student, the more likely that student should be to succeed academically, interpersonally, and socially in a foreign country.

A potential hindrance to achieving communication competence for international students is communication apprehension. Anxiety concerning communication can adversely influence one's self perceptions especially with regard to communication competence. Apprehension can be manifested in nonverbal behaviors. However, the meaning of nonverbal behaviors often differs from culture to culture (Emmert & Emmert, 1976). Emmert and Emmert (1976) go on to state that while the action may be the same "the communicative content [will vary] from culture to culture" (p 168). Simply put "we witness nonverbal displays with special meanings unique to ... our own culture or subculture" (Matsumoto, 1991, p 128). It is important to keep in mind that nonverbal

behaviors can be hard to interpret which leads to misunderstandings. This is particularly true when examining the relationship between culture and nonverbal behaviors.

Communication apprehension and nonverbal communicative behaviors are two areas that would seem to be related to communication competence. This thesis is an attempt to shed some light on these issues by examining communication competence, communication apprehension, and nonverbal behaviors of international students in a public speaking context. Specifically, the present study will examine the following two research questions.

1. Does the communication apprehension and nonverbal apprehension of international students correlate with the student's self perception of his or her communication competence?
2. Do specific nonverbal behaviors correlate with an international student's self perception of his or her communication apprehension and communication competence?

CHAPTER 2

Methodology

Subjects and Setting

Participants were students enrolled in the University of Nebraska at Omaha's Intensive Language Program (ILUNO) and International Businessmen Programs (IBP). Participants ranged in age from 18 to 25 years old. Twenty one participants were videotaped as they presented required speeches as part of their course work. University of Nebraska Institutional Review Board for the Protection of Human Subjects approval for the research was obtained (see Appendix A).

Participants were asked to complete the Communication Competence Self-Report Questionnaire (Rubin, 1985), as well as the PRCA-24 (Personal Report of Communication Apprehension) (Richmond & McCroskey, 1995). The language on these questionnaires was not changed as the course instructor was present to help students with any language problems that arose. The questionnaires were distributed approximately 10 days prior to student's speeches. These measures and the videotapes were collected by the course instructor and provided to the researcher. Prior to speaking, all participants were given an overview of why they were being videotaped and the criteria being used. Participants' names were held in complete confidence, however a coding system was used to match participants' videotapes to their questionnaires.

Instruments

In the first research question, "Does the communication apprehension and nonverbal apprehension of international students correlate with the student's self perception of his or her communication competence?" the dependent variable is communication competence, which was be measured using the Communication Competence Self-Report Questionnaire (Rubin,1985). Communication competence is defined as "an impression formed about the appropriateness of...communicative behavior" (Rubin, 1985, p 173). The questionnaire focuses on five areas of communication competence: delivery, organization, content, language, and listening skills. Participants were asked to respond using a five point Likert type scale (see Appendix B). The reliability and validity of this questionnaire has been established in previous research (Rubin, 1985).

The independent variables are communication apprehension and nonverbal apprehension. Communication apprehension was measured using the PRCA-24 (Personal Report of Communication Apprehension) (Richmond & McCroskey, 1995) (see Appendix C). This questionnaire focuses on how people feel when communicating with others in various situations. It examines the following communication contexts: group, meeting, interpersonal and public speaking. Participants answered using a five point Likert scale. The PRCA-24 has been widely used and has repeatedly demonstrated its reliability and validity (Daly & McCroskey, 1984). Nonverbal apprehension was measured using McKnight's (1997) PSNA (Public Speaking Nonverbal Assessment)

form (see Appendices D and E). The PSNA measures observer perceived nonverbal behaviors in a public speaking context. The coding form focuses on voice qualities, vocalization, speaker disposition, eye behavior and overall body motion. The PSNA has been used once and claims to be a valid and reliable instrument (McKnight, 1997).

In the second research question, "Do specific nonverbal behaviors correlate with an international student's self perception of his or her communication apprehension and communication competence?", the dependent variables are communication competence and communication apprehension while the independent variables are nonverbal behaviors, which were measured by the 18 individual PSNA items. The PSNA looks at the general areas of paralanguage, speaker disposition, eye behavior and body motion.

Data Gathering

Once the videotapes were collected and returned to the researcher they were assigned identification numbers and copies made for five coders, who were all graduate teaching assistants in a public speaking course at the University of Nebraska at Omaha. Prior to coding the videotaped speeches, the coders were not told the research questions of this thesis. The videotapes were coded using the Public Speaking Nonverbal Assessment Form (PSNA), developed by McKnight (1997) (see Appendices D and E). The coders were provided with copies of the PSNA form, the directions and definition sheet, and videotapes for coding. The coders were given one week to complete the coding which they were allowed to take home.

CHAPTER 3

Results

Videotaped speeches included 15 males and 6 females (N=21) from 10 different countries. These speeches were evaluated by five coders using McKnight's (1997) PSNA form. There were 378 possible observations (21 speeches x 18 items).

Following McKnight's (1997) example, the nine point scale of the PSNA was collasped into a three point scale in effort to increase the overall reliability of the instrument. Responses for items #1-14 were collapsed into three categories using McKnight's (1997) procedure: 1,2,3=1; 4,5,6=2; and 7,8,9=3. Responses for items #15-18 were collapsed using 1,2,3,4,5=2; 6,7,8,9=1; and 10,11,12,13=3. Table I shows the means and standard deviations of individual PSNA item scores after collapse.

The means and standard deviation for the overall self-report PRCA-24 score, each PRCA-24 subscale score and the Communication Competence Self-Report Questionnaire are shown in Table II.

The reliability of the PRCA-24 and the Communication Competence Self-Report Questionnaire were quite high. The PRCA-24 had a reliability of alpha = .97 while the communication competence scale had a reliability of alpha = .89. The individual PSNA item inter-coder reliabilities varied (see Table III) with only four items (3,5,7, and 10) having reliabilities of alpha greater than .7, and nine items (1,8,9,11,12,13,15,17, and 18) having reliabilities of between .5 and .7. Major differences between reliabilites obtained and those reported by McKnight (1997) were that pace and rate reliabilities were much

lower and enthusiasm, trunk posture and facial expression reliabilities were much higher in the present study.

