

379
N81d
NO. 2668

THE RELATIONSHIPS AMONG ENGLISH ORAL COMMUNICATION
APPREHENSION, SOCIAL INTEREST, AND LOCUS OF
CONTROL OF FAR EASTERN STUDENTS

DISSERTATION

Presented to the Graduate Council of the
North Texas State University in Partial
Fulfillment of the Requirements

For the Degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

By

Thira Praphruitkit, B.Ed., M.Ed.

Denton, Texas

May, 1987

Praphruitkit, Thira, The Relationships among English Oral Communication Apprehension, Social Interest, and Locus of Control of Far Eastern Students. Doctor of Philosophy (Higher Education), May, 1987, 139 pp., 17 tables, bibliography, 113 titles.

This study determined the relationships among English oral communication apprehension, social interest, and locus of control of Far Eastern students, and examined whether differences exist in these variables, compared to gender, age, academic classification, major field of study, employment status, and length of study in the United States. Four instruments, including a demographic questionnaire, the Adapted Personal Report of Communication Apprehension-24 (APRCA-24), the Social Interest Scale (SIS), and the Rotter's Internal-External (I-E) Scale, were used to collect data from the sample of 240 Far Eastern students enrolled at North Texas State University in the fall semester of 1986.

Analyses of data from 171 respondents using Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient revealed that English oral communication apprehension did not seem to be related to social interest, but it seemed to be related to external locus of control of Far Eastern students. Social interest did not seem to be related to external locus of control of the students.

The one-way analyses of variance revealed that gender and age did not seem to be related to levels of English oral communication apprehension, social interest, and locus of control of the students. Graduate classification, employment, and longer periods of study in the United States seemed to be positive factors in reducing levels of English oral communication apprehension for the students. Major fields of study in which a small number of Far Eastern students were enrolled (music, home economics, and library and information sciences) appeared to be related to a higher level of English oral communication apprehension. This study also found that length of study in the United States seemed to be related to external locus of control of the students.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
LIST OF TABLES	v
Chapter	
I. INTRODUCTION	1
Statement of the Problem	
Purposes of the Study	
Hypotheses	
Background and Significance of the Study	
Delimitation of the Study	
Basic Assumption	
Definition of Terms	
II. REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE	17
Oral Communication Apprehension	
Social Interest	
Locus of Control	
Oral Communication Apprehension and Social Interest	
Oral Communication Apprehension and Locus of Control	
Social Interest and Locus of Control	
III. PROCEDURES FOR COLLECTION OF DATA	57
Description of the Instruments	
Description of the Population	
Procedures for Collection of Data	
Procedures for Analysis of Data	
IV. PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF DATA	71
Demographic Characteristics and Number of Students in Sub-Groups	
Testing of Hypotheses	
Discussion of Data Findings	
V. SUMMARY, FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS	107

	Page
Summary	
Findings	
Conclusions	
Recommendations	
APPENDICES	115
BIBLIOGRAPHY	129

LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
I.	Student Respondents by Native Country	67
II.	Demographic Characteristics and Number of Students in Sub-groups	74
III.	Correlation Matrix for English Oral Communication Apprehension, Social Interest, and Locus of Control	75
IV.	Differences between Means on the APRCA-24, SIS, and I-E Scale in Relationship to Gender	79
V.	Differences among Means on the APRCA-24 SIS, and I-E Scale in Relationship to Age .	80
VI.	Results of Scheffé' Multiple Comparison for Age Means on the APRCA-24 Group Discussion Context	81
VII.	Results of Scheffé' Multiple Comparison for Age Means on the SIS	82
VIII.	Differences between Means on the APRCA-24, SIS, and I-E Scale in Relationship to Academic Classification	83
IX.	Differences among Means on the APRCA-24, SIS, and I-E Scale in Relationship to Major Field of Study	84
X.	Results of Scheffé' Multiple Comparison for Means of Major Field of Study on the APRCA-24 Group Discussion Context . .	86
XI.	Differences between Means on the APRCA-24, SIS, and I-E Scale in Relationship to Employment Status	87
XII.	Differences among Means on the APRCA-24, SIS, and I-E Scale in Relationship to Length of Study in the United States . . .	88

Table	Page
XIII. Results of Scheffé' Multiple Comparison for Means of Length of Study on the APRCA-24 Generalized-Context Total Score	90
XIV. Results of Scheffé' Mutiple Comparison for Means of Length of Study on the APRCA-24 Group Discussion Context	91
XV. Results of Scheffé' Multiple Comparison for Means of Length of Study on the APRCA-24 Class Context	91
XVI. Results of Scheffé' Multiple Comparison for Means of Length of Study on the APRCA-24 Public Speaking Context	92
XVII. Results of Scheffé' Multiple Comparison for Means of Length of Study on the I-E Scale	93

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Attendance of international students at American colleges and universities has mutual benefits for the international students, American students, and the world as a whole (33). The benefits to the international students include the advancement of personal and professional development through the acquisition of knowledge and skills, and the potential gaining of problem-solving power which the international students may someday use in their native countries against economic, social, and political ailments (35).

It is, however, widely accepted that it is not always easy for someone to study in a country other than his/her own. For international students, there are basic problems of adjustment to strange customs, to new methods of instruction, and to working with different languages (4). Thus, many come to the United States with fears of academic failure, rejection, alienation, and the anticipation of the unknown (27).

Many research studies (4, 5, 25, 26, 27, 29) on international students in America have revealed that these students often experience a traumatic culture shock in

dealing with academic problems, communication problems, social problems, emotional problems as well as other problems in varying degrees of severity. The most difficult adjustment problem for them seems to be the frustration of being unable to use the English language effectively for academic functions (15, 32). English language deficiency also inhibits the students' ability to communicate with faculty, students, and others with whom they attempt to interact socially. Scholars (18, 22) in interpersonal communication assert that if international students are apprehensive about speaking their own language, their fear of communicating in English must be magnified ten-fold. Even those international students who are not apprehensive about speaking in their own language can become apprehensive about speaking English (18).

Facing these problems, some international students find themselves being inadequately prepared and lacking in self-confidence and feeling at home, which leads to reactive feelings of isolation and withdrawal (2). Some feel there is little they can do against obstacles of prejudice and discrimination. Yet, despite the awareness of their plight, they internalize their perceived inadequacy, which leads to learned helplessness, and an absence of any sense of responsibility for the events that happen in their lives (11, 21). These feelings are experienced by international

students both in and out of the classroom. The problems encountered in the university, combined with adjustment problems in the outside community, represent a stumbling block for the desire of international students to achieve their academic goals.

According to Al-Saffar (5), a university which accepts international students is generally expected to accept the responsibility for assisting them in their academic and non-academic adjustment and adaptation. It would, therefore, seem necessary for educational institutions to periodically examine the academic and non-academic problems faced by international students. This study then investigated the relationships among English oral communication apprehension, social interest, and locus of control for Far Eastern students, and examined whether differences exist in these variables, compared to gender, age, academic classification, major field of study, employment status, and length of study in the United States. The results could be of benefit to student services offices and faculty members to deal more effectively with the problems of international students.

Statement of the Problem

The problem of this study was the relationships among certain sociopersonal characteristics of Far Eastern students and selected independent variables.

Purposes of the Study

The purposes of this study were

1. to determine the relationships among English oral communication apprehension, social interest, and locus of control of Far Eastern students; and
2. to examine whether differences exist in English oral communication apprehension, social interest, and locus of control of Far Eastern students, compared to gender, age, academic classification, major field of study, employment status, and length of study in the United States.

Hypotheses

To carry out the purposes of this study, the following hypotheses were tested.

1. There will be a significant negative relationship between English oral communication apprehension and social interest of Far Eastern students.
2. There will be a significant positive relationship between English oral communication apprehension and external locus of control of Far Eastern students.
3. There will be a significant negative relationship between social interest and external locus of control of Far Eastern students.
4. There will be significant differences in English oral communication apprehension, social interest and locus of control of Far Eastern students, compared to gender, age,

academic classification, major field of study, employment status, and length of study in the United States.

Background and Significance of the Study

Over the last decade, research studies have been conducted on the problems of international students. In 1975, Nenyod (26) conducted a study at East Texas State University to determine if international students in different schools with different sizes had different problems. He found that communication and academic problems are the most serious. In the same year, Han (13), in a study conducted on Far East students in the University of Southern California, concluded that language difficulty is the essence of all the serious problems that students face. Although these problems affect mainly the students' academic experiences, other personal and social problems are also affected by the language problem.

These research studies seem to suggest that the language barrier has always been a big problem for international students. This problem arises early during the presence of international students in America because the majority of these students come from countries in which English is not their native language. There are major language problems despite the fact that English is taught in some countries from the early grades. It is not surprising to find from Moghrabi's (25) study that 40 per cent of the

190 foreign students who took the Nelson-Denny entrance examination had a reading speed of less than 100 words-per-minute; only 4 per cent were able to read over 300 words-per-minute. This lack of basic skills makes it difficult for foreign students to handle course work that depends on the ability to take notes, and to comprehend slang and unfamiliar American accents (27).

Although the linguistic problem involved with understanding lectures and reading assignments may go unnoticed, verbal inadequacies are, however, explicitly obvious in oral reports and class discussion of international students (7). Likewise their inability to express themselves subtly also leaves them unable to ask for further information or to articulate precisely their difficulties. As a result, many international students, conscious of their English deficiencies and foreign accents, prefer to keep silent in the classroom. They are slow to raise questions and reluctant to participate in class discussions for fear of exposing their "ignorance." Unfortunately, sometimes this reluctance is mistaken by some professors for inattention, arrogance, or uncooperativeness.

In addition, the American method of teaching and learning poses a challenge for many international students because they are accustomed to passively receiving lectures, memorizing texts, and being tested only on those facts,

whereas in American higher education independent thought and active challenges of traditional concepts are highly valued (16). In regard to learning styles of international students, Brislin (8) points out that the traits attributed to international students and abhorred by faculty are learned behaviors that are acceptable, even probably mandatory or proper, in the cultures of international students. These students learn by rote memorization and they are expected to repeat the material on tests.

Another valued trait in many cultures is complete deference to authority (27). In such cultures, the words of instructors are accepted as fact, and to question a presentation by a professor is unthinkable. Upon arrival in American classrooms, these students who have such cultural backgrounds are suddenly expected to be creative and original in their thought processes and to interact with professors; their tradition of total deference has not prepared them for this type of thinking and learning. This may leave them with feelings of inferiority and a lack of self-confidence in speaking English. McCroskey, Fyer and Richmond (22) found that Puerto Rican students are much less apprehensive about communication in their native language than are the American students, but are much more apprehensive about communication in English.

Many instructors, meanwhile, are unaware that they are dealing with a special group of students--students with different backgrounds, languages, attitudes and beliefs. Bournazos and Leamy (7) found that one of the most difficult problems of the foreign students was the lack of close relationship and understanding between them and the instructors or even the American students because of their failure in communication due to anxiety and inappropriate word choices. These problems cause them to have negative attitudes toward their instructors, American students, and the university as a whole. Sabie (32) found that many of these students were not pleased with their living experiences in the American institutions. Only international students who are satisfied with their language abilities and academic performance report favorable opinions of local people (17).

These findings are relevant to Adler's concept of social interest. Adler believed that a discouraged person, who does not have a true social feeling, feels as if he is in an enemy country when he comes in a new situation (3). He stops (inactive), hesitates (poor opinion and low self-esteem), fights and escapes. He turns from the useful to the useless side of life (6). As a result, according to Adler, this individual seeks freedom from personal responsibility (3) and tends to perceive "events" as being beyond

his personal control, while another person who has a strongly developed social interest and "an optimistic outlook" does perceive "events" as being a consequence of one's own actions, and thereby, under personal control (19).

Wheless, Erickson and Behrens (36) assume that given the realities of their international experiences and their time in the United States, non-Western students studying in this country should be expected to be "international" in orientation and more internally controlled than others from their cultures because these students are somewhat likely to be acculturated to more than one culture (and perhaps more Westernized) which would, in turn, affect their communication proclivities. Many studies, however, conducted in the United States on international students consistently reveal that non-Western students tend to score externally on locus of control measures (23, 28, 36), and language problems are also frequently mentioned as their reason for being unable to develop more meaningful communication and relationship with Americans (27, 29). For some of these students, their ability to communicate in English can be improved with time, but others may continue to have problems and remain at a disadvantage since many foreign students are hesitant to admit that they do not understand (34). They secure emotional stability and find support by associating with their own countrymen (33). In the process,

unfortunately, they are kept from and keep themselves from speaking English, or even from being acculturated (18).

The effect of English communication problems, social interest, and locus of control on the adjustment of international students is negative. Given the importance of psychological, social, and academic adjustment to the well-being of international students, it is necessary for educational institutions to have a clear perception of their problems. This study attempts to clarify the problems of the international students from the Far East by determining the relationships among English oral communication apprehension, social interest, and locus of control, and by examining whether differences exist in these variables, compared to gender, age, academic classification, major field of study, employment status, and length of study in the United States.

The significance of this study is that the findings will increase knowledge and provide an enhanced understanding of the psychological, social, and academic adjustment problems of Far Eastern students. If psychological, social, and academic adjustment of Far Eastern students studying in the United States is improved, they will be more likely to have positive attitudes toward the world population and convey a positive image of the United States. Thus, the accomplishment of better adjustment could

be of great benefit not only to the Far Eastern students themselves but also the United States, and the world as a whole.

Delimitation of the Study

This study was limited to the population of the Far Eastern students enrolled at North Texas State University in the fall semester of 1986.

Basic Assumption

It was assumed that Far Eastern students have similar personal characteristics in regard to their human nature orientation, human relationships to nature (supernature) orientation, time orientation, activity orientation, and interpersonal relationships orientation.

Definition of Terms

For clarifying the purposes and handling the data, the following terms are operationally provided as such:

A Far Eastern student.--in this study is any Far Eastern student who is not an American citizen or immigrant, who speaks English as a second or foreign language, and is enrolled at North Texas State University.

English oral communication apprehension.--refers to personal ratings of English oral communication apprehension of international students, as measured by the Adapted Personal Report of Communication Apprehension-24 (Appendix C).

Oral communication apprehension.--McCroskey (23) defines oral communication apprehension as "a person's level of fear or anxiety associated with any form of communication with other people, experienced either as a trait-like, personality type response or as a response to the situational constraints of a given communication transaction" (p. 3).

Social interest.--Adler (1) defined social interest as an attitude toward life characterized by interest in and unselfish concern for others.

Locus of control.--Rotter's (32) term for the perceived origin of the events in one's life. Individuals with an internal locus of control perceive themselves as being responsible for those events while those with an external locus of control see themselves as being the victims of fate and governed by circumstances beyond their control.

CHAPTER BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Adler, Alfred, Problems of Neurosis, New York, Harper & Row, 1926.
2. _____, What Life should Mean to You, New York, K. P. Putman's, 1931.
3. _____, The Individual Psychology of Alfred Adler: A Systematic Presentation in Selections from His Writings, New York, Basic Books, 1956.
4. Ahmed, Marwa K., "Academic Adjustment and Satisfaction with College among Selected Groups of International Students," unpublished doctoral dissertation, North Texas State University, Denton, Texas, 1984.
5. Al-Saffar, Ahmed Abdullah, "A Survey of International Students' Opinions and Attitudes at the University of Tennessee," unpublished doctoral dissertation, the University of Tennessee, Knoxville, Tennessee, 1976.
6. Ansbacher, Heinz L., "Individual Psychology," in Personality Theories, Research, and Assessment, edited by Raymond J. Corsini and Anthony J. Marsella, Illinois, F. E. Peacock Publishers, Inc., 1983, pp. 69-124.
7. Bournazos, Kimon and Mary K. Leamy, An Exploratory Study Concerning Attitudes of Foreign Students Enrolled at Western Michigan University, Western Michigan University, Kalamazoo, Michigan, 1974.
8. Brislin, Richard, Learning Styles, Learning across Cultures: Intercultural Communication and International Educational Exchange, edited by Gary Althen, National Association for Foreign Students Affairs, Washington, 1981.
9. Crandall, James E., "Further Validation of the Social Interest Scale: Peer Ratings and Interpersonal Attraction," Journal of Clinical Psychology, 33 (January, 1977), 140-142.
10. Crandall, James E. and M. D. Harris, "Social Interest, Cooperation, and Altruism," Journal of Individual Psychology, 32 (May, 1976), 50-54.

11. Crandall, James E. and Gunars Reimanis, "Social Interest and Time Orientation, Childhood Memories, Adjustment and Crime," Journal of Individual psychology, 32 (November, 1976), 203-211.
12. Eisenberg, Sheldon, "Understanding and Building Self-Esteem," in Helping Clients with Special Concerns, edited by Sheldon Eisenberg and Lewis E. Patterson, Boston, Houghton Mifflin Company, 1979, pp. 11-34.
13. Han, Pyung Eui, "A Study of Goals and Problems of Foreign Graduate Students from Far East at the University of Southern California," unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Southern California, Los Angeles, California, 1975.
14. Hersch, Paul D. and Karl E. Scheibe, "On the Reliability and Validity of Internal-External Control as a Personality Dimensions," Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 31 (December, 1967), 609-614.
15. Hull, W. Frank, Foreign Students in the United States of America: Coping Behavior within the Educational Environment, New York, Praeger Publishers, 1978.
16. Klein, Marjorie H., "The Foreign Students Adaptation Program: Social Experiences of Asian Students in the U.S. International Educational and Cultural Exchange," 51 (February, 1971), 77-90.
17. Klineberg, Otto and W. Frank Hull, At a Foreign University: An International Study of Adaptation and Coping, New York, Praeger Publishers, 1979.
18. Lacas, Jenifer, "Communication Apprehension in the ESL Classroom: Getting Our Students to Talk," Foreign language Annuals, 17 (December, 1984), 593-598.
19. Lefcourt, Herbert M., "Belief in Personal Control: Research and Implication," Journal of Individual Psychology, 22 (May, 1966), 185-193.
20. Marsella, Anthony J. and Alan L. Yang, "Personality Research: Anxiety, Aggression and Locus of Control," in Personality Theories, Research, and Assessment, edited by Raymond J. Corsini and Anthony J. Marsella, Illinois, F. E. Peacock Publishers, Inc., 1983, pp. 635-669.