TABLE I

Collapsed Response Descriptive Data for the PSNA

ITEM (semantic differentials)	M	SD	ITEM (semantic differentials)	M	SD
#1- Pitch (relaxed - tense)	1.58	.36	#10 - Direct Eye Contact (extensive - little)	1.64	.50
#2 - Pace (even - irregular)	1.78	.35	#11 - Gaze (changing - fixed)	1.69	.51
#3 - Articulation (fluent - nonfluent)	1.86	.43	#12 - Trunk Posture (erect - slouched)	1.34	.33
#4 - Rate (relaxed - excessive	1.39	.22	#13 - Distracting Leg/Foot Movements (few - excessive)	1.26	.33
#5 - Vocal Segregates (limited - excessive)	1.88	.61	#14 - Distracting Hand Gestures (few - excessive)	1.57	.37
#6 - Intruding Sounds (limited - excessive)	1.04	.14	#15 - Arm/Hand Gestures (recoded 1-13) (too little - too much)	1.92	.23
#7 - Silent Pauses (limited - excessive)	1.64	.55	#16 - Head Movements (recoded 1-13) (too little - too much)	1.85	.23
#8 - Enthusiasm (limited - excessive)	1.90	.42	#17 - Facial Expressions (recoded 1-13) (too little - too much)	1.72	.28
#9 - Anxiety	1.65	.37	#18 - Overall Body Movement (recoded 1-13) (too little - too much)	1.93	.34

TABLE II

PRCA-24 and Communication Competence Descriptive Data

SCALE	M	SD
PRCA - Overall (PRCA)	65.3	17.17
PRCA - Group (PRCAGD)	16.57	3.31
PRCA - Meetings (PRCAM)	16.38	4.78
PRCA - Interpersonal (PRCAIC)	15.38	5.20
PRCA - Public Speaking (PRCAPS)	17.0	5.0
Communication Competence	66.1	10.32

TABLE III

Collapsed Response Inter-Coder Reliability for the PSNA

ITEM	Connors' Alpha	McKnight's Alpha	ITEM	Connors' Alpha	McKnight's Alpha
#1 - Pitch	.57	.63	#10 - Direct Eye Contact	.77	.65
#2 - Pace	.24	.65	#11 - Gaze	.69	.56
#3 - Articulation	.71	.45	#12 - Trunk Posture	.59	-.01
#4 - Rate	.11	.62	#13 - Distracting Leg/Foot Movements	.60	.84
#5 - Vocal Segregates	.87	.68	#14 - Distracting Hand Gestures	.42	.64
#6 - Intruding Sounds	.48	.51	#15 - Arm/Hand Gestures	.51	.60
#7 - Silent Pauses	.83	.40	#16 - Head Movements	.12	.13
#8 - Enthusiasm	.62	-.39	#17 - Facial Expression	.57	.26
#9 - Anxiety	.60	.52	#18 - Overall Body	.60	.49

Results for RQ1: Does the communication apprehension and nonverbal apprehension of international students correlate with the student's self perception of his or her communication competence?

Significant negative correlations were found between communication competence and communication apprehension (see Table IV). In other words, the more apprehensive a subject was overall and in the settings of group, meeting, interpersonal, and public speaking, the lower his/her communication competence score.

TABLE IV

Significant Correlation's between Communication Competence, Communication Apprehension and Nonverbal Apprehension

	PRCA	PRCAGD	PRCAM	PRCAIC	PRCAPS
Communication Competence	-.75**	-.69**	-.74**	-.72**	-.67**

* - Significant LE .05 **- Significant LE .01

Since there were only 21 subjects in the present study, factor scores for the PSNA could not be validly obtained from the data. McKnight's (1997) PSNA factor scores were used but no significant relationships were found between the PSNA factor scores and communication competence for the overall subject group.

The two major general geographic homelands for subjects were Asian (N=12) and South American (N=7). The Asian group was made up of students from the following countries: Japan, North Korea and South Korea. The South American group was made up of students from the following countries: Venezuela, Costa Rica, Columbia, El Salvador, and Brazil. It is understood that these are different cultural groups but for the purposes of

this thesis they were seen as unified groups. One of the other two subjects was from the Middle East, the other from Africa. When Asians and South Americans were analyzed separately again no relationship was found between PSNA factor scores and communication competence.

Results for RQ2: Do specific nonverbal behaviors correlate with an international student's self perception of his or her communication apprehension and communication competence?

For the overall group, there were no significant correlations between individual PSNA items and communication competence and only one significant correlation between individual PSNA items and any aspect of communication apprehension. Pace was significantly correlated ($r = .46$, $p < .05$) with the PRCA-24 public speaking subscale – the faster the pace, the more public speaking apprehension.

When Asian subjects and South American subjects were analyzed separately, however, several significant correlations were discovered between individual PSNA items and the other examined variables (see Tables V, VI, and VII). Analyses were performed on groups of Asian males (n=9), Asian males and females (n=12), and South American males and females (n=7). Due to the small cell sizes separate analyses were not performed on groupings of Asian females (n=3), or South American males (n=4) and females (n=3).

For Asian male subjects (see Table V), direct eye contact correlated significantly with communication competence ($r = .67$, $p < .05$) – the more direct eye contact, the *more* communicatively competent the subject. Also for Asian male subjects, vocal segregates

correlated with public speaking apprehension ($r = -.70$, $p < .05$); intruding sounds correlated with overall communication apprehension ($r = -.80$, $p < .05$), meeting apprehension ($r = -.80$, $p < .01$) and public speaking apprehension ($r = -.79$, $p < .05$); enthusiasm correlated with group apprehension ($r = -.73$, $p < .05$); direct eye contact correlated with overall apprehension ($r = -.88$, $p < .01$) and all four apprehensive subscales -- group ($r = -.74$, $p < .05$); meeting ($r = -.92$, $p < .01$), interpersonal ($r = -.75$, $p < .05$); and public speaking ($r = -.73$, $p < .05$); and distracting hand gestures correlated with public speaking apprehension ($r = -.71$, $p < .05$). In other words, the more an Asian male student demonstrated the following while giving a public speech, the more communicatively apprehensive the subject in the associated context: *limited* vocal segregates (public speaking), *limited* intruding sounds (overall, meeting, and public speaking), enthusiasm (group), *extensive* direct eye contact (overall, group, meeting, interpersonal, and public speaking), and *few* distracting hand gestures (public speaking).

For Asian male and female subjects (see Table VI) vocal segregates correlated significantly with communication competence ($r = .64$, $p < .05$) – the more vocal segregates the, *more* communicatively competent the subject. Also for Asian male and female subjects, vocal segregates correlated with overall apprehension ($r = -.73$, $p < .01$) and all four apprehensive subscales – group ($r = -.68$, $p < .05$); meeting ($r = -.59$, $p < .05$); interpersonal ($r = -.62$, $p < .05$); and public speaking ($r = -.80$, $p < .01$); intruding sounds correlated with overall apprehension ($r = -.61$, $p < .05$) and meeting apprehension ($r = -.66$, $p < .05$); silent pause correlated with overall apprehension ($r = -.72$, $p < .01$) and all

four apprehensive subscales – group ($r = -.75$, $p < .01$); meeting ($r = -.62$, $p < .05$); interpersonal ($r = -.66$, $p < .05$); and public speaking ($r = -.63$, $p < .01$); enthusiasm correlated with overall apprehension ($r = -.65$, $p < .05$), as well as, group ($r = -.78$, $p < .01$) and public speaking apprehension ($r = -.60$, $p < .05$); trunk posture also correlated with overall apprehension ($r = -.62$, $p < .05$), as well as, group ($r = -.62$, $p < .05$) and public speaking apprehension ($r = -.71$, $p < .05$); distracting hand gestures correlated with public speaking apprehension ($r = -.62$, $p < .05$) and head movements correlated with group apprehension ($r = -.71$, $p < .01$).

In other words, the more Asian male and female students demonstrated the following while giving a public speech, the more communicatively apprehensive the subject in the associated context: *limited* vocal segregates (overall, group, meeting, interpersonal, and public speaking), *limited* intruding sounds (overall and meeting), *limited* silent pauses (overall, group, meeting, interpersonal, and public speaking), *more* enthusiasm (overall, group, and public speaking), *more erect* trunk posture (overall, group, and public speaking), *fewer* distracting hand gestures (public speaking) and *more purposeful* head movement (group). Keep in mind that Asian males significantly correlated with vocal segregates, intruding sounds, enthusiasm, direct eye contact and distracting hand gestures.

For South American subjects (males and females) (see Table VII), pitch correlated with communication competence ($r = .85$, $p < .05$) – the higher the speaker's pitch, the *more* communicatively competent the subject. Also for South American subjects,

articulation correlated with interpersonal apprehension ($r = -.79$, $p < .05$); silent pauses correlated with group apprehension ($r = .83$, $p < .05$); distracting leg and foot gestures correlated with overall communication apprehension($r = -.85$, $p < .05$) and public speaking apprehension ($r = -.89$, $p < .01$); and overall body movement correlated with interpersonal apprehension ($r = -.81$, $p < .05$). In other words, the more a South American student demonstrated the following while giving a public speech, the *more* communicatively apprehensive the subject in the associated context: *limited* articulation (interpersonal), *more* silent pauses (group), fewer distracting leg and foot gestures (overall and public speaking), and *less* overall body movement (interpersonal).

These results suggest that there are some differences in nonverbal behaviors of Asian and South American students when they are experiencing high levels of communication apprehension. Table VIII is a summary table of significant correlations between individual nonverbal PSNA items and communication competence and communication apprehension (overall, group, meeting, interpersonal and public speaking) for Asian males, Asian males and females, and South American males and females.

TABLE V

Individual Item Correlation's with Communication Competence and PRCA for Asian Males (N=9)

ITEM	CC	PRCA	PRCAGD	PRCAM	PRCAIC	PRCAPS
#1 - Pitch						
#2 - Pace						
#3 - Articulation						
#4 - Rate						
#5 - Vocal Segregates						-.70*
#6 - Intruding Sounds		-.80*		-.80**		-.79*
#7 - Silent Pauses						
#8 - Enthusiasm			-.73*			
#9 - Anxiety						
#10 - Direct Eye Contact	.67*	-.88**	-.74*	-.92**	-.75*	-.73*
#11 - Gaze						
#12 - Trunk Posture						
#13 - Distracting Leg/Foot Gestures						
#14 - Distracting Hand Gestures						-.71*
#15 Arm/Hand Gestures						
#16 - Head Movements						
#17 - Facial Expressions						
#18 - Overall Body Movement						

* - Significant LE .05 ** - Significant LE .01

TABLE VI

Individual Item Correlation's with Communication Competence and PRCA for Asian Males and Females (N=12)

ITEM	CC	PRCA	PRCAGD	PRCAM	PRCAIC	PRCAPS
#1 - Pitch						
#2 - Pace						
#3 - Articulation						
#4 - Rate						
#5 - Vocal Segregates	.64*	-.73**	.-68*	-.59*	-.62*	-.80**
#6 - Intruding Sounds		-.61*		-.66*		
#7 - Silent Pauses		-.72**	-.75**	-.62*	-.66*	-.63*
#8 - Enthusiasm		-.65*	-.78**			-.60*
#9 - Anxiety						
#10 - Direct Eye Contact						
#11 - Gaze						
#12 - Trunk Posture		-.62*	-.62*			-.71*
#13 - Distracting Leg/Foot Gestures						
#14 - Distracting Hand Gestures						-.60*
#15 Arm/Hand Gestures						
#16 - Head Movements			.71**			
#17 - Facial Expressions						
#18 - Overall Body Movement						

* - Significant LE .05 ** - Significant LE .01

TABLE VII

Individual Item Correlation's with Communication Competence and PRCA for South American Males and Females (N=7)

ITEM	CC	PRCA	PRCAGD	PRCAM	PRCAIC	PRCAPS
#1 - Pitch	.85*					
#2 - Pace						
#3 - Articulation					-.79*	
#4 - Rate						
#5 - Vocal Segregates						
#6 - Intruding Sounds						
#7 - Silent Pauses			-.83*			
#8 - Enthusiasm						
#9 - Anxiety						
#10 - Direct Eye Contact						
#11 - Gaze						
#12 - Trunk Posture						
#13 - Distracting Leg/Foot Gestures		-.85*				-.89**
#14 - Distracting Hand Gestures						
#15 Arm/Hand Gestures						
#16 - Head Movements						
#17 - Facial Expressions						
#18 - Overall Body Movement					-.81*	

* - Significant LE .05 ** - Significant LE .01

TABLE VIII

A Comparison of Individual Item Correlation's with Communication Competence and the PRCA for Asian Males (1), Asian Males and Females (2), and South American Males and Females (3)

ITEM	CC	PRCA	PRCAGD	PRCAM	PRCAIC	PRCAPS
#1 - Pitch	.85* (3)					
#2 - Pace						
#3 - Articulation					-.79* (3)	
#4 - Rate						
#5 - Vocal Segregates	.64* (2)	-.73** (2)	.-68* (2)	-.59* (2)	-.62* (2)	-.80** (2) -.70* (1)
#6 - Intruding Sounds		-.61* (2) -.80* (1)		-.66* (2) -.80** (1)		-.79* (1)
#7 - Silent Pauses		-.72** (2)	-.75** (2) -.83* (3)	-.62* (2)	-.66* (2)	-.63* (2)
#8 – Enthusiasm		-.65* (2)	-.78** (2) -.73* (1)			-.60* (2)
#9 - Anxiety						
#10 - Direct Eye Contact	.67* (1)	-.88** (1)	-.74* (1)	-.92** (1)	-.75* (1)	-.73* (1)
#11 - Gaze						
#12 - Trunk Posture		-.62* (2)	-.62* (2)			-.71* (2)
#13 - Distracting Leg/Foot Gestures		-.85* (3)				-.89** (3)
#14 - Distracting Hand Gestures						-.60* (2) -.71* (1)
#15 Arm/Hand Gestures						
#16 - Head Movements			.71** (2)			
#17 - Facial Expressions						
#18 - Overall Body Movement					-.81* (3)	

* - Significant LE .05 ** - Significant LE .01

The Asian male students were found to have *more* eye contact in association with all aspects of communication apprehension and *fewer* intruding sounds associated with public speaking apprehension. The Asian male students were also found to have *fewer* intruding sounds associated with overall and meeting apprehension; *less* enthusiasm associated with group apprehension; *fewer* distracting hand gestures and *limited* vocal segregates associated with public speaking. The Asian male and female students, like the Asian male students, were found to have *limited* vocal segregates in all aspects of communication apprehension and *limited* intruding sounds associated with overall and meeting apprehension. The Asian male and female students, again like Asian male students, were found to have *increased* enthusiasm associated with overall, meeting and public speaking apprehension and *fewer* distracting hand gestures. Asian male and female students differed from Asian male students in that they were found to have *limited* silent pauses associated with all aspects of communication apprehension, *more erect* trunk postures associated with overall, group and public speaking apprehension, and *more purposeful* head movements associated with group apprehension.