21. McCroskey, James C., "Oral Communication Apprehension: Reconceptualization and a New Look Measurement," in Communication Yearbook 6, edited by Michael Burgoon, California, Sage, 1982, pp. 1-28.
22. McCroskey, James C., John M. Fyer and Virginia P. Richmond, "Don't Speak to Me in English: Communication Apprehension in Puerto Rico," Communication Quarterly, 33 (Summer, 1985), 185-192.
23. McGinnies, Elliott, Lena A. Nordholm, Charles D. Ward and D. Bhanthumnavin, "Sex and Cultural Differences in Perceived Locus of Control among Students in Five Countries," Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 42 (June, 1974), 451-455.
24. Mehrens, William A. and Irvin J. Lehmann, Standardized Tests in Education, New York, Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1975.
25. Moghrabi, Kamel, "An Analysis of Factors that Influence the Degree of Success and Failure of Foreign Students at Texas A&M University," unpublished doctoral dissertation, Texas A&M University, College Station, Texas, 1966.
26. Nenyod, Boonmee, "An Analysis of Problem Perceived by Foreign Students Enrolled in State Colleges and Universities in the State of Texas," unpublished doctoral dissertation, East Texas State University, Commerce, Texas, 1975.
27. Omar, Ali A., "Problems of International Students as Perceived by International Students and Faculty in a Public University," unpublished doctoral dissertation, North Texas State University, Denton, Texas, 1986.
28. Parsons, Oscar A. and John M. Schneider, "Locus of Control in University Students from Eastern and Western Societies," Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 42 (June, 1974), 456-461.
29. Payind, Mohammad Alam, "Academic, Personal and Social Problems of Afghan and Iranian Students in the United States," Educational Research Quarterly, 4 (Summer, 1979), 3-11.

30. Rotter, Julian B., "Generalized Expectancies for Internal versus External Control of Reinforcement," Psychological Monograph, 80 (May, 1966), whole No. 609.
31. Sabie, Taha, "Foreign Students Coping with the American Culture at Eight Selected American Universities," unpublished doctoral dissertation, George Peabody College for Teachers, Nashville, Tennessee, 1976.
32. Sharma, Sala, "A Study to Identify and Analyze Adjustment Problems Experienced by Foreign, Non-European Graduate Students Enrolled in Selected Universities in State of North Carolina," California Journal of Education, 24 (August, 1973), 135-146.
33. Spaulding, Seth and Michael J. Flack, The World's Students in the United States: A Review and Evaluation of Research on Foreign Students, New York, Praeger Publishers, 1976.
34. The International Students Committee, Handbook for Academic Advisors of Foreign Students, University of Kentucky, Lexington, Kentucky, 1982.
35. UNESCO, Formal Programs of International Cooperation between University Institutions: Report of an International Committee of Experts, Paris, France, 1960.
36. Wheeless, Lawrence R., Keith V. Erickson and Jackie Segars Behrens, "Cultural Differences in Disclosiveness as a Function of Locus of Control," Communication Monograph, 53 (March, 1986), 36-45.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

The review of relevant literature for this study is presented in two major parts. First is the theoretical basis concerning dependent variables being studied: (a) oral communication apprehension, (b) social interest, and (c) locus of control. The second part includes the literature concerning the relationships between (a) oral communication apprehension and social interest, (b) oral communication apprehension and locus of control, and (c) social interest and locus of control.

Oral Communication Apprehension

The Conceptualization of Oral Communication Apprehension

Over a decade ago, scholars in interpersonal communication became interested in determining which factors produce anxiety in public speaking situations (51). The groundwork for the field was laid during the World War II era with Gilkenson's (53) study of social fears of public speaking in college situations. Since 1970, the theoretical schema has been altered and has become known as "oral communication apprehension" (52).

McCroskey (52, p. 270) originally defined oral communication apprehension as "a broad-based anxiety or fear associated with real or anticipated communication with another person or persons." Other related constructs which have been frequently used synonymously with oral communication apprehension are reticence, speech anxiety, shyness and unwillingness to communicate. Reticence and communication apprehension were seen initially as the same constructs. Currently, reticence is the reverse of communication competence. Individuals who do not communicate competently are termed "reticent" (48).

Shyness does not represent a single construct but seems to have the properties of communication apprehension, negative predispositions toward verbal behavior and reticence (92). Speech or audience anxiety is defined as "fear, tension, and disorganization in front of the audience." It appears that speech anxiety is closely related to the construct of stage fright (39). Unwillingness to communicate occupies an intermediary position between the constructs of reticence and communication apprehension. Low self-esteem, introversion and alienation are viewed as causes for noncommunicative behavior according to the unwillingness to communicate construct (17).

Currently, oral communication apprehension is defined as "a person's level of fear and anxiety associated with any

form of communication with other people, experienced either as a trait-like, personality-type response or as a response to the situational constraints of a given communication transaction" (54, p.3). In its conception, communication apprehension is viewed as a broad-based personality-type characteristic or a learned trait based on past communication experiences (56) that is relatively enduring and subject to major fluctuations from one time to another (53). In more recent writing, McCroskey and Beatty (60) categorized communication apprehension as a specific trait anxiety. This construct represents a specific, rather than general anxiety because the stimulus that evokes the anxiety reaction is specified (12).

This conceptualization posits communication apprehension as a form of trait rather than state anxiety. Spielberger (84) and Lam (45) have provided distinctions between "state" and "trait" apprehension in communication apprehension. State oral communication refers to a specific oral communication situation. What is termed "stage fright" is probably the most common example of state oral communication apprehension. State oral communication apprehension is a normal reaction to an unfamiliar or threatening speaking situation and is no way pathological. Trait communication apprehension, however, is not the normal response of a well-adjusted person. It is characterized by

fear and anxiety across many types of communication situations. The person who possesses a high level of trait communication apprehension will avoid interpersonal contact as well as encounter in small and large-group communication settings (52). The results of the present study, however, suggest the conceptualization of communication apprehension as an accumulation of state anxiety experiences. State anxiety responses correlated significantly with communication apprehension scores based on the PRCA-24 (62).

McCroskey (54) offers four types of oral communication apprehension which fall on a continuum between trait and state apprehension: trait-like communication apprehension, generalized-context communication apprehension, person-group communication apprehension, and situational communication apprehension.

Trait-like communication apprehension is viewed as "a relatively enduring, personality-type orientation toward a given mode of communication across a wide variety of contexts" (54, p. 10). Generalized-context communication apprehension is defined as "a relatively enduring, personality-type orientation toward communication in a given type of context" (54, p. 10). The primary distribution between generalized-context apprehension and trait-like apprehension is that generalized-context apprehension "recognizes that people can be highly apprehensive about

communicating in one type of context while having less or even no apprehension about communicating in another type of context" (54, p.10).

Person-group communication apprehension refers to "relatively enduring orientation toward communication with a given person or group of people" (54, p. 11). It is a function of the situational constraints introduced by the other person or group of people. The personality of the individual has little to do with the level of apprehensiveness.

A transitory orientation toward communication with a given person or group of people defines situational communication apprehension, which recognizes that there may be times when a person is apprehensive with a particular person or group of people and not apprehensive with the same person or group of people at another time. The level of communication apprehension may be expected to vary widely from situation to situation (54, p. 11).

The Theoretical Propositions Related to Oral Communication Apprehension

Theory related to oral communication apprehension is not yet fully developed; however, the following five major theoretical propositions concerning oral communication apprehension have been set forth and substantial research has been completed employing the PRCA-24 to test these theoretical propositions (53).

Proposition 1.--People vary in the degree to which they are apprehensive about oral communication with other people. Oral communication apprehension can vary from individual to individual and be on a continuum from extremely high to extremely low.

Proposition 2.--People with high oral communication apprehension seek to avoid oral communication. It has long been known that people seek to avoid situations which cause them anxiety. Thus, it would be expected that people who are apprehensive about oral communication would try to avoid circumstances which would require them to communicate orally. In a study of seating position in a small group setting, Weiner (88) found high communication apprehensives selected seats that had been identified as requiring less interaction than other seats, while low communication apprehensives selected in an opposite manner.

Proposition 3.--People with high oral communication apprehension engage in less oral communication than do less orally apprehensive people. One method of avoiding oral communication is to withdraw from situations which require oral communication by modifying one's life style. In short, the person can withdraw while still being present by remaining silent as much as possible.

Proposition 4.--When people with high oral communi-

cation apprehension do communicate, their oral communication behaviors differ from those of people who are less apprehensive. Weiner (88) has observed that the comments of high communication apprehensives in a small group setting are much less relevant to the topic under discussion than are the comments of individuals with lower communication apprehension. McCroskey, Daly and Sorensen (56) found that high communication apprehensives exhibited more tension in small group interaction than did people with less oral communication apprehension. In addition, Powers (75) found that high communication apprehensives included more rhetorical interrogatives (ie., You know?, You see?, Okay?) in their interaction with other people than did low communication apprehensives.

Proposition 5.--As a result of their oral communication behavior, high oral communication apprehensives are perceived less positively by others than are less apprehensive people. This proposition assumes that proposition 4 is correct, and that the differences specified in proposition 4 will be perceived negatively by other communicators in the same environment. Quiggins (76) found that high oral communication apprehensives were perceived as both less credible and less interpersonally attractive than were low communication apprehensives, both by other high apprehensives and other low apprehensives.

The Constructs Related to Oral Communication Apprehension

A substantial range of personality variables that should be associated with oral communication apprehension are reported below (17, 53).

Introversion.--The introvert is characteristically quiet, timid and shy which may be an indication of anxiety about communication. Alternatively, such individuals may have less use of communication. The introvert's tendencies toward withdrawal, introspection, inner-direction, low dependency on the evaluation of others and low sociability (compared to extraverts) imply that the introvert places less value on communication (38). Whether the behaviors are explained by a lower need for communication or by anxiety, the evidence indicates that introverts engage in less interpersonal communication. Carment, Miles and Cervin (18) found that, compared to extraverts, introverts rarely spoke first and had a significantly lower amount of participation in a small group discussion.

Self-esteem and Self-acceptance.--People with low self-esteem tend to be maladjusted and to display defensive behaviors (37). In the case studies of Phillips (72) it was frequently observed that high communication apprehensive individuals also evidenced a lack of self-esteem and self-acceptance. This may be attributable to prior negative

experiences in communication with others. It should follow that such people will be apprehensive to communicate because they will expect others to reject or criticize their communication efforts.

Reticence.--According to Lustig (48), an individual who is a verbal reticent is a person whose average verbal output is characteristically low and who regards this behavior as problematic. The reticent individual is usually quiet, avoids social, verbal interaction, is threatened by face-to-face contact, and is intimidated by superordinates. He/she is hesitant about expressing ideas and problems, is highly apologetic when his/her opinions are challenged, and interprets questions about the content of his/her communication as personal criticism. Moreover, the reticent person is insecure, feels inadequate in communication, is easily embarrassed, shy, withdraw and prone to agree with others (17).

General Personality.--Oral communication apprehension has been linked theoretically to a wide variety of personality characteristics. In an attempt to determine the relationship between communication apprehension and general personality, McCroskey, Daly and Sorensen (56) administered the PRCA-24 and Cattell's 16 PF personality measure to 99 college subjects. Nine of twelve hypotheses received

statistical confirmation, and the other three were in the hypothesized direction but not statistically significant. The observed multiple correlation between the sixteen dimensions of the personality measure and the PRCA-24 was .72.

Although significant relationships were found between communication apprehension and personality variables, McCroskey, Daly and Sorensen (56) found no significant relationship between communication apprehension and intelligence among college students. Bashore (11) found a slight negative relationship in a study of high school seniors, but the correlation was significant only for female students. He also failed to find a significant correlation between communication apprehension and GPA in that same study.

Sex Differences and Communication Styles.--Also the construct of communication apprehension appears to be strongly tied to sex differences and communicator style construct (66). A relaxed communicator is calm and collected, relatively free from nervousness and anxiety in his/her communication. The literature supports the conclusion that males are more relaxed than females in their communicator styles. Females, therefore, tend to be more apprehensive in communication than males.

This conclusion is relevant to Maccoby and Jacklin's (49) findings on the general personality factor of anxiety. They conclude that self-reports and teacher ratings show girls to be more timid and anxious than boys in their communication while males suggest a more relaxed style than females (64).

McCroskey does not mention sex differences specifically in his review of the communication apprehension literature (66). A recent study, however, indicated that males may be slightly more shy than females, females may be slightly more apprehensive about public speaking than males, but females and males do not differ meaningfully in terms of general communication apprehension (59).

The Measurement of Oral Communication Apprehension

The construct of oral communication apprehension has been defined as state and trait personality characteristics. Three approaches to the study of oral communication apprehension have traditionally been followed. The first views oral communication apprehension as a physiologically experienced phenomenon. Typically, subjects are monitored for galvanic skin response, changes in heart rate and blood pressure increases (14, 77).

The second approach to the study of oral communication apprehension involves observable behavior patterns which can be attributed to communication apprehension. Observer

rating scales are the most frequently employed techniques for the approach (73).

The third view of oral communication apprehension considers apprehension to be a cognitively based experience. Generally, the measurement chosen has been in the form of self-report scales (39, 74, 84).

Daly (33) reports that there are no less than twenty-five instruments available to researchers for measuring oral communication apprehension. The conceptualization of oral communication apprehension as a trait-like personality-type variable which is cognitively experienced has led researchers to use self-report measures in determining the level of oral communication apprehension. Several of these scales are widely used in the literature: the Lustig's Verbal Reticence Scale (48); the Phillips-Erickson Reticence Scale (72); and the Personal Report of Communication Apprehension-24 (PRCA-24).

The PRCA-24 appears to be sensitive to trait and state characteristics (53, 62). It is a 24-item measure which uses the Likert-type scale and represents four communication contexts: speaking in small groups, speaking in meetings or classes, dyadic interactions and public speaking. Six items are included for each of the four contexts. To avoid response bias, three of the items are positively worded and three of the items are negatively worded. The instrument

provides scores on the four contexts and a generalized context total score. McCroskey (54) has indicated that this version of the PRCA-24 should replace all previous instruments to measure the conceptualization of oral communication apprehension.

Social Interest

The Conceptualization and Theoretical Foundations of Social Interest

The original term for social interest is "Gemeinschaftsgefühl." The following translations have been used: social feeling, community feeling, communal feeling, fellow feeling, sense of solidarity, social sense, communal intuition, community interest, and, finally, social interest (8, p. 69).

One major concept of Adlerian theory is that each individual is born with an innate capacity for the development of social interest (6). This view leaves man with a unitary dynamic force toward growth plus a positive interest in interacting with the surrounding world, a social interest. This view is shared with Adler by the Gestalt Psychologist, Solomon Asch. In Asch's version,

social tendencies are an expression of our most basic orientation to the world. We seek the company of others for the same general reason that we seek for the company of things, because we strive to relate ourselves meaningfully to the surroundings. Social interest is an intrinsic part of our extending interest in the surrounding (10, p. 334).

Additionally, social interest is characterized by its usefulness. Usefulness in turn is defined by Adler as "in the interests of mankind generally" (2, p. 78). Thus, social interest actually means not merely an interest in others, but an "interest in the interests of others" or an attitude toward life characterized by interest in and unselfish concern for others (8, p. 85).

The social interest concept comprises various psychological processes. Adler describes social interest as an innate potential of each individual that must be consciously developed (8). If social interest is not nurtured, developed, and educated, the individual becomes self-centered and strives on the useless side of life (1). Adler asserts:

A person who does not have a true social feeling stops, hesitates, fights, escapes, when he comes in a new situation such as kindergarten, school, marriage, and friendship. All these are social situations and require social feeling. It is this type that become the criminals, problem children, neurotics, and suicides. Striving for superiority (like everybody) and lacking in courage (defined as activity plus social feeling), they turn from the useful to the useless side (1, p. 119).

According to Adler, social interest, or the lack of it, strongly impacts the total functioning of the individuals (2). Thus, social interest is the criterion for mental health, the barometer of normality and the difference between a useful life and a useless life. Furthermore, for Adler, the degree of social interest was "the main charac-

teristic of each person" and involved in all actions. He said:

The mind improves, for intelligence is a communal function. The feeling of worth and value is heightened, giving courage and an optimistic view, there is a sense of acquiescence in the common advantages and drawbacks of our lot. The individual feels at home in life and feels his existence to be worthwhile just so far as he is useful to others and is overcoming common, instead of private, feelings of inferiority (4, p. 155).

One implication that can be drawn from Adler's theory seems to be that successful students in all actions will reveal more social interest than unsuccessful students. It would seem to follow that international students with greater social interest would be more successful students than those with less social interest.

The Measurement of Social Interest

During the past twelve years, three instruments that could be used to measure social interest have been developed (69). Greever's Social Interest Index (SII) was developed using a norm group of rural Appalachian community college students (69), and Zarski, West and Bubenzer (91) revised the SII to offer a better measure of social interest (69). Sulliman's Scale of Social Interest (SSSI) was developed using Anglo-American and Black-American high school students as members of the norm group (86). Crandall's Social Interest Scale (SIS) was developed using some high school students but primarily college students as the norm group (20, 24).

Several studies have investigated the relationship between scores on the SIS and the SII. A study of the relationship between SIS and SII scores of forty-seven students in a graduate counseling course yielded a correlation of .29 (91). Crandall replicated the study with thirty-two students in an introductory psychology course and found a similar correlation between the scores of the two tests, .33 (24).

Social interest scores as measured by the SIS have significantly correlated with a number of psychological and behavioral processes that facilitate adjustment. Therefore, validity data for the SIS were based on numerous measures of those relevant aspects of Adler's concept of social interest (69).