The South American students were found to have *limited* articulation associated with interpersonal apprehension while *more* silent pauses were associated with group apprehension. South American students were also found to have *fewer* distracting leg and foot gestures associated with overall and public speaking apprehension, in addition to, *less* overall body movement associated with interpersonal apprehension; vocal segregates associated with overall, group, meeting, and interpersonal apprehension.

CHAPTER 4

Discussion

The Personal Report of Communication Apprehension-24 (PRCA-24) examines how individuals feel when communicating with others in the following situations: group; meeting; interpersonal; and public speaking. The Communication Competence Self-Report Questionnaire examines areas of communication competence such as: delivery, organization, content, language, and listening skills. The Public Speaking Nonverbal Assessment instrument (PSNA) measures perceptions of an individual's nonverbal behaviors. The PSNA consists of 18 items divided into four groups: paralanguage, speaker disposition, eye behavior, and body motion.

The data collected for the PRCA-24 and PSNA are consistent with scores collected in previous research. However, no national norms for the Communication Competence Self-Report Questionnaire have been reported. For the PRCA-24, this study's means of 65.3, 16.57, 16.38, 15.38, and 17.0 (Table II) are consistent with the national norms (McCroskey, 1993) 65.6, 15.4, 16.4, 14.5, and 19.3 for PRCA overall, group, meeting, interpersonal, and public speaking accordingly. For the PSNA, this study's means (Table I) of 1.66, 1.78, 1.86, 1.39, 1.88, 1.04, 1.64, 1.90, 1.65, 1.64, 1.69, 1.34, 1.26, 1.57, 1.92, 1.85, 1.72, and 1.93 are consistent with McKnight's (1997) reported means of 1.66, 1.71, 1.42, 1.53, 1.84, 1.24, 1.35, 1.66, 1.77, 1.78, 1.81, 1.53, 1.59, 1.55, 1.99, 2.02, 2.28, and 1.74 for pitch, pace, articulation, rate, vocal segregates, intruding sounds, silent pauses, enthusiasm, anxiety, direct eye contact, gaze, trunk

posture, distracting leg/foot movements, distracting hand gestures, arm/hand gestures, head movements, facial expressions, and overall body movement accordingly.

RQ#1: Does the communication apprehension and nonverbal apprehension of international students correlate with the student's self perception of his or her communication competence?

Before answering research question one, it is important to keep in mind that McKnight (1997) defines nonverbal apprehension as those behaviors which convey a speaker's uneasiness to his/her audience. Indicators of nonverbal apprehension according to (McKnight, 1997) include such behaviors as decreased eye contact, hand twitching, little expressiveness, and longer pauses. While a speaker may feel that he/she is effectively communicating with the audience, his/her nonverbal apprehension may create a different perception in the minds of the audience. A speaker's nonverbal apprehension is instrumental in the audience's perception of a speaker, especially for international student speakers.

The answer to research question one is yes and no. There was a strong negative correlation between the speaker's level of communication apprehension (overall and in all four subareas - group, meeting, interpersonal and public speaking) and his/her level of communication competence. The results of this study suggest that as a speaker's level of communication apprehension rises his/her level of communication competence goes down. Simply put, speakers who have high levels of communication apprehension feel that they are unable to effectively communicate with their audience. However, there were no significant relationships found between communication competence and nonverbal

apprehension as measured by McKnight's (1997) PSNA factor scores either for the overall subject group or the two primary sub-groups (Asian and South American).

RQ#2: Do specific nonverbal behaviors correlate with an international students self perception of his or her communication apprehension and communication competence?

Upon initial examination of the data and analysis from the overall group, there were no significant correlations between the individual PSNA items and communication competence. However, there was one significant correlation between individual PSNA items and communication apprehension. The results indicate that pace was significantly correlated ($r = .46$, $p < .05$) with the PRCA-24 public speaking subscale suggesting the faster the pace, the more public speaking apprehension was present.

During analyses of the data, it was noted that 19 of the 21 subjects were Asian (N=12) or South American (N=7). One of the two other subjects was from the Middle East and the other from Africa.

When the data from the Asian and South American students were analyzed separately, surprising and unexpected results were obtained (see Tables V, VI and VII).

The Asian students' nonverbal behaviors that correlated with communication apprehension were almost the exact opposite of what would be expected of typical Asians in normal interactions (Lieberman, 1994). According to Lieberman (1994), Asians will typically use very few gestures, little eye contact and use silence to make their point. Significant negative correlations were found for Asian males between public speaking apprehension and the following items: vocal segregates, intruding sounds, direct eye

contact, and distracting hand gestures (see Table V). Negative correlations were also found for Asian males between intruding sounds and overall and meeting apprehension; enthusiasm and direct eye contact and overall group, meeting, and interpersonal apprehension.

For Asian males and females as a group, significant negative correlations were found between public speaking apprehension and vocal segregates, silent pauses, enthusiasm, trunk posture and distracting hand gestures. Negative correlations were also found for Asian males and females between vocal segregates and overall, group, meeting, and interpersonal apprehension; intruding sounds and overall and meeting apprehension; silent pauses and overall, group, meeting, and interpersonal apprehension; enthusiasm and overall and group apprehension; trunk posture and overall and group apprehension; and head movements and group apprehension.

These results indicate that the following behaviors will be associated with Asian students who experience high levels of communication apprehension while giving a speech: fewer vocal segregates (umm, uh-huh, uh), and intruding sounds (y'know, okay) (for males), increased eye contact (for males) fewer distracting hand gestures, limited silent pauses and more enthusiasm. Keep in mind that individuals from high context cultures, such as Asian, "are more adept at reading nonverbal behavior" (Lieberman, 1994, p 8) such as eye contact, gestures, and pause. Lieberman (1994) goes on to state that individuals from high context cultures also place more emphasis on using nonverbal behaviors.

For South American males and females as a group, only one significant correlation was found between nonverbal behaviors and public speaking apprehension – few distracting leg and foot gestures correlated with increased public speaking apprehension. Negative correlations were also found for South American males and females between articulation and interpersonal apprehension; silent pauses and group apprehension; distracting leg and foot gestures and overall apprehension; and overall body movement with interpersonal apprehension.

The results suggest that Asian and South American students manifest high levels of communication apprehension differently from their North American counterparts. According to McKnight (1997, p. 28) the following nonverbal behaviors (as measured by the PSNA) were found to positively correlate with various aspects of communication apprehension for her sample of North American students: nonfluent articulation, little direct eye contact, fixed gaze, and too much facial expressions; and the following to negatively correlate: extensive distracting leg and foot movements and excessive distracting hand gestures.