Significant positive associations were found between social interest as measured by the SIS and observed cooperation and helping behavior (27), empathy (23), altruism and trustworthiness (20, 24), peer ratings (20), favorable views of human nature (23), values of family security, peace and equality (20), meaningfulness in life (26), and positive outlook on life and happiness (28).

Significant negative associations were found between social interest as measured by the SIS and desire for acceptance (24), social desirability response set and extraversion (24, 46), self-centeredness (31), depression

and hostility (20), anti-social behavior and memories of unpleasant childhood experiences (23, 28).

A nonsignificant association was indicated between social interest as measured by the SIS and intelligence (23), ethnicity (69), socioeconomic and gender (24). This finding lends support to Adler's concept of universality of social interest. He believed that social interest is a characteristic of all people (4, 5).

In conclusion, the correlation of social interest as measured by the SIS with a large variety of indices of adjustment and with processes by which social interest is presumed to facilitate adjustment gives considerable support for Adler's contention that social interest is an important factor in adjustment and feelings of overall well-being, especially beyond adolescence (23).

Locus of Control

The Conceptualization of Locus of Control

The distinction between chance or choice in human destiny has emerged as a popular topic of inquiry in personality research under the rubric of "locus of control" (50). As a personality construct, locus of control developed from the research of Rotter, a social learning theorist associated with Expectancy Reinforcement Theory (78).

Within the context of social learning theory, Rotter (79, p. 1) defined locus of control as the following:

The degree to which the individual perceives that a reward follows from or is contingent upon his attributes or behavior versus the degree to which the individual feels the reward is controlled by forces outside of himself.

Rotter (79) distinguished between different locus of control orientations. Internally oriented individuals believe events in their life are determined by their own behavior and effort. Externally oriented individuals believe events in their life are determined by fate, chance, or other forces over which they have no control. Both of these orientations refer to an individual's perceived locus of causality (50).

Theoretical Foundations

The central elements of the theory of locus of control are the concepts of situation, reinforcement, reinforcement value and expectation. Situations differ, both environmentally and in our psychological perceptions of them. Different situations provide different cues. Whether we are attentive to the cue depends on a variety of personal characteristics.

A reinforcement can be any event that follows a specific behavior. Reinforcement value refers to the degree of preference an individual has for a particular reinforcement. Thus, reinforcement value is relative for each

individual and we can assume relative hierarchies in reinforcement value for different reinforcers given actual behavior (50).

Expectancy is the belief a specific reinforcement will occur as a result of a particular behavior. Rotter (79) posits two types of expectancies, generalized and specific. There usually is an expectancy by college students that serious studying will result in good grades. Such a belief may be called a generalized expectancy. Generalized expectancies arise out of validated specific expectancies which he or she had validated in previous, specific situations.

The interaction of situation, reinforcement, reinforcement value and expectancy is summed up in the formula:

$$BP_x, s_l, R_a = f (E_x, R_a, s_l \& RV_a, s_l)$$

That is, the probability of behavior $x(BP_x)$ to occur in a particular situation (s_l) with a particular reinforcer (R_a) is a function of the expectancy that behavior $x(E_x)$ will be reinforced by R_a in situation s_l , and the value of that reinforcement in that situation (RV_a, s_l) (50).

In terms of Rotter's theory, the individual's behavior in a particular situation can be predicted and explained with particular expectancies and reinforcement values. Generalized expectancies refer to expectations concerning

behavior and reinforcement that are applicable over a wide range of situations over time. Locus of control is one generalized expectancy regarding perceived causes for behavior (47).

The Measurement of Locus of Control

The primary method used to assess generalized expectancies of internal-external control have been self-report questionnaires. The first questionnaires to assess the topic were developed in 1957 by Phares and James (50). In 1966, Rotter (79) published a new scale which emerged as the most popular scale. Rotter's scale consists of twenty-nine items. Six of the items are fillers and the remaining twenty-three items assess locus of control through direct questions regarding an individual's perception of control over events. The maximum score obtainable on the scale is twenty-three. For a normal adult population, the mean is 8.50, SD = 3.74 (47). Factor analyses of the Rotter scale by Mirels (65) and Parsons and Schneider (70) pointed out its dimensionality. For example, Mirels found Rotter's scale measured two basic factors: (1) mastery over one's life, and (2) the influence one can exert over political institutions.

The Rotter's Internal-External Scale has been widely used to investigate dozens of variables (50). Parsons and Schneider (70) administered the Rotter's I-E scale to

students from Eastern and Western societies and found the Eastern students were more externally oriented while the Western students were internally oriented. Sex differences in locus of control have also been studied by using the I-E scale. In the same study, Parsons and Schneider found that women tended to score more externally than men. Nowicki, Duke and Crouch (68) studied the achievement behavior of male and female students. They found the achievement behavior of internal females was more affected by sex of partner and type of competition than that of males. While internal males increased their achievement more than the external males, internal females increased their performance only when competing against males or when cooperating with females. Competition with a male or female makes a difference to an internal female. Thus, locus of control has an effect on the way one performs under conditions of competition versus cooperation, particularly among females.

Oral Communication Apprehension and Social Interest

Although oral communication apprehension was purported by scholars in interpersonal communication to be a major obstruction of successful adjustment, no studies were found in the literature that related oral communication apprehension to social interest. The review of literature of the relationship between these two variables will deal with the

certain factors related to the characteristics of oral communication apprehension and social interest.

McCroskey (54, p.3) defined oral communication apprehension as "a person's level of fear and anxiety associated with any form of communication with other people, experienced either as a trait-like, personality-type response or as a response to the situational constraints of a given communication transaction." Oral communication apprehension is not the normal response of a well-adjusted person. It is characterized by fear and anxiety across many types of communication situations. The person who possesses a high level of communication apprehension will avoid interpersonal contact as well as encounter in small and large group communication settings. The low communication apprehensive individual is usually perceived as outgoing, friendly, sociable and willing to communicate in most contexts (52).

This view is relevant to Alfred Adler's theory of social interest and anxiety. Adler (1) stated that underdeveloped social interest exerted a negative influence on perception, reasoning and value formation. His theory postulated that social interest is the criterion of mental health and the failures in life lack social interest.

According to Adler, those people can take two positions toward the environment: moving toward or moving away. If

one moves closer in a hostile way--that is aggression; and if one moves away in an escaping manner--that is anxiety (50). Anxiety is only another mechanism to prevent a person from doing what is required. A person in effort is saying "I can't because I am anxious," and thereby gives himself or herself a kind of excuse, thinking "I can't do it, I am too frightened." Adler (4) frequently indicated that every discouraged individual has an inferiority feeling, indecision, anxiety, rigidity, self-centeredness, and is also low in activity. This assumption is relevant to communication apprehension constructs. Many research studies revealed that people with high communication apprehension have personality variables associated with introversion, low self-esteem or self-acceptance and verbal reticence (18, 38, 48, 53). McCroskey, Daly and Sorensen (56) also found that oral communication apprehension had moderately high positive correlations with general anxiety and moderately negative correlations with self-control, adventurousness, urgency, and emotional maturity.

In contrast, according to Adler, a person who has developed social interest can be considered mentally healthy, or one who can identify, empathize, and cooperate with others, or in Adler's words, "see with the eyes of another, hear with the ears of another, and feel with the heart of another" (6, p. 132).

Dreikurs (34) considered work the most important of tasks for the maintenance of life, and to be successful in life, demands social interest in that a person must enjoy participating and working with others, make worthwhile contributions, and find satisfying the experience of being a part of something larger than the self (3). Additionally, Crandall (24) asserts that social interest creates healthy attitudes toward the frustration of groupwork, decreases self-centeredness and prevents the individual's personal problems from assuming exaggerated importance.

A substantial number of studies (51, 83) have investigated the relationships among oral communication apprehension, interpersonal perceptions and opinions of oneself. These studies have revealed that people with high oral communication apprehension avoid interaction and if forced to communicate, do so in ways such that undesirable perceptions are formed of them by other communicators. High apprehensives are perceived as less attractive, less credible, less similar, less desirable as opinion leaders, less likely to succeed in school (both academically and socially) and less likely to be successful in their careers.

Beatty and Beatty (13) also found that anxiety as a negative reaction to the task of interaction with another person or persons generates avoidance tendencies. Thus, the highly anxious person, given a choice will avoid communi-

cation (15). Zakahi and Duran (90) studied the relationship among loneliness, communication competence and communication apprehension of 398 students at a midsized mid-Western University. They found that oral communication as measured by the revised PRCA-24 was related to loneliness as measured by the revised UCLA Loneliness Scale. The research suggests that the lonely person may have trouble dealing with social interaction. Similarly, Cutrona (32) found lonely people reported that problems such as shyness and fear of rejection prevent them from initiating social interaction.

McCroskey and Richmond (58) studied the effect of oral communication apprehension on the social dimension of college student life. They found that high communication apprehensive individuals were less likely to accept blind dates, likely to date one person to the exclusion of others and have fewer dates. Their further study found that high oral communication apprehensives would prefer large-section lectures in classes in university settings. Scott, Yates and Wheeless (101) also found that these students establish fewer relationships with faculty members, have less positive attitudes toward faculty/student advising systems, and in general have less positive attitudes about the college environment.

In still another study of student behavior, McCroskey and Sheahan (57) found that while students with low levels

of communication apprehension chose seats in the front of and center of a classroom with traditional straight-row seating for twenty-five students, the students with high communication apprehension avoided those seats and instead chose seats on the periphery of the room, on the sides and in the back. The front and center area, of course, is the most accessible to the teacher and the place where a person is more likely to be called upon to participate.

Oral Communication Apprehension and Locus of Control

Since oral communication apprehension is defined as "a person's level of fear and anxiety associated with any form of communication with other people...." (54, p.3), research studies concerning anxiety and characteristics related to oral communication apprehension and their relationship to locus of control can be relevant to this discussion.

Existing evidence supports that the less control an individual perceives he has in determining his life outcomes, the more anxiety he exhibits (50). Archer (9) reviewed twenty-one studies relating locus of control to general trait anxiety and concluded that externality is related to higher levels of trait anxiety.

However, as Phares (71) notes, it may be reasonable to assume the relationship may be U-Shaped. Both extremely external and internal subjects could experience high levels

external and internal subjects could experience high levels of anxiety. This perspective agrees with the earlier sentiments of Rotter (79) who thought extreme "internals" are as maladjusted as extreme "externals." Nonetheless, Rotter noted most internals are better adjusted than externals (50). Those who score in the direction of internal control appear more active in their attempts to control and master the environment. They seek out more information and greater problem-solving skills to help them reach their goals. They are less influenced by social pressures, tend to be better adjusted and can tolerate frustration and can cope with stress (80). Studies indicate that when internals can accurately perceive certain events as being controlled by external causes, they are more active in trying to change those events or the causes of them than are externals (47, 81).

Johnson and Sarason (43) hypothesized significant life changes would have the greatest effect on subjects who perceive themselves as having little control over life events. The results indicated significant correlations between life change, depression, anxiety and an external locus of control. Crandall and Lehman (29) also found that an accumulation of stressful life events lead to greater perceived external control and thus be positively correlated with the I-E Scale. Correlations are larger when life

change scores are based only on unpleasant changes. Natale (67) investigated whether depression was associated with an external locus of control and whether elation was related to an internal locus of control. He produced temporary mood states (depression, elation, neutral) through an auto-suggestion technique and obtained I-E scale scores both before and after the auto-suggestion procedure. Depression was found to be correlated with significant increase in externality and elation with an increase in internality.

It appears externals are more prone to experience anxiety and depression. A contributing factor is that externals appear to be less able, than internals, to ignore or discount aversive information (50). Efran (36) found externals relatively unable to forget failures and personal setbacks. Greene and Sparks (40) concluded that externals usually have three characteristics: (1) perception of low personal competence, (2) an inability to identify appropriate social behavior, and (3) anticipation of negative outcomes to communication.

In summary, when individuals are involved in situations where personal competence can affect the outcome, they tend to perform more actively and adequately than when situations appear less controllable to them. When controllability is absent for a prolonged length of time people accommodate to these oppressive circumstances by ceasing efforts to behave

competently and they begin to appear as passive and irresponsible "objects."

Social Interest and Locus of Control

Adler wrote extensively about the overcoming of helplessness and the development of mastery (47). Adler's conception of striving for superiority was that man is motivated to become more effective in controlling his world. In addition, his concept of "courage" or "developed social interest" refers to having confidence in oneself and one's ability to manage or control his personal world (4). According to Adler, only the underdeveloped social interest individual seeks freedom from personal responsibility, blaming all sorts of "objective causes" not under his control for his difficulties, and it is the discouraged individual who has lost "faith in his own mental and physical powers" (4).

This concept of Adler has been validated by a number of research on internal-external locus of control. Crandall and Lehman (29) found that external locus of control scores correlated positively with a number of symptoms of maladjustment; especially, on physical and psychological functioning, and negatively with social interest.

Hjelle (42) examined the relationship between social interest, locus of control and self-actualization in seventy-two female university undergraduate students

enrolled in psychology classes. The results provided support for Hjelle's hypotheses that women who evidenced high social interest were significantly more internally controlled and significantly more self-actualized. The findings suggested that for this group of women, one characteristic of social interest, that of a cooperative empathetic attitude toward others, was indeed valid.

The findings of another study conducted by Stevich et al. (85) were consistent with Hjelle's findings that persons with high internal locus of control have significantly greater social interest as measured by the Social Interest Index. The data were collected from 100 female and twenty-five male undergraduate students. These findings also suggested that the relationship between social interest and locus of control exists in both men and women.

Crandall and Putman (30) studied the relationship between social interest and psychological well-being which affects a person's capacity to find satisfaction in life. Ninety-three adult university employees responded to the Social Interest Scale and several measures of psychological well-being. The results showed social interest was positively correlated with thirty-eight measures of well-being ($p < .05$).

Self-disclosiveness as a factor related to social interest has also been correlated with locus of control. In

a study on non-Western international students, Wheless, Erickson and Behrens (89) found that self-disclosiveness tends to have positive relationship with internal locus of control of these students, especially, the non-Western students who have been in the United States for several years. It suggests that locus of control can be westernized and improved with time.

The findings of these studies support the concept that social interest is significantly associated with locus of control and factors related to locus of control. Further testing of Adler's hypothesis regarding the importance of social interest in successful adjustment seems warranted.

CHAPTER BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Adler, Alfred, "Individual Psychology," Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 22 (May, 1927), 116-122(a).
2. _____, Problems of Neurosis. New York, Harper & Row, 1926.
3. _____, What Life Should Mean to You, New York, K. P. Putman's, 1931.
4. _____, The Individual Psychology of Alfred Adler: A Systematic Presentation in Selections from his Writings, New York, Basic Books, 1956.
5. _____, Social Interest: A Challenge to Mankind, New York, Capricorn Books, 1964.
6. Ansbacher, Heinz L., "The Concept of Social Interest," Journal of Individual Psychology, 24 (November, 1968), 131-149.
7. _____, The Science of Living, New York, Anchor, 1968.
8. _____, "Individual Psychology," in Personality Theories, Research, and Assessment, edited by Raymond J. Corsini and Anthony J. Marsella, Illinois, F. E. Peacock Publishers, Inc., 1983, pp. 69-124.
9. Archer, Robert, "Relationship between Locus of Control and Anxiety," Journal of Personality Assessment, 43 (October, 1979), 617-626.
10. Asch, Solomon E., Social Psychology, New York, Prentice Hall, 1952.
11. Bashore, D. M., "Relationships among Speech Anxiety, IQ., and High School Achievement," unpublished master's degree thesis, Illinois State University, Normal, Illinois, 1971.
12. Beatty, Michael J. and Gregory L. Andriate, "Communication Apprehension and General Anxiety in the Prediction of Public Speaking Anxiety,"

- Communication Quarterly, 33 (Summer, 1985), 174-184.
13. Beatty, Michael J. and P. J. Beatty, "Interpersonal Communication Anxiety Theory into Practice," Speech Monograph, 15 (March, 1975), 368-372.
 14. Behnke, Ralph and Larry W. Carlile, "Heart Rate as an Index of Speech Anxiety," Speech Monograph, 38 (March, 1971), 65-69.
 15. Boohar, Richard U. and William J. Seiler, "Speech Communication Anxiety: An Impediment to Academic Achievement in the University Classroom," Journal of Classroom Interaction, 18 (Winter, 1982), 23-27.
 16. Burgoon, Judee K., "Unwillingness to Communicate and Conflict as Predictors of Information Processing Behavior in Small Groups," unpublished paper presented at the Convention of the Speech Communication Association, Chicago, Illinois, 1974.
 17. _____, "The Unwillingness to Communicate Scale: Development and Validation," Communication Monograph, 43 (March, 1976), 60-69.
 18. Carment, D. W., C. G. Miles and V. B. Cervin, "Persuasiveness and Persuasibility as Related to Intelligence and Extraversion" British Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology, 4 (June, 1965), 1-7.
 19. Crandall, James E., "Sex Differences in Extreme Response Style: Differences in Frequency of Use of Extreme Positions and Negative Ratings," Journal of Social Psychology, 89 (April, 1973), 281-293.
 20. _____, "A Scale for Social Interest," Journal of Individual Psychology, 31 (November, 1975), 187-195.
 21. _____, "Further Validation of the Social Interest Scale: Peer Ratings and Interpersonal Attraction," Journal of Clinical Psychology, 33 (January, 1977), 140-142.
 22. _____, "The Effect of Stress on Social Interest and Vice Versa," Journal of Individual Psychology, 12 (November, 1978), 350-360.

23. _____, "Adler's Concept of Social Interest: Theory, Measurement, and Implications for Adjustments," Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 39 (September, 1980), 481-495.
24. _____, Theory and Measurement of Social Interest: Empirical Tests of Alfred Adler's Concept, New York, Columbia University Press, 1981.
25. _____, "Social Interest, Extreme Response Style, and Implications for Adjustment," Journal of Research in Personality, 16 (March, 1982), 82-89.
26. Crandall, James E. and Roger D. Rasmussen, "Purpose of Life as Related to Specific Values," Journal of Clinical Psychology, 31 (July, 1975), 483-485.
27. Crandall, James E. and M. D. Harris, "Social Interest, Cooperation, and Altruism," Journal of Individual Psychology, 32 (May, 1976), 50-54.
28. Crandall, James E. and Gunars Reimanis, "Social Interest and Time Orientation, Childhood Memories, Adjustment and Crime," Journal of Individual psychology, 32 (November, 1976), 203-211.
29. Crandall, James E. and Robert E. Lehman, "Relationship of Stressful Life Events to Social Interest, Locus of Control and Psychological Adjustment," Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 45 (December, 1977), 1208.
30. Crandall, James E. and E. L. Putman, "Relations between Measures of Social Interest and Psychological Well-being," Journal of Individual Psychology, 26 (November, 1980), 156-168.
31. Crandall, James E. and J. A. Kytonen, "Sex, Age and Stress between Social Interest and Well-being," Journal of Individual Psychology, 36 (November, 1980), 169-182.
32. Cutrona, C. E., "Transition to College: Loneliness and the Process of Social Adjustment," in Loneliness: A Sourcebook of Current Theory, Research and Therapy, edited by L. A. Peplau and D. Perlman, New York, John Wiley & Son, 1982, pp. 291-309.

33. Daly, John A., "The Assessment of Social-Communicative Anxiety via Self-Reports: A Comparison of Measures," Communication Monograph, 45 (August, 1978), 204-218.
34. Dreikurs, Rudolf, Psychology in the Classroom, New York, Harper & Row, 1957.
35. _____, Social Quality: The Challenge of Today, Chicago, Henry Regnery Company, 1971.
36. Efran, J., "Some Personality Determinants of Memory for Success and Failure," unpublished doctoral dissertation, Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio, 1963.
37. Eisenberg, Sheldon, "Understanding and Building Self-Esteem," in Helping Clients with Special Concerns, edited by Sheldon Eisenberg and Lewis E. Patterson, Boston, Houghton Mifflin Company, 1979, pp. 11-34.
38. Eysenck, Hans J., Reading in Extraversion-Introversion, New York, Wesley Inter Science, 1970.
39. Fremouw, William J. and M. G. Harmatz, "A Helper Model for Behavioral Treatment of Speech Anxiety," Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 43 (October, 1975), 652-660.
40. Greene, John O. and Glenn G. Sparks, "The Roles of Outcome Expectations in the Experiences of a State of Communication Apprehension," Communication Quarterly, 31 (Summer, 1983), 212-219.
41. Hersch, Paul D. and Karl E. Scheibe, "On the Reliability and Validity of Internal-External Control as a Personality Dimensions," Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 31 (December, 1967), 609-614.
42. Hjelle, L. A., "Relationship of Social Interest to Internal-External Control and Self-Actualization in Young Women," Journal of Individual Psychology, 31 (May, 1975), 171-174.
43. Johnson, J. and I. Sarason, "Moderator Variables in Life Stress Research," in Stress and Anxiety, edited by I. Sarason and C. Spielberger, Washington, D.C., Hemisphere Publishing Company, 1979, pp. 222-305.

44. Kaplan, H. B., "An Evaluation of Social Interest Measures and their Relationship to Cooperative Behavior," unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Georgia, Athens, Georgia, 1976.
45. Lam, Y. L. J., "Relationships between Anxiety and Classroom Behaviors of Adults Learners," Journal of Educational Psychology, 51 (April, 1981), 90-96.
46. Leak, G. K., "Two Social Interest Measures and Social Desirability Response Sets," Journal of Individual Psychology, 38 (May, 1982), 42-46.
47. Lefcourt, Herbert M., "Belief in Personal Control: Research and Implication," Journal of Individual Psychology, 22 (May, 1966), 185-193.
48. Lustig, Myron W., "Verbal Reticence: A Reconceptualization and Scale Development," unpublished paper presented at the Convention of the Speech Communication Association, Chicago, Illinois, 1974.
49. Maccoby, Eleanor E. and Carol N. Jacklin, The Psychology of Sex Differences, Stanford, Stanford University Press, 1974.
50. Marsella, Anthony J. and Alan L. Yang, "Personality Research: Anxiety, Aggression and Locus of Control," in Personality Theories, Research, and Assessment, edited by Raymond J. Corsini and Anthony J. Marsella, Illinois, F. E. Peacock Publishers, Inc., 1983, pp. 635-669.
51. McCroskey, James C., "Measure of Communication-Bound Anxiety," Speech Monograph, 37 (November, 1970), 269-277.
52. _____, "Classroom Consequences of Communication Apprehension," Communication Education, 26 (January, 1977), 27-33.
53. _____, "Validity of the PRCA as an Index of Oral Communication Apprehension," Communication Monograph, 45 (August, 1978), 192-203.
54. _____, "Oral Communication Apprehension: Reconceptualization and a New Look Measurement," in Communication Yearbook 6, edited by Michael Burgoon, California, Sage, 1982, pp. 1-28.

55. McCroskey, James C. and Janis F. Anderson, "The Relationship between Communication Apprehension and Academic Achievement among College Students," Human Communication Research, 3 (Fall, 1976), 73-81.
56. McCroskey, James C., John A. Daly and Gail A. Sorensen, "Personality Correlations of Communication Apprehension," Human Communication Research, 2 (Summer, 1976), 376-380.
57. McCroskey James C. and Michale E. Sheahan, "Seating Position and Participation: An Alternative Theoretical Explanation," unpublished paper presented at the International Communication Association, Portland, Oregon, 1976.
58. McCroskey, James C. and Virginia P. Richmond, "The Effects of Communication Apprehension on the Perception of Peers," Western Speech Communication, 40 (Winter, 1976), 14-21.
59. McCroskey, James C., Timothy J. Simpson and Virginia P. Richmond, "Biological Sex and Communication Apprehension," Communication Quarterly, 30 (Spring, 1982), 129-133.
60. McCroskey, James C. and Michael J. Beatty, "Communication Apprehension and Accumulated Communication State Anxiety Experiences: A Research Note," Communication Monograph, 51 (March, 1984), 79-83.
61. McCroskey, James C., John M. Fyer and Virginia P. Richmond, "Don't Speak to me in English: Communication Apprehension in Puerto Rico," Communication Quarterly, 33 (Summer, 1985), 185-192.
62. McCroskey, James C., Michael J. Beatty, Patricia Kearney and Timothy G. Plax, "The Content Validity of the PRCA-24 as a Measure of Communication Apprehension across Communication Contexts," Communication Quarterly, 33 (Summer, 1985), 165-173.
63. McGinnies, Elliott, Lena A. Nordholm, Charles D. Ward and D. Bhanthumnavin, "Sex and Cultural Differences in Perceived Locus of Control among Students in Five Countries , " Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 42 (June, 1974), 451-455.

64. Mehrabian, Albert, Silent Message, California, Wadsworth, 1971.
65. Mirels, Herbert L. "Dimensions of Internal versus External Control," Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 34 (June, 1970), 226-228.
66. Montgomery, Barbara M. and Robert W. Norton, "Sex Differences and Similarities in Communication Styles," Communication Monograph, 48 (June, 1981), 121-132.
67. Natale, Michael, "Effects of Induced Elation and Depression on Internal-External Locus of Control," Journal of Psychology, 100 (November, 1978), 315-320.
68. Nowichi, S., M. Duke and M. Crouch, "Sex Differences in Locus of Control and Performance under Competitive and Cooperative Conditions," Journal of Educational Psychology, 40 (May, 1973), 482-486.
69. Olson, Claudia D., "Social Interest in Specified Group of Community College Students," unpublished doctoral dissertation, North Texas State University, Denton, Texas, 1984.
70. Parsons, Oscar A. and John M. Schneider, "Locus of Control in University Students from Eastern and Western Societies," Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 42 (June, 1974), 456-461.
71. Phares, E. Jurry, Locus of Control in Personality, New Jersey, General Learning Press, 1976.
72. Phillips, Gerald M., "Reticence: Pathology of the Normal Speakers," Speech Monograph, 35 (March, 1968), 39-49.
73. Porter, D. Thomas, "The Effects of Communication Apprehension on Language Behavior," unpublished doctoral dissertation, Florida State University, Tallahassee, Florida, 1974.
74. _____, "An Empirical Appraisal of the PRCA for Meaning Oral Communication," Human Communication Research, 8 (Fall, 1981), 58-71.
75. Powers, Williams G., "The Rhetorical Interrogative: Anxiety or Control?" Human Communication Research, 4 (Fall, 1977), 44-47.

76. Quiggins, James G., "The Effects of High and Low Communication on Small Group Members Credibility, Interpersonal Attraction, and Interaction," unpublished paper presented at the Convention of the Speech Communication Association, Chicago, Illinois, 1972.
77. Redding, C. W., "The Psychogalvanometer as a Laboratory in the Basic Courses in Speech," unpublished master's degree thesis, University of Denver, Denver, Colorado, 1936.
78. Rotter, Julian B., Social Learning and Clinical Psychology, New Jersey, Prentice Hall, 1954.
79. _____, "Generalized Expectancies for Internal versus External Control of Reinforcement," Psychological Monograph, 80 (May, 1966), whole No. 609.
80. Rotter Julian B., Jane E. Chance and E. Jerry Phares, Applications of a Social Learning Theory of Personality, New York, Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1972.
81. Rotter Julian B., "Some Problems and Misconceptions Related to the Construct of Internal versus External Control of Reinforcement," Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 43 (February, 1975), 56-67.
82. Scott, Michael D., Michael P. Yates and Lawrence R. Wheeless, "An Exploratory Investigation of the Effects of Communication Apprehension in Alternate Systems of Instruction," unpublished paper presented at the International Communication Association, Chicago, Illinois, 1975.
83. Scott, Michael D. and Lawrence R. Wheeless, "An Exploratory Investigation of Three Types of Communication Apprehension on Students Achievement," unpublished paper presented at the Convention of the Speech Communication Association, San Francisco, California, 1976.
84. Spielberger, Charles D. "The Effects of Manifest Anxiety on the Academic Achievement of College Students," Mental Hygiene, 46 (May, 1962), 420-426.

85. Stevich, R. A., P. N. Dixon, W. K. Willingham and K. Welborn, "Locus of Control and Behavior versus Self-Response Measures of Social Interest," Journal of Individual Psychology, 36 (May, 1980), 183-190.
86. Sulliman, J. R., "The Development of a Scale for the Measurement of Social Interest," unpublished doctoral dissertation, Florida State University, Tallahassee, Florida, 1973.
87. Sweeny, T. J., Adlerian Counseling: Proven Concepts and Strategies, Indiana, Accelerated Development Inc., 1981.
88. Weiner, Allen N., "Machiavellianism as a Predictor of Group Interaction and Cohesion," unpublished master's degree thesis, West Virginia University, Morgantown, West Virginia, 1973.
89. Wheeless, Lawrence R., Keith V. Erickson and Jackie Segars Behrens, "Cultural Differences in Disclosiveness as a Function of Locus of Control," Communication Monograph, 53 (March, 1986), 36-45.
90. Zakahi, Walter R. and Robert L. Duran, "Loneliness, Communicative Competence and Communication Apprehension: Extension and Replication," Communication Quarterly, 33 (Winter, 1985), 50-60.
91. Zarski, John J., John D. West and Donald L. Bubenzer, "A Factor Analysis of the Social Interest Index-Revised," Journal of Clinical Psychology, 39 (March, 1983), 90-94.
92. Zimbardo, Philip G., Shyness: Reading, Massachusetts, Addison-Wesley, 1977.

CHAPTER III

PROCEDURES FOR COLLECTION OF DATA

This study was designed to determine the relationships among English oral communication, social interest, and locus of control of Far Eastern students, and to examine whether differences exist in these variables, compared to gender, age, academic classification, major field of study, employment status, and length of study in the United States.

Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient was used to determine the relationships among the generalized-context total score and the four context scores on the APRCA-24, and the total scores on the SIS and I-E scale. For the latter purpose after categorizing the Far Eastern students according to the selected independent variables, their scores on each scale were compared by using one-way analysis of variance.

Description of the Instruments

Four instruments were used in the study: a demographic questionnaire, the Adapted Personal Report of Communication Apprehension-24 (APRCA-24), the Social Interest Scale (SIS), and the Rotter's Internal-External (I-E) Scale. The demographic questionnaire asked the student gender, age,

academic classification, major field of study, employment status, length of study in the United States, and native country.

The second instrument was adapted from the Personal Report of Communication Apprehension-24 (PRCA-24) (13) by filling the word "in English" after the word "communication" in the directions (Appendix C), as suggested by McCroskey, Fyer and Richmond (14) in their studies on Puerto Rican students. The PRCA-24 contains 24 items on a five point Likert-type scale ranging from "strongly agree" to "strongly disagree." It identifies four communication contexts which provide a representative cross-section of all communication contexts. The four contexts are: public speaking, meetings or classes, group discussions, and dyadic interactions. An equal number of items to reflect each of those contexts was chosen from a large pretested sample. Factor analysis was used to confirm expected dimensionality. The total scores on the PRCA-24 may range from twenty-four to 120. Within each context the subscores may range from six to thirty.

The PRCA-24 was normed on three independent samples. The numbers of subjects totalled 12,418 for sample one, 2131 for sample two and 10,133 for sample three. The three samples yielded a mean of 65.5 and standard deviation of 15.3 for the overall scale. Subjects who scored 50.3 or below were identified as low communication apprehension, and

scores of 80.9 or above indicated high communication apprehension. The public speaking subjects yielded a mean of 19.3 and standard deviation of 5.1. Subjects who scored 23.4 or above were considered high communication apprehensive in public speaking situations; and subjects who scored 14.2 or below were considered as low communication apprehensive in public speaking context. A mean of 16.4 and a standard deviation of 4.8 were recorded for the meetings or classes sub-test. Scores of 21.2 or above indicated high communication apprehensiveness in a meeting or class communication context, and scores of 11.6 or below were considered to indicate low communication apprehensiveness in this context. In the small group discussion context, subscores yielded a mean of 15.4 and a standard deviation of 4.8. High communication apprehensive subjects scored 20.2 or higher on this sub-test; and low communication apprehensive subjects scored 10.6 or less on this sub-test.

For the dyadic sub-test a mean of 14.5 and a standard deviation of 4.5 were the best combined estimates. Scores of 18.7 or above on this sub-test indicated high communication apprehensiveness, and scores of 10.3 or below indicated low communication apprehensiveness within this context. Internal reliabilities for the PRCA-24 are $> .94$ for all samples and $> .75$ for all subtests (13). The use of the APRCA-24 in this study was based on the criteria of the original Personal Report of Communication Apprehension-24.

The third instrument used to measure the social interest of Far Eastern students was the Social Interest Scale (SIS). The SIS is short, self-administered measure that was designed for group research rather than individual diagnosis (11). The SIS contains twenty-four pairs of traits, one trait in each pair being related to social interest. The subjects are asked to make choices as to which of the two traits in each pair they would rather possess, and indicate their choice with a 1 or 2. Of the twenty-four pairs of traits, nine are "buffer" pairs that are not scored. Scores consist of the number of social interest traits an individual chooses, and may range from 0 to 15, 0 to 6 indicating low social interest, and eleven to fifteen indicating high social interest (3).

In designing and developing the SIS, Crandall (4) focused on the operational definition of social interest as interest in and concern for others. Based on his operational definition of social interest, Crandall expected SIS scores to be positively associated with empathy, cooperation, and altruistic behavior and to be negatively related to hostility and anti-social behaviors. Initially, he chose ninety words based on their general desirability rating and apparent differing degrees of relevance for social interest. Each trait was rated by experts on a seven point scale ranging from no direct implications to strong

implications for social feeling or behavior and forty-eight pairs of traits were formed. Each pair of words equated the general desirability of the two traits and maximized the difference in the word's relevance to social interest. An item analysis of the forty-eight pairs resulted in a 15-item scale. Nine "buffer" pairs that lessen the possibility that the respondent of the SIS will guess the intent of the scale are also included but are not scored.

Crandall indicated SIS scores in relation to normative data available on various groups. Means based on data obtained from 213 high school and college students, indicated a mean of 8.43 with a standard deviation of 3.57. Dividing data into two groups, the male mean was 8.00 and the female mean was 8.91 with a standard deviation of 3.83 and 3.21 respectively. No significant difference was found between the scores of university and high school students (11).

To establish reliability on the SIS, Crandall (11) used four sample groups. Two groups consisted of volunteers from college introductory psychology classes, a third group from high school psychology classes, and a fourth group from upper division psychology courses. The split-half reliability for the first three groups, using the Spearman Brown Formula, was .77. Test-retest reliability over a five-week period involving the fourth group, was .82 ($N = 37$)

The SIS has been validated against a variety of criteria because the construct of social interest has no single criterion (3). Crandall reported twenty-two validity studies, using mostly University of Idaho student samples with sizes from 45 to 223. These students indicated the SIS scores negatively correlated in the expected direction with measures of criminal or anti-social behavior ($p < .02$), of self-centeredness ($p < .01$) and of depression and hostility ($p < .05$) (25, 33), and positively correlated in the expected direction with measures of empathy ($P < .005$), of cooperation ($p < .01$), of altruistic behavior ($p < .05$), and of adjustment ($p < .001$) (5).

The fourth instrument used in this study was the Internal-External (I-E) Scale, developed by Rotter (16). It is a 29-item, forced-choice test including six filler items intended to make more ambiguous the purpose of the test (16). Each item has two statements, one designed an "internal" choice, and the other denoting an "external" response. The score is the total number of external choices. A high score, therefore, suggests externality. The scores may range from 0 to 23, with a score of 11 or less indicating an internal locus of control, and a score of 12 or more indicating an external locus of control. The scale measures whether the individual believes that reinforcements are beyond the individual's control or believes

that the person controls much of what happens to the particular individual. People who believe their lives are controlled by outside forces beyond their control are named externals. Those who see their own personal locus of control as inside themselves are viewed as internals (7).