In the present study, for Asian students the only positive correlation between any nonverbal behavior and any aspect of communication apprehension was head movements. Negative correlations were found between various aspects of communication apprehension and the following nonverbal behaviors: vocal segregates, intruding sounds, silent pauses, enthusiasm, direct eye contact, trunk posture, and distracting hand gestures.

For South American students in the present study, no positive correlations were found between nonverbal behaviors (as measured by the PSNA) and any aspect of communication apprehension; and negative correlations were found between aspects of communication apprehension and the following nonverbal behaviors: articulation, silent pauses, distracting leg and foot gestures, and overall body movement.

Communication apprehension may manifest itself in the form of nonverbal behaviors. However, the meaning of nonverbal behaviors may differ from culture to culture (Emmert & Emmert, 1976), which may then lead to misunderstandings. Previous research suggests that misunderstandings often occur when words are understood in one way but nonverbal behaviors are decoded in another (Schneller, 1989). The international students in this study used some typically North American nonverbal gestures of confidence, such as more direct eye contact and sweeping gestures (Lieberman, 1994) when they had high levels of communication apprehension. As an example, an international student may feel that he/she gave a poor speech and his/her nervousness was obvious to the American instructor, yet the American instructor/audience felt that the student was very relaxed and presented a clear speech given his/her use of nonverbal behaviors.

The results of the data analysis indicate that cross culturally as a speaker's level of communication apprehension goes up his/her level of communication competence goes down. The results also suggest that there are specific nonverbal behaviors, such as eye contact and distracting hand gestures, which are related to a speaker's level of

communication competence and communication apprehension, however, these behaviors are very culture specific.

CHAPTER 5

Conclusions

The intent of this study was to examine the communication competence, communication apprehension and nonverbal communicative behaviors of international students at an American university. As cross cultural communication becomes the norm in today's society it is more important than ever that people learn how to effectively communicate with individuals from another culture. This learning process is at times hindered because the accepted forms of communication often vary from culture to culture. It is the uncertainties surrounding the meaning and interpretation of differing communication styles, in the area of cross cultural communication, which is at times a source of apprehension for international students.

For many international students, studying in the United States is a struggle. Life in the United States is more than simply taking classes. These students must confront conflicting cultural values, a confusing educational system, little or no social support, and language barriers (Kumagai, 1977; Zimmerman, 1995; & Wan et al., 1992). For these, and other reasons, an international student's level of communication competence and communication apprehension often go through a number of changes while studying in a foreign country. It is important to keep in mind that the subjects of this study were in a different country and trying to gain command of a new language, as well as, learning the unwritten rules of communication, which frequently include nonverbal behaviors. The PRCA-24, Communication Competence Self-Report Questionnaire, and the PSNA were

ways of measuring an international student's communication competence, communication apprehension, and nonverbal behaviors when delivering a speech.

The results of this study suggest that as a speaker's level of communication apprehension goes up his/her level of communication competence goes down. The results also indicate that there are specific nonverbal behaviors that are related to a speaker's level of communication competence and communication apprehension. Significant correlations between a speaker's communication apprehension and specific nonverbal behaviors were found. However, these behaviors are very culture specific.

For example, the specific nonverbal behaviors associated with *public speaking* apprehension for Asian students include: limited vocal segregates, limited intruding sounds (for males), limited silent pauses, enthusiasm, extensive direct eye contact (for males), more rigid trunk posture and fewer distracting hand gestures. The specific nonverbal behavior associated with *public speaking* apprehension for South American students was few distracting leg and foot gestures. The results of this study also reinforce previous research stating that nonverbal behaviors do in fact differ from culture to culture (Emmert & Emmert, 1976 and Matsumoto, 1996).

An interesting point to consider is whether or not the nonverbal behaviors used by the international students in this study were in fact a result of nervousness. Emmert and Emmert (1976) suggest that individuals often "mirror" or imitate someone else's use of nonverbal behaviors, such as posture and the use of hands and legs, as one way indicating interest. Lieberman (1994), takes this idea one step further, arguing that nonverbal

behaviors are known to "mirror a culture's self-image" (p 17). The question then becomes, were the international students unaware of the nonverbal behaviors they used, or were they purposefully using nonverbal behaviors that reflect the American culture as a way of "fitting in" on an American college campus?

Implications

The results of this study present a number of interesting implications for not only the field of cross cultural communication but nonverbal communication as well. The way that international students handle high levels of communication apprehension differs from that of North American students. These differences at times manifested themselves in the international student's use of nonverbal behaviors. Some of the international students in this study with high levels of communication apprehension tended to have more eye contact, fewer vocal segregates, intruding sounds, distracting hand gestures, and less overall body movement. Conversely, North American students, when experiencing high levels of communication apprehension, are apt to talk less, have more repetition, and decreased eye contact (Ayers et al., 1994 and Napieralski et al., 1995).

The question of how well an individual communicates with someone from another culture is especially meaningful to an international student. The more communicatively competent an international student, the more likely that student should be to succeed academically, interpersonally and socially in the host country. One possible obstacle to becoming communicatively competent is communication apprehension. Previous research suggests that individuals suffering from high communication apprehension may communicate "inappropriately and ineffectively" (Martin & Anderson, 1996, p 60). Asian

students use of more direct eye contact, fewer intruding sounds, and distracting hand gestures when nervous may be seen as communicating "inappropriately and ineffectively" (Martin & Anderson, 1996, p 60) in their home country, however, in the United States their communication may be viewed as appropriate and effective. Keep in mind, however, that international students self perception of nonverbal behaviors used is unknown. This researcher questions whether the international students were aware of the nonverbal behaviors used and how these behaviors would be interpreted.

These findings may have far reaching effects on the field of nonverbal communication. Previous research suggests that some nonverbal behaviors may be "universal", such as eye contact and smiling as ways of showing willingness to being approached. However, the results of this study indicate that that may not be the case. This study suggests that the nonverbal behaviors used by international students when they are nervous may not reflect the accepted patterns of nonverbal communication in their home country. In this study, correlations were found between an international students high levels of communication apprehension and specific nonverbal behaviors, such as increased eye contact and smiling, that were indicative of what is expected of North American students with low levels of communication apprehension. If, as this study indicates, certain nonverbal behaviors may not be "universal", as once thought, other "universal" nonverbal behaviors need to be re-examined.

The PRCA-24 and Communication Competence Self-Report Questionnaire demonstrated high reliabilities, as has been demonstrated in previous research. The PSNA

items demonstrated fair reliability in measuring observer-perceived nonverbal behaviors of speakers. While the PSNA demonstrated fair reliability, it may have been more advantageous to use another instrument, which focused on how nonverbal behaviors are used by international populations. The PSNA was designed by a *North American* with *North American* students and focused only on the nonverbal behaviors used by *North Americans*. An instrument focusing on the nonverbal behaviors of international populations may have provided further insight into the types of behaviors outside of the United States when an individual experiences high levels of communication apprehension. Given this study's findings, one questions the validity of this instrument when dealing with international students. Further research needs to be conducted in the area of nonverbal behaviors used outside of the United States.