Rotter (16) reported internal consistency of .73 for elementary psychology students at Ohio State University with an equal number of males and females, and .69 in a study using 100 tenth, eleventh, and twelfth graders. On three different sample populations, Rotter reported test-retest reliability coefficients of .78 and .72 for one month period. The 23-item measure had a split-half reliability of .65 (17).

In an analysis of construct validation, the literature dealing with convergent validity indicates there are individual differences in perception about one's control over one's destiny and that the Rotter scale is sensitive to those differences (11). For discriminant validity, Rotter reported that correlations with the Marlowe Crowne Social Desirability Scale range from -.07 to -.35. In addition, correlations with Edward's Social Desirability Scales have been found to range between .23 to -.70. Hersch and Scheibe (19) found non-significant correlations between I-E scale total score and three different measures of intelligence.

The use of the APRCA-24 and I-E scale in this study was based on the validity and reliability, obtained from the cross-cultural research studies, using these two instruments. McCroskey, Fyer, and Richmond (17), in their study on Puerto Rican students using the PRCA-24 reported reliability of > .90 for all subtests. Parsons and Schneider (15) and Wheless, Erickson and Behrens (17) reported the I-E scale internal consistency of .76 and .65 for university students from Eastern societies.

For the SIS, a nonsignificant association was indicated between social interest as measured by the SIS and ethnicity, socioeconomic status, and gender (3). This finding lends supports to Adler's concepts of universality of social interest. The SIS which was developed basically on numerous measures of relevant aspects of Adler's concept of social interest (3), therefore, can also be used across cultures.

Description of the Population

The population for this study was 917 Far Eastern students who speak English as a second or foreign language, including Chinese, Japanese, Hong Kong, Korean, Taiwan, Indonesian, Malaysian, Philippino, Singaporean, Thai, and Vietnamese students. They were enrolled at North Texas State University in the fall semester of 1986. The selection of this population was based on criteria commonly used in cross-cultural research. These international

students have similarities in regard to human nature orientation, human relationships to nature (supernature) orientation, time orientation, activity orientation, and interpersonal relationships orientation (12, 17).

Procedures for Collection of Data

Names, address labels, and telephone numbers of the 917 Far Eastern students enrolled at North Texas State University in the fall semester of 1986 were obtained from the Registrar's Office of North Texas State University through the International Programs Office. Out of a total population of 917, 240 Far Eastern students were randomly selected (every three students listed) to receive the questionnaires. The selection of this sample was based on the criteria suggested by Borg and Gall (2) and Gay (9). For survey research there should be at least 20 to 50 in each minor subgroup. In the population of this size, the minimum of the desired sample size recommended by experts in this field is 25 per cent.

The questionnaires including a cover letter to each Far Eastern student (Appendix A), a demographic questionnaire (Appendix B), the APRCA-24 (Appendix C), the SIS (Appendix E), the I-E scale (Appendix F) and a stamped return envelope were mailed to the sample under study. To help each respondent cooperate and feel positively regarded, the cover letter to Far Eastern students communicated that each person

was a part of a carefully selected sample, and the response of the individual was important to international students and to the success of the study. Two weeks following the mailing of the questionnaire, a follow-up letter, a copy of the questionnaire and a stamped return envelope were sent to encourage nonrespondents to return the questionnaire (Appendix G).

Two weeks following the follow-up letter, a second appeal using a postcard follow-up (Appendix H) was repeated to all nonrespondents. For this study, a 70 per cent return of questionnaires and at least twenty subjects in each minor sub-group are considered very good in that they provide sufficient data for analysis (1,2). To ensure as high a percentage of return as possible, after a period of one week, the third appeal was repeated to nonrespondents by using telephone calls and personal contacts. At the time of this third appeal, a total of 176 questionnaires was returned, only 171 (71.3 per cent) of the original sample of 240 questionnaires were completed sufficiently for analyses used in this study. As shown in Table I, students from eleven countries participated in the study.

TABLE I
STUDENT RESPONDENTS BY NATIVE COUNTRY

Country	Number	Percentage
Republic of China (Taiwan)	48	28.0
Thailand	45	26.3
Malaysia	26	15.1
South Korea	20	11.6
Peoples Republic of China	14	8.1
Singapore	6	3.5
Japan	5	2.9
Hong kong	4	2.3
Indonesia	2	1.2
Philippines	1	.5
Vietnam	1	.5
Total	171	100.0

Procedures for Analysis of Data

Responses to the demographic questionnaire, APRCA-24, SIS, and the I-E scale were coded and processed at the Computing Center at North Texas State University. Methods of descriptive statistics which include means and standard deviations were used to describe English oral communication

apprehension, social interest, and locus of control of Far Eastern students, compared to gender, age, academic classification, major field of study, employment status, and length of study in the United States. Quartile deviations (8) were used to categorize ranges of age and length of study in the United States of the students. Hypotheses 1 through 3 were tested by using the Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient. The tenability of each hypothesis was tested at the .01 level of significance. In addition to being tested at the .01 level of significance, the distribution of t (t-test) (8) was used.

For hypothesis 4, one-way analysis of variance was used to determine significant differences between or among the sub-groups under study. When the test results were found to be significant at the .05 level or greater, the Scheffé' multiple comparisons were utilized. The computations for the testing of the hypotheses were made through the use of the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) at the Computing Center at North Texas State University.

CHAPTER BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Babbie, E. R., Survey Research Methods, California, Wadsworth, 1973.
2. Borg, Walter R. and Meredith D. Gall, Educational Research: An Introduction, New York, Longman, 1979.
3. Crandall, James E., "A Scale for Social Interest," Journal of Individual Psychology, 31 (November, 1975), 187-195.
4. _____, "Further Validation of the Social Interest Scale: Peer Ratings and Interpersonal Attraction," Journal of Clinical Psychology, 33 (January, 1977), 140-142.
5. Crandall, James E. and M. D. Harris, "Social Interest, Cooperation, and Altruism," Journal of Individual Psychology, 32 (May, 1976), 50-54.
6. Crandall, James E. and Gunars Reimanis, "Social Interest and Time Orientation, Childhood Memories, Adjustment and Crime," Journal of Individual Psychology, 32 (November, 1976), 203-211.
7. Eisenberg, Sheldon, "Understanding and Building Self-Esteem," in Helping Clients with Special Concerns, edited by Sheldon Eisenberg and Lewis E. Patterson, Boston, Houghton Mifflin Company, 1979, pp. 11-34.
8. Ferguson, George A., Statistical Analysis in Psychology and Education, New York, McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1981.
9. Gay, L. R., Educational Research: Competencies for Analysis and Application, Ohio, Charles E. Merrill Publishing Company, 1981.
10. Hersch, Paul D. and Karl E. Scheibe, "On the Reliability and Validity of Internal-External Control as a Personality Dimensions," Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 31 (December, 1967), 609-614.

11. Lefcourt, Herbert M., "Belief in Personal Control: Research and Implication," Journal of Individual Psychology, 22 (May, 1966), 185-193.
12. Marsella, Anthony J. and Alan L. Yang, "Personality Research: Anxiety, Aggression and Locus of Control," in Personality Theories, Research, and Assessment, edited by Raymond J. Corsini and Anthony J. Marsella, Illinois, F. E. Peacock Publishers, Inc., 1983, pp. 635-669.
13. McCroskey, James C., "Oral Communication Apprehension: Reconceptualization and a New Look Measurement," in Communication Yearbook 6, edited by Michael Burgoon, California, Sage, 1982, pp. 1-28.
14. McCroskey, James C., John M. Fyer and Virginia P. Richmond, "Don't Speak to Me in English: Communication Apprehension in Puerto Rico," Communication Quarterly, 33 (Summer, 1985), 185-192.
15. Parsons, Oscar A. and John M. Schneider, "Locus of Control in University Students from Eastern and Western Societies," Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 42 (June, 1974), 456-461.
16. Rotter, Julian B., "Generalized Expectancies for Internal versus External Control of Reinforcement," Psychological Monograph, 80 (May, 1966), whole No. 609.
17. Wheeless, Lawrence R., Keith V. Erickson and Jackie Segars Behrens, "Cultural Differences in Disclosiveness as a Function of Locus of Control," Communication Monograph, 53 (March, 1986), 36-45.

CHAPTER IV

PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF DATA

This study determined the relationships among English oral communication apprehension, social interest, and locus of control of Far Eastern students, and examined whether differences exist between and among sub-group mean scores of these variables, compared to gender, age, academic classification, major field of study, employment status, and length of study in the United States. To determine the relationships among English oral communication apprehension, social interest, and locus of control, as stated in Hypotheses 1 through 3, means and standard deviations on the APRCA-24, SIS and I-E scale were computed (Appendix I). Pearson product-moment correlation coefficients were used to test the three hypotheses at the .01 level of significance.

For the purpose of examining the differences among or between mean scores obtained from the three scales as stated in Hypothesis 4, sub-group mean scores and standard deviations, compared to gender, age, academic classification, major field of study, employment status, and length of study in the United States, were also computed (Appendix I). One-way analysis of variance was used to analyze the data. When a significant difference between and

among means existed at the .05 level or greater, Scheffé' multiple comparisons were used to determine where the differences were.

Demographic Characteristics and Number of Students in Sub-Groups

The demographic characteristics of respondents were analyzed using frequencies. Eighty respondents were in the male group and ninety-one were in the female group. Quartile deviations were conducted to categorize the ranges of age. Based on the quartile deviation procedure, the ages of the participants, which ranged from twenty to forty-nine, were categorized into four groups. Respondents younger than twenty-four years were placed in group one; from twenty-four to twenty-seven years, in group two, twenty-seven to thirty-one years, in group three; and those over thirty-one in group four.

The academic classification was designated as undergraduate and graduate students. Twenty-nine respondents were in the undergraduate classification and 142 were in the graduate classification. Major fields of study in which the subjects enrolled in the fall semester of 1986 were education, arts and sciences, business, music, home economics, and library and information sciences. The categorization, based on the schools and colleges at North Texas State University, placed thirty respondents in

education, seventy-six in arts and sciences, and forty-four in business. There were ten, six and five students whose majors were in music, home economics, and library and information sciences, respectively. Since each of the last three major fields of study did not provide sufficient number of students required for data analysis, the "others" category which included all of these major fields was used in this study.

Employment status was designated as employed and unemployed. These categories represented the working status of Far Eastern students during their study in the United States. Employed students worked full or part-time on or off campus. Unemployed students did not work on and off campus. They enrolled as full time students and maintained a full course of studies. Based on this categorization, ninety-five respondents were placed in the employed group and seventy-six were placed in the unemployed group.

A quartile deviation categorized the length of study in the United States of the respondents which ranged from four months to ten years into less-than-one-year, one-to-two-year, two-to-three-and-a-half-year, and over-three-and-a-half-year groups. The categorization placed thirty-nine respondents in group one; forty-seven, in group two, forty-two, in group three; and forty-three, in group four. The demographic characteristics and number of students in sub-groups are shown in Table II.

TABLE II
DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS AND NUMBER OF
STUDENTS IN SUB-GROUPS

Characteristics	Number
Gender	
Male	80
Female	91
Age in years	
Less than 24	42
24-27	46
27-31	42
Over 31	41
Academic classification	
Undergraduate	29
Graduate	142
Major field of study	
Education	30
Arts and Sciences	76
Business	44
Others	21
Employment status	
Employed	95
Unemployed	76
Length of study in the United States	
Less than one year	39
1-2	47
2-3 1/2	42
Over 3 1/2	43
Total	171

Testing of Hypotheses

Research Hypotheses 1 through 3

Hypotheses 1 through 3 were tested using Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient. It is stated in hypotheses 1 through 3 that there will be significant relationships among English oral communication apprehension, social interest, and external locus of control of Far Eastern students. Correlation coefficients of these variables are presented in Table III.

TABLE III

CORRELATION MATRIX FOR ENGLISH ORAL COMMUNICATION APPREHENSION, SOCIAL INTEREST, AND LOCUS OF CONTROL OF FAR EASTERN STUDENTS
(N=171)

Variables	Social Interest (r)	Locus of Control (r)
General English Oral Communication Apprehension	.129	.218**
Group	.063	.215**
Class	.095	.154
Dyadic	.072	.207**
Public	.172	.081
Social Interest069

**p < .01

As shown in Table III, a statistically significant relationship is found by using Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient only between English oral communication apprehension and external locus of control of Far Eastern students. The relationship between the scores of English oral communication apprehension in every context and social interest is not found at the .01 level of significance. Hypothesis 1, which stated that there will be a significant negative relationship between English oral communication apprehension and social interest of Far Eastern students, is, therefore, rejected. Hypothesis 2, which stated that there will be a significant positive relationship between English oral communication apprehension and external locus of control of Far Eastern students, is accepted because the result shows that there is a positive relationship at the .01 level of significance between general English oral communication apprehension and external locus of control.

Hypothesis 3 stated that there will be a significant negative relationship between social interest and external locus of control of Far Eastern students. As shown in Table III, a coefficient of .07 is found. An examination of the result indicates that there is not a negative relationship at the .01 level of significance. Hypothesis 3 is rejected.

An examination of the relationships among the four context scores of English oral communication apprehension and external locus of control indicates positive relationships at the .01 level of significance between group discussion context and external locus of control, and between dyadic interaction context and external locus of control. Hypothesis 2, focusing on the relationships between group discussion context and external locus of control, and between dyadic interaction context and external locus of control, is accepted.

Research Hypothesis 4

To examine whether differences exist between or among sub-group mean scores of English oral communication apprehension, social interest, and external locus of control of Far Eastern students, compared to gender, age, academic classification, major field of study, employment status, and length of study in the United States, one-way analyses of variance were performed. The one-way analysis of variance assumes that scores in each of the groups are homogeneous in variance. When groups are not equal in number, this assumption must be tested (8). A test of homogeneity using Cochran's C was performed before testing each hypothesis. In addition, a Scheffé multiple comparison was used to determine the nature of the significant relationship when a significant difference between or among means existed.

It is stated in Hypothesis 4 that there will be significant differences in English oral communication apprehension, social interest, and locus of control of Far Eastern students, compared to gender, age, academic classification, major field of study, employment status, and length of study in the United States. The results of one-way analyses of variance and Scheffé' multiple comparisons performed with the mean scores on the APRCA-24, SIS, and I-E scale as dependent variables, and gender, age, academic classification, major field of study, employment status, and length of study in the United States as independent variables, are summarized in Tables IV through XVII.

The differences between means on the APRCA-24, SIS, and I-E scale in relationship to gender are presented in Table IV. Since gender groups were not equal in number; eighty respondents were in the male group and ninety-one in the female group; a test of homogeneity using Cochran's C was performed before the one-way analysis of variance was employed. A test of homogeneity indicates homogeneity of variance ($C = .5931 - .5125$, $p = .084 - .819$); therefore, transformation of scores is not necessary.

TABLE IV
DIFFERENCES BETWEEN MEANS ON THE APRCA-24, SIS, AND
I-E SCALE IN RELATIONSHIP TO GENDER

Variable	Gender		F	P
	Male	Female		
General English Oral Communication Apprehension	71.7	73.3	.677	.411
Group	17.3	18.3	2.064	.152
Class	18.1	18.2	.060	.807
Dyadic	17.1	17.4	.369	.544
Public	18.9	19.5	.857	.356
Social Interest	9.1	8.6	1.715	.192
External Locus of Control	10.6	10.9	.407	.524

An examination of the results presented in Table IV indicates that no significant difference is found between means of male and female students in every scale score. Hypothesis 4, focusing on the difference between means on the APRCA-24, SIS, and I-E scale, compared to gender of Far Eastern students, is rejected.

The differences among means on the APRCA-24, SIS, and I-E scale in relationship to age are presented in Table V. For the purpose of one-way analysis of variance, age was

categorized into four groups. This categorization placed forty-two participants in group one; forty-six, in group two; forty-two, in group three; and forty-one, in group four. The Cochran's C test was used to test for homogeneity of variance. A test of homogeneity reveals homogeneity of variance ($C = .3496-.2647$, $p = .091-.814$); therefore, the transformation of scores is not necessary.

TABLE V

DIFFERENCES AMONG MEANS ON THE APRCA-24, SIS, AND
I-E SCALE IN RELATIONSHIP TO AGE

Variable	Age				F	p
	< 24	24-27	27-31	> 31		
General English Oral Communication Apprehension	73.9	74.7	70.8	70.6	1.123	.341
Group	18.9	18.6	17.2	16.5	2.688	.048*
Class	18.6	18.7	17.8	17.7	.564	.639
Dyadic	17.3	17.5	16.9	17.2	.114	.952
Public	19.2	20.2	18.6	18.8	1.492	.218
Social Interest	8.2	9.6	8.2	9.2	2.739	.045*
External Locus of Control	10.7	11.0	10.3	10.9	.550	.644

*p < .05

An examination of the results presented in Table V indicates that no significant differences are found among

age means in the scores of general English oral communication apprehension, class context, dyadic interaction context, public speaking context, and external locus of control. Significant differences at the .05 level are found among age means in the scores of group discussion context and social interest.

An examination of the F ratio indicates that the differences among the age means existed overall in the scores of group discussion context and social interest. Scheffé' multiple comparisons and the underlining method of test reports (11) were used to determine where the differences were. The Scheffé' test is considered to be the most conservative procedure that will indicate a significant difference between means only when the means are far apart (10). The results of the Scheffé' test are summarized in Tables VI and VII.

TABLE VI

RESULTS OF SCHEFFE' MULTIPLE COMPARISON FOR AGE MEANS
ON THE APRCA-24 GROUP DISCUSSION CONTEXT

Age	Over 31	27-31	24-27	Less than 24
Number	41	42	46	42
Mean	16.5366	17.1667	18.6304	18.9048

An examination of the Scheffé' test data in Table VI does not indicate a statistically significant difference in group discussion context score between or among the four age means. Hypothesis 4, focusing on the differences among age means in the group discussion context score is, therefore, rejected.

TABLE VII
RESULTS OF SCHEFFÉ' MULTIPLE COMPARISON FOR AGE MEANS ON THE SIS

Age	Less than 24	27-31	Over 31	24-27
Number	42	42	41	46
Mean	8.2381	8.2381	9.1707	9.6304

An examination of the Scheffé' test data in Table VII does not indicate a statistically significant difference in social interest score between or among the four age means. Hypothesis 4, focusing on the differences among age means in the social interest score, is also rejected.

The differences between means on the APRCA-24, SIS, and I-E scale in relationship to academic classification are presented in Table VIII. Twenty-nine respondents were in the undergraduate group and 142, were in the graduate group. The use of Cochran's C test before using one-way analysis of

variance reveals homogeneity of variance ($C = .5854-.5013$, $p = .097-.981$); therefore, the transformation of scores is not necessary.

TABLE VIII

DIFFERENCES BETWEEN MEANS ON THE APRCA-24, SIS, AND I-E SCALE IN RELATIONSHIP TO ACADEMIC CLASSIFICATION

Variable	Academic Classification		F	p
	Undergraduate	Graduate		
General English Oral Communication Apprehension	77.7	71.5	5.344	.022*
Group	19.6	17.5	4.990	.026*
Class	19.2	18.0	1.782	.183
Dyadic	18.5	17.0	2.978	.086
Public	20.5	19.0	3.847	.051
Social Interest	8.3	8.9	1.376	.242
External Locus of Control	10.8	10.7	.010	.920

* $p < .05$

An examination of the results presented in Table VIII indicates that significant differences at better than the .05 level are found between means of academic classification in the scores of general English oral communication apprehension and group discussion context. No significant differences are found in the scores of class context, dyadic

interaction context, public speaking context, social interest, and external locus of control.

An examination of the mean scores in Table VIII indicates that the undergraduate students show a higher level of English oral communication apprehension in general English oral communication and group discussion context than the graduate students. Hypothesis 4, focusing on the difference between means of academic classification in the scores of general English oral communication apprehension and group discussion context is, therefore, accepted.

TABLE IX
DIFFERENCES AMONG MEANS ON THE APRCA-24, SIS, AND I-E SCALE IN RELATIONSHIP TO MAJOR FIELD OF STUDY

Variable	Major Field of Study				F	p
	Education	Arts & Science	Business	Others		
General English Oral Communication Apprehension	69.3	73.5	70.9	78.4	1.984	.118
Group	15.9	17.8	18.3	20.6	4.031	.008**
Class	17.2	18.4	17.8	19.9	1.632	.183
Dyadic	17.4	17.3	16.7	17.8	.336	.799
Public	19.0	19.7	18.2	20.1	1.760	.157
Social Interest	8.9	8.8	8.7	9.2	.119	.948
External Locus of Control	10.8	10.4	10.9	11.9	1.167	.324

**p < .01

The differences among means on the APRCA-24, SIS, and I-E scale in relationship to the major field of study are presented in Table IX. The categorization, based on the schools and colleges at North Texas State University, placed thirty respondents in education, seventy-six in arts and sciences, forty-four in business, and twenty-one in "others" categories. The use of Cochran's C test before using one-way analysis of variance reveals homogeneity of variance ($C = .3508-.2686$, $p = .086-1.000$); therefore, the transformation of scores is not necessary.

An examination of the results presented in Table IX indicates that no significant differences are found among group means of major field of study in the scores of general English oral communication apprehension, class context, dyadic interaction context, public speaking context, social interest, and external locus of control. A significant difference at better than the .01 level is found among means in the group discussion context score. Therefore, Hypothesis 4, focusing on the difference among means of major field of study in the group discussion context score, is accepted.

An examination of the F ratio indicates a difference among the means of major field of study for the group discussion context. A Scheffe' multiple comparison test was used to determine where the differences were. The results of the Scheffe test are summarized in Table X.

TABLE X
RESULTS OF SCHEFFE' MULTIPLE COMPARISON FOR
MAJOR FIELDS OF STUDY ON THE GROUP
DISCUSSION CONTEXT

Major field of study	Education	Arts & sciences	Business	Others
Number	30	76	44	21
Mean	15.9333	17.7531	18.2727	20.6250

An examination of the Scheffe' test data indicates that the mean score of the students majored in "others" category, which included music, home economics, and library and information sciences, differs significantly from those of the students in education, arts and sciences, and business at the .05 level. The students in "others" category indicate more apprehension in group discussion context than the other three groups.

The differences between means on the APRCA-24, SIS, and I-E scale in relationship to employment status are presented in Table XI. Ninety-five respondents were employed and seventy-six were unemployed. The Cochran's C test reveals homogeneity of variance ($C = .5739-.5231$, $p = .671-.172$); therefore, the transformation of scores is not necessary.

TABLE XI

DIFFERENCES BETWEEN MEANS ON THE APRCA-24, SIS, AND I-E SCALE IN RELATIONSHIP TO EMPLOYMENT STATUS

Variables	Employment Status		F	P
	Employed	Unemployed		
General English Oral Communication Apprehension	70.3	75.4	6.442	.012*
Group	17.4	18.4	2.036	.155
Class	17.4	19.3	8.459	.004**
Dyadic	16.6	18.0	4.479	.033*
Public	18.9	19.6	1.485	.224
Social Interest	9.1	8.5	1.513	.220
External Locus of Control	10.8	10.7	.052	.819

*p < .05

**p < .01

An examination of the results presented in Table XI indicates that significant differences are found between means of employment status at better than the .05 level in the scores of general English oral communication apprehension and dyadic interaction context, and at better than the .01 level in class context score. No significant differences are found between means of employment status in the scores of group discussion context, public speaking context, social interest, and external locus of control.

An examination of the mean scores in Table XI indicates that the unemployed students show higher levels of apprehension in general English oral communication and the contexts of classes or meetings, and dyadic interactions than the employed students. Hypothesis 4, focusing on the differences between means in the scores of general English oral communication apprehension, class or meeting context, and dyadic interaction context, is accepted.

TABLE XII

DIFFERENCES AMONG MEANS ON THE APRCA-24, SIS, AND I-E SCALE IN RELATIONSHIP TO LENGTH OF STUDY
IN THE UNITED STATES

Variables	Length of Study				F	p
	Less than 1	1-2	2-3 1/2	Over 3 1/2		
General English Oral Communication Apprehension	80.0	71.8	69.9	69.0	6.563	<.001***
Group	20.1	17.5	17.5	16.4	5.575	.001***
Class	20.3	17.8	17.4	17.5	4.204	.006**
Dyadic	18.6	17.1	16.7	16.6	1.857	.138
Public	21.0	19.4	19.1	17.5	6.029	<.001***
Social Interest	9.4	8.7	8.4	8.9	1.052	.371
External Locus of Control	11.6	11.4	10.4	9.7	3.995	.008**

**p < .01

***p < .001

The differences among means on the APRCA-24, SIS, and I-E scale in relationship to length of study in the United States are presented in Table XII. The categorization using quartile deviation placed thirty-nine participants in group one, forty-seven in group two, forty-two in group three, and forty-three in group four. The use of the Cochran's C test before using one-way analysis of variance reveals homogeneity of variance ($C = .3512-.2990$, $p = .084-.600$); therefore, the transformation of scores is not necessary.

An examination of the results in Table XII indicates that significant differences are found among means of length of study in the United States at better than the .001 level in the scores of general English oral communication apprehension and public speaking context, and at .001 level in the score of group discussion context. The significant differences at better than the .01 level are found in the scores of class context and external locus of control. No significant differences are found among means in the scores of dyadic interaction context and social interest.

Hypothesis 4, focusing on the differences among means of length of study in the United States in the scores of general English oral communication apprehension, group discussion context, class context, public speaking context, and external locus of control is, therefore, accepted.

An examination of the F ratio indicates the differences among the means existed overall for the scores of general English oral communication apprehension, group discussion context, class context, public speaking context, and external locus of control. Scheffé' multiple comparisons were used to determine where the differences were. The results of the Scheffé' test are summarized in Tables XIII through XVII.

TABLE XIII
RESULTS OF SCHEFFE' MULTIPLE COMPARISON FOR THE MEANS
OF LENGTH OF STUDY ON THE APRCA-24
GENERALIZED CONTEXT

Length of Study	Over 3 1/2	2-3 1/2	1-2	Less than 1
Number	39	47	42	43
Mean	68.9762	69.8837	71.8298	80.2308

An examination of the Scheffé' test data in Table XIII indicates that the less-than-one-year group differs significantly from the other three groups at the .05 level. The less-than-one-year group indicates more apprehension in general English oral communication than the other three groups.

TABLE XIV

RESULTS OF SCHEFFE' MULTIPLE COMPARISON FOR THE MEANS
 OF LENGTH OF STUDY ON THE APRCA-24
 GROUP DISCUSSION CONTEXT

Length of Study	Over 3 1/2	2-3 1/2	1-2	Less than 1
Number	43	42	47	39
Mean	16.3721	17.4762	17.5106	20.1308

An examination of the Scheffé test data in Table XIV indicates that the less-than-one-year group differs significantly from the other three groups at the .05 level. The less-than-one-year group indicates more apprehension in group discussion context than the other three groups.

TABLE XV

RESULTS OF SCHEFFE' MULTIPLE COMPARISON FOR MEANS
 OF LENGTH OF STUDY ON THE APRCA-24
 CLASS CONTEXT

Length of study	2-3 1/2	Over 3 1/2	1-2	Less than 1
Number	42	43	47	39
Mean	17.4048	17.5349	17.7842	20.2821

An examination of the Scheffe' test data in Table XV indicates that the less-than-one-year group differs significantly from the other three groups at the .05 level. The less-than-one-year group indicates more apprehension in class or meeting context than the other three groups.

TABLE XVI

RESULTS OF SCHEFFE' MULTIPLE COMPARISON FOR MEANS
OF LENGTH OF STUDY ON THE APRCA-24
PUBLIC SPEAKING CONTEXT

Length of study	Over 3 1/2	2-3 1/2	1-2	Less than 1
Number	42	43	47	39
Mean	17.4762	19.0930	19.4043	21.0256

An examination of the Scheffe' test data in Table XVI indicates that the less-than-one-year group differs significantly from the over-three-and-a-half-year group at the .05 level. The less-than-one-year group indicates more apprehension in public speaking context than the over-three-and-a-half-year group, but does not indicate more apprehension in this context than the other two groups.

TABLE XVII
RESULTS OF SCHEFFÉ MULTIPLE COMPARISON FOR MEANS
OF LENGTH OF STUDY ON THE I-E SCALE

Length of study	Over 3 1/2	2-3 1/2	1-2	Less than 1
Number	43	42	47	39
Mean	9.6774	10.3571	11.3830	11.5641

An examination of the Scheffé' test data in Table XVII indicates that the less-than-one-year group differs significantly from the over-three-and-a-half-year group at the .05 level. The less-than-one-year group indicates more external in locus of control than the over-three-and-a-half-year group, but does not indicate more external than the other two groups.

Discussion of Findings

The original motivation for carrying out this study was concerned with the poor English oral communication apprehension of international students and the possible basis for the malperformance in communication-related behaviors. It is clear from the overall results that the score of English oral communication apprehension in every context is not as high as the criterion score indicated by McCroskey (17) for

the high apprehensives, and the social interest mean score is as high as the mean score ($X = 8.43$) found by Crandall (7) in a study on normal American students. As a result, no negative significant relationship was found between English oral communication and social interest of Far Eastern students. This finding suggests that (1) the Far Eastern students do not have as serious problems in English oral communication apprehension and social interest as the investigator expected, and (2) English oral communication apprehension does not seem to be related to social interest of Far Eastern students. In addition, the social interest score of the students lends supports to Adler's concepts of universality of social interest. Adler asserted that social interest is a characteristic of all people, and a barometer of normality (1, 2, 3, 4).

Considering the relationship between English oral communication apprehension and external locus of control of the Far Eastern students, as stated in Hypothesis 2, the .01 level of significance was found in the scores of general English oral communication apprehension, group discussion context, and dyadic interaction context. These findings support the notion that the less control an individual perceives he has in determining his life outcomes, the more anxiety he exhibits (15). They also support the conclusions of Greene and Sparks (9) that externals usually have three

characteristics: (1) perception of low competence, (2) an inability to identify appropriate social behaviors, and (3) anticipation of negative outcomes to communication.

The correlation coefficients found in this study, however, were quite low ($r = .218, .215$ and $.207$ respectively). The mean scores of locus of control also indicated more internal ($X = 10.7$). These findings suggest that although significant relationships are found, the Far Eastern students have the tendency to have a more internal locus of control orientation and less apprehension in English oral communication. Thus, a conclusion that can be drawn from these findings is that the lower apprehension in English oral communication the students have, the less external or more internal in locus of control they are. This conclusion is relevant to Wheless, Erickson, and Behrens (25) who assumed that, given the realities of their international experiences and their time in the United States, the non-Western students were somewhat likely to be acculturated to more than one culture (and perhaps more Westernized) which would, in turn, affect their communication proclivities and locus of control. It is also consistent with their further finding (25) which indicated that these non-Western students were more internal in locus of control than American students.

Hypothesis 3 was concerned with the relationship between social interest and external locus of control of Far Eastern students. No significant negative relationship was found between these two variables. This finding did not support the findings of Stevich et al. (24) and Hjelle (10) which suggest that the relationship between social interest and locus of control exists in college students, and persons with high external locus of control have significantly less social interest. Further studies need to be conducted to investigate the relationship between these constructs.

Further analyses using one-way analysis of variance revealed no significant differences in this study in the levels of English oral communication apprehension, social interest, and external locus of control between male and female students. The finding that no significant difference was found between male and female students in the level of English oral communication apprehension was different from the previous studies. Maccoby and Jacklin (15) and Infante (13) found that female students tended to be more apprehensive in communication than males, especially in public speaking. Omar (21) and Payind (23) also found that females reported significantly more problems than males in English language, and in the sociopersonal areas of their experience. The finding of McCroskey, Simpson and Richmond (19), however, was the same as the result of this study that

male and female students did not differ meaningfully in terms of general oral communication apprehension. The finding of this study, therefore, suggests that the female students from the male-dominated cultures tend to be more westernized and "international" in orientation during their study in the United States which would, in turn, affect their English oral communication. Further studies, however, need to be conducted to examine this assumption and the finding of this study.

The finding that there was no significant difference between male and female students in the scores of social interest lends support to Crandall's assertion that the SIS is equally valid for males and females (6, 7), and seems to support Adler's belief once again that social interest is a characteristic of all people (1, 2, 3, 4). In the scores of external locus of control, the result that no significant difference existed between male and female students was contrary to the findings of Parsons and Schneider (22) and Nowichi, Duke and Crouch (20) that women tended to score more externally than men. The finding of this study also suggests that length of study in the United States, exposure to Western or international cultures, and social interactions affect the external locus of control of the female students in the same way as English oral communication.

Although the age variable produced a statistically significant difference at the .05 level for group discussion context, and social interest, Scheffé' multiple comparisons revealed no significant difference between or among age groups. Other studies (12, 21, 23) also produced unrelated findings. Age, therefore, does not appear to be a dependable variable as a predictor of English oral communication apprehension, social interest, and external locus of control of Far Eastern students. Length of study or stay in the United States, exposure to Western cultures, social interactions, and communication experiences should be considered as the more important effects on the sociopersonal characteristics of the students than age.

The variable of academic classification produced significant differences in general English oral communication apprehension and group discussion context. The undergraduate students showed higher levels of apprehension in these contexts than the graduate students. These findings are relevant to Payind's (23) study which found that graduate students experienced fewer problems concerning English oral communication than undergraduate students because graduate students have more written assignments, it is accepted that English can be improved with time (12), and it is easier to learn to speak than to write a language properly. English oral communication, especially, group

discussion, therefore, does not seem to be a significant problem for graduate students. Additionally, it is generally accepted that most undergraduate international students have fewer years of study in the United States and tend to have less experience in group discussions because of their traditional passive learning styles (5) than the graduate students. When they have to participate in group discussions, some of them who are apprehensive in communication tend to perceive themselves as being threatened by face-to-face contact and intimidated by superordinates (14). This experience may cause undergraduate students to be more insecure, inadequate and apprehensive in communication than graduate students, especially in group discussions. This significant problem with English of undergraduate Far Eastern students is not surprising.

The major field of study in which the students enrolled resulted in a significant difference for only group discussion apprehension of the students whose majors were in music, home economics, and library and information sciences. These students revealed more apprehension in group discussion context than the students whose majors were in education, arts and sciences, and business. This finding supported Omar's (21) study which found that faculty members of the School of Library and Information Sciences, the

School of Music, and the School of Home Economics perceived international students as having more problems in the English language than any other areas. It is possible that this finding could be related to academics or learning process but not to social or personal problem areas. Hull (12) found that the major field of study affected only the degree of involvement and participation of international students with American students and professors. The impact of this variable for some fields of study in which the students have fewer discussions in class, appears to be remarkable. It is generally accepted that the students who major in music, home economics, and library and information sciences, devote most of their time to laboratory practices and not in group discussions. They may have less degree of involvement and participation with other students and professors (12). Hull (12) indicated that only the international students whose majors were in arts and humanities had the most involvement and participation with American students and professors, and those in engineering and sciences most often reported academic cooperation with Americans.

In relation to employment status, the findings of this study indicated that unemployed students had more apprehension in general English oral communication, class, and dyadic interaction than the employed students. Focusing on

the apprehension about English oral communication in each context of the unemployed students, the results are consistent with McCroskey's (17) findings that the person who possesses a high level of communication apprehension will avoid personal contact as well as encounter in small and large group communication settings. The low communication apprehensive individual is usually perceived as outgoing, friendly, sociable, and willing to communicate in most contexts. These findings also supported Dreikurs(8) who assumed that to be successful in life, a person must enjoy participating and working with others, and find satisfying the experience of being a part of something larger than the self. Dreikurs considered work the most important of tasks for the maintenance of life (6). It is reasonable to assume that employed students had more exposure to Western culture, communication experience or social network, and social confirmation (26) than the unemployed students. Omar (21) found that these students had fewer problems with the English language. Wheeless, Erickson and Behrens (25) also found that international experience and cultural interactions had significant impact on English communication of international students. It seems a logical assumption that such experiences would benefit Far Eastern students in many obvious ways, especially, in English oral communication in classes and interpersonal interactions.