Limitations

This study, while presenting some interesting findings, has several limitations that must be addressed. First, the sample size (N=21) was very small and may not be applicable to other international student populations. Also, while the sample allowed analyses based on the general classification of Asian/South American students, very small cell sizes in terms of the variables of specific nationality and gender prevented meaningful analyses being conducted based on these variables.

Other limiting factors relate to the coding of the videotaped speeches. The coders expressed concern over the quality of the duplicated videotapes they viewed. It was at times hard to *clearly* identify facial expressions and the use of eye contact. Another

limitation due to the quality duplicated videotaped was the sound quality. Coders reported that it was frequently difficult to *clearly* distinguish the speaker's words and sounds.

Another limitation exists regarding the level of language proficiency of the subjects. Some of the subjects had little or no difficulty completing the self-report questionnaires. However, other participants did not clearly understand the questions being asked and required assistance in completing the questionnaire. The differing language skills were also evident on the videotaped speeches. A number of the subjects had noticeably stronger English skills than their counterparts.

A limitation of this study is the way in which cultural groups were viewed. For the purposes of this study, North Americans, Asians, and South Americans were each treated as if they were unified, homogeneous groups. However, each of these groups is made up of differing subgroups. The subgroups may, in fact, have differing cultural aspects that could impact the results of this study. Exploration of potential subcultural differences was beyond the scope of the present study.

A final limitation of the study was the marginal reliability of the PSNA, individual items and the inability, because of small sample size, to validate McKnight's (1997) factor scores. The PSNA instrument was created with North American students in mind and, as the present study's results suggest, different nonverbal behaviors may be associated with international students who have high levels of communication apprehension. Thus, the reliability and validity of using McKnight's (1997) PSNA factor scores in research involving international students is questionable.

Future Research

This study is only the tip of the iceberg in terms of new research in the area of cross cultural communication. Due to the limited amount of research in this area, great potential exists for future research to improve our understanding of interpersonal cross cultural communication, communication apprehension, and international patterns of nonverbal behavior.

Previous research indicates that international students often insulate themselves from life on American campuses by interacting predominately with other international students (Olaniran, 1996). As more and more international students come to the United States to study, it is increasingly important to understand how they manage daily interactions with Americans.

The results of this study indicate that international student's use of nonverbal behaviors differs from that of their North American counterparts when giving a speech in front of other international students. Future research should examine whether or not international student's use of nonverbal behaviors will also change when presenting a speech in front of North American students. Additional research is also needed to determine if international students' use of nonverbal behaviors differs only when speaking in front of a group or in all areas of interpersonal communication.

More research needs to be completed focusing on international students' interpersonal communication skills with members of the host country. Current research examines the international students adjustment to being in a new, and often very

different, country. Further research needs to explore how international student's manage interactions with the other students, as well as, the faculty and staff members of their university. It is through future research, that North American universities may reduce the number of misunderstandings with international students and discover ways to foster their involvement with, not only their North American counterparts, but campus life as well.

Finally, more joint research needs to be completed by researchers around the world. The research available at the time of this thesis focused on North American business people working abroad or international students on North American campuses. However, the majority of existing research was completed by *North Americans* using instruments designed by *North Americans*. Subjects were judged on the basis of what was expected of *North American* males and females. Also, additional research is needed to determine if gender played any role in the nonverbal behaviors used by international students.

If we are to truly gain a better understanding of cross cultural communication then more research involving international researchers needs to be completed. Research should focus on using instruments designed by universities from around the world. If international students complete instruments designed by researchers from their home country while studying abroad, the reliability of the instruments may increase. Joint research ventures could also track the progress or concerns of international students before, during, and after their stay abroad. Future research may provide a more in-depth understanding of the international students cross cultural communication experience.

Bibliography

Agar, Michael. (1994). The intercultural frame. International Journal of Intercultural Relations. 18(2). 221-237.

Anderson, L. E. (1994). A new look at an old construct: cross-cultural adaptation. International Journal of Intercultural Relations. 18(2). 293-328.

Baird, J. E. Jr. (1977). Some nonverbal elements of leadership emergence. The Southern Speech Communication Journal. 42. 352-361.

Barber, J. (1988). Are microskills worth teaching? Journal of Social Work Education. 24(1). 3-13.

Bhawuk, D. P. S. and Brislin, R. (1992). The measurement of intercultural sensitivity using the concepts of individualism and collectivism. International Journal of Intercultural Relations. 16. 431-436.

Babiker, I. E., Cox, J. L. & Miller, P. (1980). The measurement of cultural distance and its relationship to medical consultation, symptomatology and examination performance of overseas students at Edinburgh university. Social Psychiarity. 15. 109-116.

Chapman, D. W., Yuan, W. T. & Ming, X. (1988). Academic adjustment of international students in American universities. Education and Society. 6 (2). 96-103.

Chen, L. (1995). Interaction involvement and patterns of topical talk: a comparison of intercultural and intracultural dyads. International Journal of Intercultural Relations. 19(4). 463-482.

Cui, G and Awa, N. (1992). Measuring intercultural effectiveness: an integrative approach. International Journal of Intercultural Relations. 16. 311-328.

Cui, G. and van den Berg, S. (1991). Testing the construct validity of intercultural effectiveness. International Journal of Intercultural Relations. 15. 227-241.

Daly, J. A. & McCroskey, J. C. (Eds.) (1984). Avoiding communication: Shyness, reticence, and communication apprehension. Beverly Hills, Ca. Sage Publication.

Donaghy, W. C. and Goldberg, J. (1991). Head movement and gender differences following the onset of simultaneous speech. Southern Communication Journal. 56(2). 114-127.

Duran, R. L. and Carveth, R. A. (1990). The effects of gender-role expectations upon perceptions of communicative competence. Communication research Reports. 7-8. 25-33.

Emmert, P. and Emmert, V. J. L. (1976). Interpersonal Communication. Wm, C. Brown Publishers. Dubuque, Iowa.

Givens, D. (1978). Greeting a stranger: some commonly used nonverbal signals of aversiveness. Semiotica. 22(3/4). 351-367.

Gudykunst, W. B., Maraumoto, Y., Ting-Toomey, S., Nishida, T., Kim, K. and Heyman, S. (1996). The influence of cultural individualism-collectivism, self construals, and individual values on communication styles across cultures. Human Communication Research. 22(4). 510-543.

Hannigan, T. P. (1990). Traits, attitudes, and skills that are related to intercultural effectiveness and their implications for cross-cultural training: a review of the literature. International Journal of Intercultural Relations. 14. 88-111.

Holsti, O. R. (1969). Content analysis for the Social Sciences and Humanities. London: Addeson-Wesley Publishing Company.