Perceptions of English oral communication apprehension and external locus of control by Far Eastern students in relation to length of study in the United States produced five significant differences. The mean scores indicated directional and incremental in degree of English oral communication apprehension and external locus of control. The less-than-one-year group indicated more apprehension in general English oral communication, group discussion context, and class or meeting context than the one-to-two-year, two-to-three-and-a-half-year, and the three-and-a-half-year groups. The over-three-and-a-half-year group had less apprehension in public speaking context and less external locus of control than the less-than-one year group. The implication of these findings could be that the shorter the period of study in the United States, the more likely Far Eastern students were apprehensive about communication, and were external in locus of control; the longer the period of study in the United States, the less likely the students were apprehensive about communication, and were external in locus of control. These findings are basically confirmed by the previous studies (21, 23, 25) which found that the longer the international students studied or stayed in the United States, and were exposed to Western culture, the fewer English communication problems and the less external locus of control they had. Length of study in the United

States, therefore, appears to be an important variable to predict the English oral communication apprehension and external locus of control of the Far Eastern students.

CHAPTER BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Adler, Alfred, Problem of Neurosis, New York, Harper & Row, 1926.
2. _____, What Life Should Mean to You, New York, K. P. Putman's, 1931.
3. _____, The Individual Psychology of Alfred Adler: A Systematic Presentation in Selections from his Writings, New York, Basic Books, 1956.
4. _____, Social Interest: A Challenge to Mankind, New York, Capricorn Books, 1964.
5. Brislin, Richard, Learning Styles, Learning across Cultures: Intercultural Communication and International Educational Exchange, edited by Gary Althen, National Association for Foreign Students Affairs, Washington, 1981.
6. Crandall, James E., "A Scale for Social Interest," Journal of Individual Psychology, 31 (November, 1975), 187-195.
7. _____, Theory and Measurement of Social Interest: Empirical Tests of Alfred Adler's Concept, New York, Columbia University Press, 1981.
8. Dreikurs, Rudolf, Psychology in the Classroom, New York, Harper & Row, 1957.
9. Greene, John O. and Glenn G. Sparks, "The Roles of Outcome Expectations in the Experiences of a State of Communication Apprehension," Communication Quarterly, 31 (Summer, 1983), 212-219.
10. Hjelle, L. A., "Relationship of Social Interest to Internal-External Control and Self-Actualization in Young Women," Journal of Individual Psychology, 31 (May, 1975), 171-174.
11. Huck, S. W., W. H. Cormier and W. G. Bounds, Jr., Reading Statistics and Research, New York, Harper & Row, 1974.

12. Hull, W. Frank, Foreign Students in the United States of America: Coping Behavior within the Educational Environment, New York, Praeger Publishers, 1978.
13. Infante, D. A., "Motivation to Speak on a Controversial Topic, Value Expectancy, Sex Differences and Implications," Central States Speech Journal, 34 (Summer, 1983), 96-103.
14. Lustig, Myron W., "Verbal Reticence: A Reconceptualization and Scale Development," unpublished paper presented at the Convention of the Speech Communication Association, Chicago, Illinois, 1974.
15. Maccoby, Eleanor E. and Carol N. Jacklin, The Psychology of Sex Differences, Stanford, Stanford University Press, 1974.
16. Marsella, Anthony J. and Alan L. Yang, "Personality Research: Anxiety, Aggression and Locus of Control," in Personality Theories, Research, and Assessment, edited by Raymond J. Corsini and Anthony J. Marsella, Illinois, F. E. Peacock Publishers, Inc., 1983, pp.635-669.
17. McCroskey, James C., "Classroom Consequences of Communication Apprehension," Communication Education, 26 (January, 1977), 27-33.
18. _____, "Oral Communication Apprehension: Reconceptualization and a New Look Measurement," in Communication Yearbook 6, edited by Michael Burgoon, California, Sage, 1982, pp. 1-8.
19. McCroskey, James C., Timothy J. Simpson and Virginia P. Richmond, "Biological Sex and Communication Apprehension," Communication Quarterly, 30 (Spring, 1982), 129-133.
20. Nowichi, S. M. Duke and M. Crouch, "Sex Differences in Locus of Control and Performance under Competitive and Cooperative Conditions," Journal of Educational Psychology, 40 (May, 1973), 482-486.
21. Omar, Ali A., "Problems of International Students as Perceived by International Students and Faculty in a Public University," unpublished doctoral dissertation, North Texas State University, Denton, Texas, 1985.

22. Parsons, Oscar A. and John M. Schneider, "Locus of Control in University Students from Eastern and Western Societies," Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 42 (June, 1974), 456-461.
23. Payind, Mohammad Alam, "Academic, Personal and Social Problems of Afghan and Iranian Students in the United States," Educational Research Quarterly, 4 (Summer, 1979), 3-11.
24. Stevich, R. A., P. N. Dixon, W. K. Willingham and K. Welborn, "Locus of Control and Behavior versus Self-Response Measures of Social Interest," Journal of Individual Psychology, 36 (May, 1980), 183-190.
25. Wheeless, Lawrence R., Keith V. Erickson and Jackie Segars Behrens, "Cultural Differences in Disclosiveness as a Function of Locus of Control," Communication Monograph, 53 (March, 1986), 36-45.
26. Zakahi, Walter R. and Robert L. Duran, "Loneliness, Communicative Competence and Communication Apprehension: Extension and Replication," Communication Quarterly, 33 (Winter, 1985), 50-60.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Summary

This study determined the relationships among English oral communication apprehension, social interest and locus of control of Far Eastern students, and examined whether differences exist in these variables, compared to gender, age, academic classification, major field of study, employment status, and length of study in the United States. A sample of 240 students was randomly selected from the total population of 917 Far Eastern students enrolled at North Texas State University in the fall semester of 1986.

The questionnaires, including a cover letter to each Far Eastern student, a demographic questionnaire, the Adapted Personal Report of Communication Apprehension-24, the Social Interest Scale, and the Rotter's Internal-External (I-E) Scale, were used to collect the data. One hundred and seventy-one students participated in the study. The Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient was used to treat data dealing with relationships among English oral communication apprehension, social interest, and external locus of control of Far Eastern students. To examine

whether the differences exist between or among sub-group mean scores obtained from all scales, compared to gender, age, academic classification, major field of study, employment status, and length of study in the United States, one-way analysis of variance was used. When the test results were found to be significant at the .05 level or greater, the Scheffe' multiple comparisons were utilized.

Findings

In testing hypotheses considered in this study, the Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient and one-way analyses of variance resulted in the following findings.

1. There was not a significant negative relationship between English oral communication apprehension and social interest of Far Eastern students.

2. There were significant positive relationships between the levels of apprehension in general English communication, group discussion context and dyadic interaction context, and external locus of control of Far Eastern students.

3. There was not a significant negative relationship between social interest and external locus of control of Far Eastern students.

4. Male and female Far Eastern students did not differ significantly in English oral communication apprehension, social interest, and external locus of control.

5. Student age did not produce significant differences in English oral communication apprehension, social interest and external locus of control.

6. The undergraduate students showed higher levels of apprehension for general English oral communication and group discussion context than the graduate students. For the class context, dyadic interaction context, public speaking context, social interest, and external locus of control, no significant differences were found between the two groups.

7. The students whose majors were in "others" category, which included music, home economics, and library and information sciences, revealed more apprehension in group discussion context than the students whose majors were in education, arts and sciences, and business. No significant differences were found among group means in other contexts of English oral communication apprehension, social interest, and external locus of control with regard to major field of study.

8. The unemployed students showed higher levels of apprehension in general English oral communication, class context and dyadic interaction context than the employed students. For the group discussion context, public speaking context, social interest, and external locus of control, no significant differences were found between the two groups.

9. Length of study in the United States of students produced significant differences in most scale scores. The less-than-one-year group had higher levels of apprehension in general English oral communication, group discussion context, and class context than the other three groups. The over-three-and-a-half-year group had less apprehension in public speaking context and less external locus of control than the less-than-one-year group. No significant differences were found in dyadic interaction context and social interest among these student groups.

Conclusions

On the basis of the findings from the Far Eastern students involved in this study, the following conclusions appear to be warranted.

1. English oral communication apprehension does not seem to be related to social interest, but it seems to be related to external locus of control of Far Eastern students.
2. Social interest does not seem to be related to external locus of control of Far Eastern students.
3. A high level of English oral communication apprehension seems to be more likely to occur if the students have high external locus of control; a low level of English oral communication apprehension seems to be more likely to occur if the students have low external locus of control.

4. Gender and age of Far Eastern students seem to have little or no effect on the level of English oral communication apprehension, social interest, and external locus of control.

5. Graduate classification, employment, and longer periods of study in the United States seem to be positive factors in reducing levels of English oral communication apprehension for Far Eastern students.

6. Major fields of study in which most Far Eastern students are enrolled (education, arts and sciences, and business) do not seem to be significantly related to English oral communication apprehension, but in those major fields of study in which a smaller number of such students are enrolled (music, home economics, and library and information sciences) appear to be related to a higher level of English oral communication apprehension.

7. Length of study in the United States seems to be related to external locus of control of the Far Eastern students.

Recommendations

Based on the results of this study, the following recommendations are made.

Recommendations for Further Research

1. It is recommended that further research be directed toward the larger sample of international students, regarding other variables such as marriage status, size of institutions, and nationalities of international students.
2. It is recommended that further research be conducted to clarify the factors that decrease and increase levels of oral communication apprehension, social interest, and locus of control of students.
3. It is recommended that this study be replicated using different methods to collect data. For example, a classroom observation should be used as an additional technique for tracing levels of English oral communication apprehension, and a longitudinal study should be done to trace the changes in English oral communication apprehension, social interest, and locus of control of the students.

Recommendations for Faculty and Administrators

1. The results of this study should be considered by faculty and administrators who have responsibility to provide more services and programs for international students to help them fulfill their sociopersonal needs and solve their language problems.
2. The orientation program for new international students should include more information about proper

English communication, ways of and opportunities for social interactions, international or Western cultures, and work opportunities for exposure to Western cultures.

3. Professors should take advantages of the presence of international students in their classes by using them as learning resources. Encouraging them to talk about their countries, cultures, and their societal systems can serve many purposes. First, it helps faculty and American students understand the background of international students, and consequently enhances mutual appreciation of differences. Second, it enhances the self-esteem of the international student and encourages him to participate in class discussions.

4. It is recommended that community organizations and businesses be encouraged to become involved with international students' activities. This action will promote understanding and provide educational, social, and cultural experiences for all involved. It will also enhance the international students' self-esteem and help them with their adjustment to the university and the community.

Recommendations for Far Eastern Students

1. Far Eastern students should acquire proper English language training in conjunction with cultural orientation and information.

2. Far Eastern students should participate more in international student organizations. These organizations should be used as support systems for international students to articulate their concerns and problems relative to the university and the community.

APPENDICES

Appendix A

A cover letter to Far Eastern students

December , 1986

Dear Colleague:

The attached questionnaire is part of my dissertation for a doctoral degree in higher education. The purpose of the study is to determine the relationships among English oral communication apprehension, social interest and locus of control of Far Eastern students.

You have been carefully selected to participate in this research study. Your responses to the questionnaire will be of benefit to international student body and to the success of this study.

Please complete the questionnaire, and return it in the enclosed stamped and self-addressed envelope. Complete confidentiality of responses will be maintained.

A summary of the results will be available upon request. Your assistance and cooperation is deeply appreciated.

Sincerely,

Thira Praphruitkit
Doctoral Student
College of Education
North Texas State
University

Appendix B
Demographic Questionnaire

1. Gender: _____ male; _____ female
2. Age: (years) _____ (months) _____
3. Academic Classification: undergraduate _____;
graduate _____
4. Major field of study: _____
5. Employment status (on or off campus in the United States) :
employed _____; not employed _____
6. How long have you been studying in the United States?
(years) _____ (months) _____
7. My native country is _____.

Appendix C

The Adapted Personal Report of Communication Apprehension-24

Directions: This instrument is composed of 24 statements concerning your feelings about oral communication in English with other people. Please indicates 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, or (5) Strongly Disagree with each statement. There are no right answer or wrong answers. Many of the statements are similar to other statements. Do not be concerned about this. Work quickly, just record your first impression.

1. I dislike participating in group discussion.
2. Generally, I am comfortable while participating in a group discussion.
3. I am tense and nervous while participating in group discussions.
4. I like to get involved in group discussion.
5. Engaging in group discussion with new people makes me 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 meeting.
8. Usually I am calm and relaxed while participating in meetings.
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 in 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 am afraid to speak up in conversations.
19. I have no fear of giving a speech.
20. Certain parts of my body feel very tense and rigid while 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
Permission Letter for the SIS

December 8, 1986

Dr. James E. Crandall
University of Idaho
Professor of Psychology and Statistics
Moscow, ID 838443

Dear Dr. Crandall:

I am a doctoral student in Higher Education at North Texas State University. My major advisor is Dr. Howard W. Smith. I am currently writing a dissertation proposal examining the relationships among English oral communication apprehension, social interest and locus of control of international students.

In selecting the instrument to measure social interest, I would like to use the Social Interest Scale and would like your permission to do so. I look forward to hearing from you. Thanks for your help.

Sincerely,

Thira Praphruitkit

Thira Praphruitkit
Doctoral Student
College of Education
North Texas State University

Please feel free to use the Social Interest Scale.
Good luck with your research.

James E. Crandall

Appendix E

Personal Trait Value Scale

Below are a number of pairs of personal characteristics or traits. For each pair, choose the trait which you value more highly. In making each choice, ask yourself which of the traits in that pair you would rather possess as one of your own characteristics. For example, the first pair is "imaginative/rational." If you had to make a choice, which would you rather be? Mark / in front of the number (1 or 2) of the pair to indicate your choice. Some of the traits will appear twice, but always in combination with a different other trait. No pairs will be repeated. Be sure to choose one, but, only one, trait in each pair.

I would rather be

- | | |
|------------------------------|------------------------------|
| <u> </u> 1. imaginative | <u> </u> 1. neat |
| <u> </u> 2. rational | <u> </u> 2. logical |
| <u> </u> 1. helpful | <u> </u> 1. forgiving |
| <u> </u> 2. quick-witted | <u> </u> 2. gentle |
| <u> </u> 1. neat | <u> </u> 1. efficient |
| <u> </u> 2. sympathetic | <u> </u> 2. respectful |
| <u> </u> 1. level-headed | <u> </u> 1. practical |
| <u> </u> 2. efficient | <u> </u> 2. self-confident |
| <u> </u> 1. intelligent | <u> </u> 1. alert |
| <u> </u> 2. considerate | <u> </u> 2. cooperative |
| <u> </u> 1. self-reliant | <u> </u> 1. imaginative |
| <u> </u> 2. ambitious | <u> </u> 2. helpful |
| <u> </u> 1. respectful | <u> </u> 1. realistic |
| <u> </u> 2. original | <u> </u> 2. moral |
| <u> </u> 1. creative | <u> </u> 1. popular |
| <u> </u> 2. sensitive | <u> </u> 2. conscientious |
| <u> </u> 1. generous | <u> </u> 1. considerate |
| <u> </u> 2. individualistic | <u> </u> 2. wise |
| <u> </u> 1. responsible | <u> </u> 1. reasonable |
| <u> </u> 2. likable | <u> </u> 2. quick-witted |
| <u> </u> 1. capable | <u> </u> 1. sympathetic |
| <u> </u> 2. tolerant | <u> </u> 2. individualistic |
| <u> </u> 1. trustworthy | <u> </u> 1. ambitious |
| <u> </u> 2. wise | <u> </u> 2. patient |

Appendix F

The Rotter's Internal-External Scale

Instructions:

This is a questionnaire to find out the way in which certain important events in our society affect different people. Each item consists of a pair of alternatives lettered a or b. Please select the one statement of each pair

(and only one) which you more strongly believe to be the case as far as you are concerned.

Be sure to select the one you actually believe to be more true rather than the one you think you should choose or the one you would like to be true.

This is a measure of personal belief. Obviously, there are no right or wrong answers.

Please answer these items carefully but do not spend too much time on any one item. Be sure to find an answer for every choice.

In some instances you may discover that you believe both statements or neither. In such cases, be sure to select the one you more strongly believe to be the case as far as you are concerned. Also, try to respond to each item independently when making your choice; do not be influenced by your previous choice.

For each item, select A or B according to your opinion. Do not omit any items.

- ___ 1. A. Children get into trouble because their parents punish them too much.
B. The trouble with most children nowadays is that their parents are too easy with them.
- ___ 2. A. Many of the unhappy things in people's lives are partly due to bad luck.
B. People's misfortunes result from the mistakes they make.
- ___ 3. A. One of the major reasons why we have wars is because people don't take enough interest in politics.
B. There will always be wars, no matter how hard people try to prevent them.
- ___ 4. A. In the long run, people get the respect they deserve in this world.
B. Unfortunately, an individual's worth often passes unrecognized no matter how hard he tries.
- ___ 5. A. The idea that teachers are unfair to students is nonsense.
B. Most students don't realize the extent to which their grades are influenced by accidental happenings.