Holtgraves. T. (1992). The linguistic realization of face management: implications for language production and comprehension, person perception, and cross-cultural communication. Social Psychology Quarterly. 55(2). 141-159.

Honeycut, J. M. (1991). The role of nonverbal behaviors in modifying expectancies during initial encounters. The Southern Communication Journal. 56(3). 161-178.

Lieberman, D. A. (1994). Public Speaking In The Multicultural Environment. Prentice Hall. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey.

Lucas, S. (1995). The Art of Public Speaking. McGraw-Hill. New York.

Kealey, D. J. (1989). A study of cross-cultural effectiveness. International Journal of Intercultural Relations. 13. 387-428.

Kenner, A. N. (1993). A cross-cultural study of body-focused hand movement. Journal of Nonverbal Behavior. 17(4). 236-277.

Kim, M. (1994). Cross-cultural comparison of the perceived importance of conversational constraints. Human Communication Research. 21(1). 125-151.

Kim, M. and Sharkey, W.B. (1995). Independent and interdependent contruals of self: explaining cultural patterns of interpersonal communication in multi-cultural organizational settings. Communication Quarterly. 43(1). 20-38.

Kim, M., Sharkey, W. B. and Singelis, T. (1994). The relationship between individuals' self-construals and perceived importance of interactive constraints. International Journal of Intercultural Relations. 1(18). 117-140.

Koester, J. and Olebe, M. (1988). The behavioral assessment scale for intercultural communication effectiveness. International Journal of Intercultural Relations. 12. 233-246.

Kumagai, F. (1977). The effects of cross-cultural education on attitudes and personality of Japanese students. Sociology of Education. 50(1). 40-47.

Olaniran, B. A. (1996). Social skills acquisition: a closer look at foreign students on college campuses and factors influencing their level of social difficulty in social situations. Communication Studies. 47(1/2). 72-88.

Mabry, E. A. (1989). Developmental aspects of nonverbal behaviors in small group settings. Small Group Behavior. 20(2). 190-202.

Martin, M. M. and Anderson, C. M. (1995). Roommate similarity: are roommates who are similar in their communication traits more satisfied? Communication Research Reports. 12(1). 46-52.

Matsumoto, D. (1995). Cultural influences on facial expressions of emotion. Southern Communication Journal. 56(2). 128-137.

McCroskey, J. C. (1982). Communication competence and performance: a research and pedagogical perspective. Communication Education. 31. 1-8.

McCroskey, J. C. and Richmond, V. P. (1990). Willingness to communicate: differing cultural perspectives. Southern Communication Journal. 65(1). 72-77.

Manusov, V. (1995). Reacting to changes in nonverbal behaviors relational satisfaction and adaptation in romantic dyads. Human Communication Research. 21(4). 456-477.

McKnight, J. A. (1997). The Public Speaking Nonverbal Assessment Form (PSNA): Creation, Reliability, and Validity. Unpublished thesis, University of Nebraska at Omaha.

Olebe, M. and Koester, J. (1989). Exploring the cross-cultural equivalence of the behavioral assessment scale for intercultural communication. International Journal of Intercultural Relations. 13. 333-347.

Palmer, M. T. and Simmons, K. B. (1995). Communication intentions trough nonverbal behaviors conscious and nonconscious encoding of liking. Human Communication Research. 22(1). 128-160.

Remland, M. S. (1984). Leadership impressions and nonverbal communication in a superior-subordinate interaction. Communication Quarterly. 32(1). 41-48.

Richmond, V. P., McCroskey, J. C. and McCroskey, L. L. (1989). An investigation of self-perceived communication competence and personality orientations. Communication Research Reports. 6(1). 28-36.

Rosenfeld, L. B., Grant, C. H. and McCroskey, J. C. (1995). Communication apprehension and self-perceived communication competence of academically gifted students. Communication Education. 44. 79-86.

Rubin, R. B. (1985). The validity of the communication competency assessment instrument. Communication Monographs. 52. 173-185.

Rubin, R. B., Martin, M. M., Bruning, S. S. and Powers, D. E. (1993). Test of a self-efficacy model of interpersonal communication competence. Communication Quarterly. 41(2). 210-220.

Rubin, R. B. and Martin, M. M. (1994). Development of a measure of interpersonal communication competence. Communication Research Reports. 11(1). 33-44.

Sallinen-Kuparinen, A., McCroskey, J. C. and Richmond, V. P. (1991). Willingness to communicate, communication apprehension, introversion, and self-reported communication competence: Finnish and American comparisons. Communication Research Reports. 8. 55-64.

Schneller, R. (1989). Intercultural and intrapersonal processes and factors of misunderstanding: implications for multicultural training. International Journal of Intercultural Relations. 13. 465-484.

Schrader, D. C. (1994). Judgments of acceptable partners for social goals based on perceptions of nonverbal behaviors. Journal of Social Behaviors and Personality. 9(1). 353-368.

Shrout, P. E. and Fiske, D. W. (1981). Nonverbal behaviors and social evaluation. Journal of Personality. 49(2). 115-128.

Spitzberg, B. H. (1983). Communication competence as knowledge, skill, and impression. Communication Education. 32. 323-329.

Wan, T., Chapman, D. W. & Biggs, D. A. (1992). Academic stress of international students attending U.S. universities. Research in Higher Education. 33(5). 607-623.

Wiseman R. L., Hammer, M. R. and Nishida, H. (1989). Predictors of intercultural communication competence. International Journal of Intercultural Relations. 13. 349-370.

Zimmermann, S. (1995). Perceptions of intercultural communication competence and international student adaptation to an American campus. Communication Education. 44. 321-335.

Appendix A

University of Nebraska
Nebraska's Health Science Center

Institutional Review Board
For the Protection of
Human Subjects

University of Nebraska Medical Center
Eppley Science Hall 3018
600 South 42nd Street
Box 986810
Omaha, NE 68198-6810
(402) 559-6463
Fax (402) 559-7845

February 26, 1998

Sarah Connors
Communications
UNO - 68152

IRB#: 027-98-EX

TITLE OF APPLICATION/PROTOCOL: An Examination of International Students' Communication Competence, Communication Apprehension and Public Speaking Nonverbal Behaviors

Dear Ms. Connors:

The IRB has reviewed your Exemption Form for the above-titled research project. According to the information provided, this project is exempt under 45 CFR 46:101b, category 1. You are therefore authorized to begin the research.

It is understood this project will be conducted in full accordance with all applicable sections of the IRB Guidelines. It is also understood that the IRB will be immediately notified of any proposed changes that may affect the exempt status of your research project.

Please be advised that the IRB has a maximum protocol approval period of five years from the original date of approval and release. If this study continues beyond the five year approval period, the project must be resubmitted in order to maintain an active approval status.

Sincerely,

E Prentice/jlg

Ernest D. Prentice, PhD
Vice Chair, IRB

EDP:jlg

Appendix B

Communication Competence Self-Report (CCSR) Questionnaire

This questionnaire is composed of statements concerning your communication with other people. Please indicate in the space provided the degree to which each statement applies to you by marking whether you:

(1) ALWAYS (2) USUALLY (3) SOMETIMES (4) SELDOM (5) NEVER

_____ 1. I mispronounce a lot of words.

_____ 2. When speaking with someone, the words I use say one thing while my face and tone of voice say something different.

_____ 3. When giving a speech, I speak clearly and distinctly.

_____ 4. When giving a speech, I can be persuasive when I want to be.

_____ 5. When I speak with others, my ideas are clearly and concisely presented.

_____ 6. When giving a speech, I thoroughly express and fully defend my position on issues.

_____ 7. I an unable to tell whether or not someone has understood what I have said.

_____ 8. I know when I'm hearing a fact and when I'm hearing someone's personal opinion.

_____ 9. When professors make suggestions in class on how I can improve, I understand the suggestions.

_____ 10. I understand the assignments that are given orally in class.

_____ 11. When I tell others about a class lecture I've heard, my version leaves out some important items.

_____ 12. When I have to introduce myself in a class, I am able to fully and concisely describe my interests and let others know who I am.

_____ 13. When speaking with others, I have to ask a question several times, in several ways, to get the information I want.

_____ 14. I have to answer a question several times before others seem satisfied with my answer.

_____ 15. I find it difficult to express my satisfaction or dissatisfaction about a course to the professor.

_____ 16. When I explain something to someone, it tends to be disorganized.

_____ 17. When I give directions to another person, the directions are accurate.

_____ 18. When I try to describe someone else's point of view, I have trouble getting it right.

_____ 19. I am able to give a balanced explanation of differing opinions.

Appendix C

McCroskey's Personal report of Communication Apprehension (PRCA-24)

Directions: This instrument is composed of twenty-four statements concerning feelings about communicating with other people. **WORK QUICKLY, RECORD YOUR FIRST IMPRESSION**. Please indicate in the space provided the degree to which each statement applies to you by marking whether you:

(1) STRONGLY AGREE, (2) AGREE, (3) ARE UNDECIDED, (4) DISAGREE, (5) STRONGLY DISAGREE

------ 1. I dislike participating in group discussions.

------ 2. Generally, I am comfortable while participating in group discussions.

------ 3. I am tense and nervous while participating in group discussions.

------ 4. I like to get involved in group discussions.

------ 5. Engaging in a group discussion with new people makes me feel tense and nervous.

------ 6. I am calm and relaxed while participating in group discussions.

------ 7. Generally, I am nervous when I have to participate in a meeting.

------ 8. Usually I am calm and relaxed while participating in a meeting.

------ 9. I am very calm and relaxed when I am called upon to express an opinion at a meeting.

------ 10. I am afraid to express myself at meetings.

------ 11. Communicating at meetings usually makes me uncomfortable.

------ 12. I am very relaxed when answering questions at a meeting.

------ 13. While participating in a conversation with a new acquaintance, I feel very nervous.

------ 14. I have no fear of speaking up on conversations.

------ 15. Ordinarily I am very tense and nervous in conversations.

------ 16. Ordinarily I am very calm and relaxed in conversations.

------ 17. While conversing with a new acquaintance, I feel very relaxed.

------ 18. I'm afraid to speak up in conversation.

------ 19. I have no fear of giving a speech.

------ 20. Certain parts of my body feel very tense and rigid while I am giving a speech.

------ 21. I feel relaxed while giving a speech.

------ 22. My thoughts become confused and jumbled when I am giving a speech.

------ 23. I face the prospect of giving a speech with confidence.

------ 24. While giving a speech, I get so nervous I forget facts I really know.

Appendix D

PSNA DIRECTIONS AND DEFINITIONS

Directions: Use the attached coding forms to rate speakers on the areas defined below:

Definitions:

Pitch: The degree of height or depth of sound (Does the student's voice sound strained?)

Pace: The rhythm of the student's speaking (Does the student's speech sound evenly flowed or does it sound like spurts?)

Articulation: The enunciation of the words (Are the student's words clear and easy to understand?)

Rate: The speech of speaking (Is the student speaking so quickly it hinders understanding?)

Vocal Segregates: Filler sounds such as Ummm, Uh-huh, and Uh (This may include any sound that is repeated often to fill time or as transition)

Intruding Sounds: Filler words such as Y'know and Okay (This may include any word that is repeated often to fill time or as transition)

Silent Pauses: Periods of time in which no vocalizations are made

Direct Eye Contact: The amount of time the speaker spends looking directly at members of the audience

Gaze: The variety of eye contact (Does the speaker look for a short time at each member of the audience or only look at one person the entire time?)

Trunk Posture: The posture of the speaker (Poor posture may include hunching or leaning on or over the podium, wall, table, etc.)

Distracting Leg/Foot Movements: Leg/Foot movements that are not related to the speech (These may include tapping or shaking)

Distracting Hand Gestures: Hand gestures that are not related to the speech (These may include hands in pockets, wringing hands, or pen/notecard manipulation)

Arm/Hand Gestures: The use of arm/hand gestures that emphasize or assist the understanding of the speech

Head Movements: The use of nodding and head shaking to emphasize speech

Facial Expressions: Using facial expression to ad emphasis to speech (This category also includes the appropriateness/consistency of facial expressions to speech tone and content)

Overall Body Movement: Using the body to emphasize the speech (Too much body movement may include swaying and too little may include unnatural rigidity)

Appendix E

The Public Speaking Nonverbal Assessment Form (PNSA)

Name _____ Gender _____ Home country _____

PARALANGUAGE

Voice Qualities

Pitch:									
Relaxed	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9 Tense
Pace:									
Even	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9 Irregular
Articulation:									
Fluent	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9 Nonfluent
Rate:									
Relaxed	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9 Excessive

Vocalizations

Vocal Segregates (uh, um, uh-huh):									
Limited	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9 Excessive
Intruding Sounds (y'know, okay, etc.):									
Limited	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9 Excessive
Silent Pauses:									
Limited	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9 Excessive

SPEAKER DISPOSITION

Enthusiasm:									
Enthusiasm	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9 Passive
Anxiety:									
Composed	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9 Nervous

EYE BEHAVIOR

Direct Eye Contact:									
Extensive	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9 Little
Gaze:									
Changing	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9 Fixed

PSNA CONTINUED

BODY MOTION

Trunk Posture:

Erect 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 Slouched

Distracting Leg/ Foot Movements:

Few 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 Excessive

Distracting Hand Gestures:

Few 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 Excessive

Arm/Hand Gestures: 6 7 8 9 Too Little

Purposeful 1 2 3 4 5

6 7 8 9 Too Much

Head Movements: 6 7 8 9 Too Little

Purposeful 1 2 3 4 5

6 7 8 9 Too Much

Facial Expressions: 6 7 8 9 Too Little

Purposeful 1 2 3 4 5

6 7 8 9 Too Much

Overall Body Movement: 6 7 8 9 Too Little

Purposeful 1 2 3 4 5

6 7 8 9 Too Much