- ___ 6. A. Without the right breaks one cannot be an effective leader.
B. Capable people who fail to become leaders have not taken advantage of their opportunities.
- ___ 7. A. No matter how hard you try some people just don't like you.
B. People who can't get others to like them don't understand how to get along with others.
- ___ 8. A. Heredity plays the major role in determining one's responsibility.
B. It is one's experience in life which determine what they're like.
- ___ 9. A. I have often found that what is going to happen will happen.
B. Trusting to fate has never turned out as well for me as making a decision to take a definite course of action.
- ___ 10. A. In the case of the well prepared student there is rarely, if ever, such a thing as an unfair test.
B. Many times exam questions tend to be so unrelated to course work that studying is really useless.
- ___ 11. A. Becoming a success is a matter of hard work, luck has little or nothing to do with it.
B. Getting a good job depends mainly on being in the right place at the right time.
- ___ 12. A. The average citizen can have an influence in government decisions.
B. This world is run by the few people in power, and there is not much the little guy can do about it.
- ___ 13. A. When I make plans, I am almost certain that I can make them work.
B. It is not always wise to plan too far ahead because many things turn out to be a matter of good or bad fortune anyhow.
- ___ 14. A. There are certain people who are just no good.
B. There is some good in everybody.
- ___ 15. A. In my case, getting what I want has little or nothing to do with luck.
B. Many times we might just as well decide what to do by flipping a coin.
- ___ 16. A. Who gets to be the boss often depends on who was lucky enough to be in the right place first.
B. Getting people to do the right thing depends upon

ability, luck has little or nothing to do with it.

- 17. A. As far as world affairs are concerned, most of us are the victims of forces we can neither understand, nor control.
B. By taking an active part in political and social affairs, the people can control world events.
- 18. A. Most people don't realize the extent to which their lives are controlled by accidental happenings.
B. There really is no such thing as "luck."
- 19. A. One should always be willing to admit mistakes.
B. It is usually best to cover up one's mistakes.
- 20. A. It is hard to know whether or not a person really likes you.
B. How many friends you have depends upon how nice a person you are.
- 21. A. In the long run the bad things that happen to us are balanced by the good ones.
B. Most misfortunes are the results of lack of ability, ignorance, laziness, or all three.
- 22. A. With enough effort, we can wipe out political corruption.
B. It is difficult for people to have much control over the things politicians do in office.
- 23. A. Sometimes I can't understand how teachers arrive at the grades they give.
B. There is a direct connection between how hard I study and the grades I get.
- 24. A. A good leader expects people to decide for themselves what they should do.
B. A good leader makes it clear to everybody what their jobs are.
- 25. A. Many times I feel that I have little influence over the things that happen to me.
B. It is impossible for me to believe that chance or luck plays an important role in my life.
- 26. A. People are lonely because they don't try to be friendly.
B. There's not much use in trying too hard to please people, if they like you.
- 27. A. There is too much emphasis on athletics in high school.
B. Team sports are an excellent way to build character.

- 28. A. What happens to me is my own doing.
B. Sometimes I feel that I don't have enough control over the directions my life is taking.
- 29. A. Most of the time I can't understand why politicians behave the way they do.
B. In the long run, the people are responsible for bad government on a national as well as on a local level.

Appendix G
Follow-up Letter

December , 1986

Dear:

Recently I sent you the enclosed questionnaire with a stamped envelope, but perhaps it was overlooked.

Again, please remember that your contribution is very important. You play a key role in helping me continue research which will result in very critical information of assistance to international students.

A copy of the questionnaire is enclosed.
Please take the time to complete and return it as soon as possible.

I am very grateful for your effort.

Thank you so much.

Thira Praphruitkit
College of Education
North Texas State University

Appendix H
Follow-up Postcard

January , 1986

Recently a questionnaire investigating your perception on English oral communication apprehension, social interest and locus of control was mailed to you. Your name was drawn in a random sample of international students from the Far East.

If you have already completed and returned it to me, please accept my sincere thanks. If not, I would appreciate your doing so today. Your answer is extremely important to gather information for this study.

Thank you very much

Thira Praphruitkit

Appendix I

**Number in Sub-Groups, Means, and Standard Deviations
on the APRCA-24, SIS, and I-E Scale, Compared to
Demographic Characteristics of Students**

Characteristic	Num- ber	APRCA-24					SIS	I-E
		Group X SD	Class X SD	Dyad X SD	Public X SD	Total X SD	X SD	X SD
Gender								
Male	80	17.3 4.3	18.1 4.1	17.0 3.8	18.9 4.1	71.7 12.6	9.1 2.8	10.6 3.1
Female	91	18.3 4.8	18.3 4.5	17.4 4.5	19.5 3.8	73.3 13.9	8.6 2.9	10.9 2.9
Age in years								
Less than 24	42	18.9 4.6	18.6 4.7	17.3 4.2	19.2 3.8	73.9 13.2	8.2 2.4	10.7 2.9
24-27	46	18.6 4.2	18.7 4.3	17.5 4.8	20.2 3.3	74.7 13.0	9.6 2.5	11.0 2.9
27-31	42	17.2 4.9	17.8 3.8	16.9 4.0	18.6 3.9	70.8 13.7	8.2 3.1	10.3 2.6
Over 31	41	16.5 4.4	17.7 4.5	17.2 3.9	18.8 4.6	70.6 13.3	9.2 3.1	10.9 3.5
Academic classi- fication							-	
Undergraduate	29	19.6 4.9	19.2 4.3	18.4 4.9	20.5 3.4	77.7 13.4	8.3 3.1	10.8 2.7
Graduate	142	17.5 4.5	18.0 4.3	17.0 4.1	19.0 4.0	71.5 13.1	9.0 2.8	10.7 3.0
Major field of study								
Education	30	15.9 4.6	17.2 4.6	17.4 5.2	19.0 3.5	69.3 14.4	8.9 2.6	10.8 2.9
Arts and sciences	76	17.8 4.3	18.4 4.2	17.3 3.9	19.7 4.0	73.5 12.9	8.8 2.7	10.4 3.0
Business	44	18.3 4.5	17.8 4.2	16.7 4.1	18.2 4.1	70.9 13.3	8.7 3.3	10.9 3.0
Others	21	20.6 4.9	19.9 4.5	17.8 4.2	20.1 3.5	78.4 12.1	9.2 2.9	11.9 2.8

Appendix I--Continued

Characteristic	Num- ber	APRCA-24						SIS X SD	I-E X SD
		Group X SD	Class X SD	Dyad X SD	Public X SD	Total X SD			
Employment status									
Employed	95	17.4 4.8	17.4 4.1	16.6 4.2	18.9 4.1	70.3 13.8	9.1 2.6	10.8 3.1	
Unemployed	76	18.4 4.3	19.3 4.4	18.0 4.1	19.6 3.7	75.4 12.2	8.5 3.1	10.7 2.8	
Length of study									
Less than one year	39	20.1 4.8	20.3 4.0	18.6 4.6	21.0 3.0	80.0 12.5	9.4 2.7	11.6 2.7	
1-2	47	17.5 3.3	17.8 3.4	17.1 3.7	19.4 3.7	71.8 10.2	8.7 2.6	11.4 3.2	
2-3 1/2	42	17.5 5.0	17.4 4.3	16.7 3.8	19.1 4.1	69.9 13.3	8.4 3.3	10.4 2.8	
Over 3 1/2	43	16.4 4.5	17.5 5.0	16.6 4.6	17.5 4.1	69.0 14.5	8.9 2.8	9.7 2.9	
Total	171	17.8	18.2	17.2	19.2	72.6	8.8	10.7	.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Books

- Adler, Alfred, Problems of Neurosis, New York, Harper & Row, 1926.
- _____, What Life should Mean to You, New York, K. P. Putman's, 1931.
- _____, The Individual Psychology of Alfred Adler: A Systematic Presentation in Selections from His Writings, New York, Basic Books, 1956.
- _____, Social Interest: A Challenge to Mankind, New York, Capricorn Books, 1964.
- Ansbacher, Heinz L., The Science of Living, New York, Anchor, 1968.
- _____, "Individual Psychology," in Personality Theories, Research, and Assessment, edited by Raymond J. Corsini and Anthony J. Marsella, Illinois, F. E. Peacock Publishers, Inc., 1983, pp. 69-124.
- Asch, Solomon E., Social Psychology, New York, Prentice Hall, 1952.
- Babbie, E. R., Survey Research Methods, California, Wadsworth, 1973.
- Borg, Walter R. and Meredith D. Gall, Educational Research: An Introduction, 3rd ed., New York, Longman, 1979.
- Crandall, James E., Theory and Measurement of Social Interest: Empirical Tests of Alfred Adler's Concept, New York, Columbia University Press, 1981.
- Cutrona, C. E., "Transition to College: Loneliness and the Process of Social Adjustment," in Loneliness: A Sourcebook of Current Theory, Research and Therapy, edited by L. A. Peplau and D. Perlman, New York, John Wiley & Son, 1982, pp. 291-309.
- Dreikurs, Rudolf, Psychology in the Classroom, New York, Harper & Row, 1957.

- , Social Quality: The Challenge of Today.
Chicago, Henry Regnery Company, 1971.
- Eysenck, Hans J., Reading in Extraversion-Introversion, New York, Wesley Inter Science, 1970.
- Ferguson, George A., Statistical Analysis in Psychology and Education, New York, McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1981.
- Gay, L. R., Educational Research: Competencies for Analysis and Application, Ohio, Charles E. Merrill Publishing Company, 1981.
- Huck, S. W., W. H. Cormier and W. G. Bounds, Jr., Reading Statistics and Research, San Francisco, Harper & Row, 1974.
- Hull, W. Frank, Foreign Students in the United States of America: Coping Behavior within the Educational Environment, New York, Praeger Publishers, 1978.
- Infante, D. A., "Motivation to Speak on a Controversial Topic, Value Expectancy, Sex Differences and Implications," Central States Speech Journal, 34 (Summer, 1983), 96-103.
- Johnson, J. and I. Sarason, "Moderator Variables in Life Stress Research," in Stress and Anxiety, edited by I. Sarason and C. Spielberger, Washington, D. C., Hemisphere Publishing Company, 1979, pp. 222-305.
- Klineberg, Otto and W. Frank Hull, At a Foreign University: An International Study of Adaptation and Coping, New York, Praeger Publishers, 1979.
- Maccoby, Eleanor E. and Carol N. Jacklin, The Psychology of Sex Differences, Stanford, Stanford University Press, 1974.
- McCroskey, James C., "Oral Communication Apprehension: Reconceptualization and a New Look Measurement," in Communication Yearbook 6, edited by Michael Burgoon, California, Sage, 1982, pp. 1-28.
- Mehrabian, Albert, Silent Message, California, Wadsworth, 1971.
- Mehrens, William A. and Irvin J. Lehmann, Standardized Tests in Education, New York, Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1975.

- Phares, E. Jurry, Locus of Control in Personality, New Jersey, General Learning Press, 1976.
- Rotter, Julian B., Social Learning and Clinical Psychology, New Jersey, Prentice Hall, 1954.
- Rotter, Julian B., Jane E. Chance and E. Jerry Phares, Applications of a Social Learning Theory of Personality, New York, Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1972.
- Spaulding, Seth and Michael J. Flack, The World's Students in the United States: A Review and Evaluation of Research on Foreign Students, New York, Praeger Publishers, 1976.
- Sweeny, T. J., Adlerian Counseling: Proven Concepts and Strategies, Indiana, Accelerated Development Inc., 1981.
- Zimbardo, Philip G., Shyness: Reading, Massachusetts, Addison-Wesley, 1977.

Articles

- Ansbacher, Heinz L., "The Concept of Social Interest," Journal of Individual Psychology, 24 (November, 1968), 131-149. Archer, Robert, "Relationship between Locus of Control and Anxiety," Journal of Personality Assessment, 43 (October, 1979), 617-626.
- Beatty, Michael J. and Gregory L. Andriate, "Communication Apprehension and General Anxiety in the Prediction of Public Speaking Anxiety," Communication Quarterly, 33 (Summer, 1985), 174-184.
- Beatty, Michael J. and P. J. Beatty, "Interpersonal Communication Anxiety Theory into Practice," Speech Monograph, 15 (March, 1975), 368-372.
- Behnke, Ralph and Larry W. Carlile, "Heart Rate as an Index of Speech Anxiety," Speech Monograph, 38 (March, 1971), 65-69.
- Boohar, Richard U. and William J. Seiler, "Speech Communication Anxiety: An Impediment to Academic Achievement in the University Classroom," Journal of Classroom Interaction, 18 (Winter, 1982), 23-27.

Burgoon, Judee K. "The Unwillingness to Communicate Scale: Development and Validation," Communication Monograph, 43 (March, 1976), 60-69.

Carment, D. W., C. G. Miles and V. B. Cervin, "Persuasiveness and Persuasibility as Related to Intelligence and Extraversion" British Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology, 4 (June, 1965), 1-7.

Crandall, James E., "Sex Differences in Extreme Response Style: Difference in Frequency of Use of Extreme Positions and Negative Ratings," Journal of Social psychology, 89 (April, 1973), 281-293.

_____, "A Scale for Social Interest," Journal of Individual Psychology, 31 (November, 1975), 187-195.

_____, "Further Validation of the Social Interest Scale: Peer Ratings and Interpersonal Attraction," Journal of Clinical Psychology, 33 (January, 1977), 140-142.

_____, "The Effect of Stress on Social Interest and Vice Versa," Journal of Individual Psychology, 12 (November, 1978), 350-360.

_____, "Adler's Concept of Social Interest: Theory, Measurement, and Implications for Adjustments," Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 39 (September, 1980), 481-495.

_____, "Social Interest, Extreme Response Style, and Implications for Adjustment," Journal of Research in Personality, 16 (March, 1982), 82-89.

Crandall, James E. and Roger D. Rasmussen, "Purpose of Life as Related to Specific Values," Journal of Clinical Psychology, 31 (July, 1975), 483-485.

Crandall, James E. and M. D. Harris, "Social Interest, Cooperation, and Altruism," Journal of Individual Psychology, 32 (May, 1976), 50-54.

Crandall, James E. and Gunars Reimanis, "Social Interest and Time Orientation, Childhood Memories, Adjustment and Crime," Journal of Individual Psychology, 32 (November, 1976), 203-211.

Crandall, James E. and Robert E. Lehman, "Relationship of Stressful Life Events to Social Interest, Locus of Control and Psychological Adjustment," Journal of

- Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 45 (December, 1977), 1208.
- Crandall, James E. and E. L. Putman, "Relations between Measures of Social Interest and Psychological Well-Being," Journal of Individual Psychology, 36 (November, 1980), 156-168.
- Crandall, James E. and J. A. Kytonen, "Sex, Age and Stress between Social Interest and Well-Being," Journal of Individual Psychology, 36 (November, 1980), 169-182.
- Daly, John A., "The Assessment of Social-Communicative Anxiety via Self-Reports: A Comparison of Measures," Communication Monograph, 45 (August, 1978), 204-218.
- Fremouw, William J. and M. G. Harmatz, "A Helper Model for Behavioral Treatment of Speech Anxiety," Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 43 (October, 1975), 652-660.
- Greene, John O. and Glenn G. Sparks, "The Roles of Outcome Expectations in the Experiences of a State of Communication Apprehension," Communication Quarterly, 31 (Summer, 1983), 212-219.
- Hersch, Paul D. and Karl E. Scheibe, "On the Reliability and Validity of Internal-External Control as a Personality Dimensions," Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 31 (December, 1967), 609-614.
- Hjelle, L. A., "Relationship of Social Interest to Internal-External Control and Self-Actualization in Young Women," Journal of Individual Psychology, 31 (May, 1975), 171-174.
- Infante, D. A., "Motivation to Speak on a Controversial Topic, Value Expectancy, Sex Differences and Implications," Central States Speech Journal, 34 (Summer, 1983), 96-103.
- Klein, Marjorie H., "The Foreign Students Adaptation Program: Social Experiences of Asian Students in the U.S.," International Educational and Cultural Exchange, 51 (February, 1971), 77-90.
- Lacas, Jenifer, "Communication Apprehension in the ESL Classroom: Getting Our Students to Talk," Foreign Language Annuals, 17 (December, 1984), 593-598.

Lam, Y. L. J., "Relationships between Anxiety and Classroom Behaviors of Adults Learners," Journal of Educational Psychology, 51 (April, 1981), 90-96.

Leak, G. K., "Two Social Interest Measures and Social Desirability Response Sets," Journal of Individual Psychology, 38 (May, 1982), 42-46.

Lefcourt, Herbert M., "Belief in Personal Control: Research and Implication," Journal of Individual Psychology, 22 (May, 1966), 185-193.

McCroskey, James C., "Measure of Communication-Bound Anxiety," Speech Monograph, 37 (November, 1970), 269-277.

_____, "Classroom Consequences of Communication Apprehension," Communication Education, 26 (January, 1977), 27-33.

_____, "Validity of the PRCA as an Index of Oral Communication Apprehension," Communication Monograph, 45 (August, 1978), 192-203.

McCroskey, James C. and Janis F. Anderson, "The Relationship between Communication Apprehension and Academic Achievement among College Students," Human Communication Research, 3 (Fall, 1976), 73-81.

McCroskey, James C., John A. Daly and Gail A. Sorensen, "Personality Correlations of Communication Apprehension," Human Communication Research, 2 (Summer, 1976), 376-380.

McCroskey, James C. and Virginia P. Richmond, "The Effects of Communication Apprehension on the Perception of Peers," Western Speech Communication, 40 (Winter, 1976), 14-21.

McCroskey, James C., Timothy J. Simpson and Virginia P. Richmond, "Biological Sex and Communication Apprehension," Communication Quarterly, 30 (Spring, 1982), 129-133.

McCroskey, James C. and Michael J. Beatty, "Communication Apprehension and Accumulated Communication State Anxiety Experiences: A Research Note," Communication Monograph, 51 (March, 1984), 79-83.

McCroskey, James C., John M. Fyer and Virginia P. Richmond, "Don't Speak to me in English: Communication

- Apprehension in Puerto Rico," Communication Quarterly, 33 (Summer, 1985), 185-192.
- McCroskey, James C., Michael J. Beatty, Patricia Kearney and Timothy G. Plax, "The Content Validity of the PRCA-24 as a Measure of Communication Apprehension across Communication Contexts," Communication Quarterly, 33 (Summer, 1985), 165-173.
- McGinnies, Elliott, Lena A. Nordholm, Charles D. Ward and D. Bhanthumnavin, "Sex and Cultural Differences in Perceived Locus of Control among Students in Five Countries," Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 42 (June, 1974), 451-455.
- Mirels, Herbert L. "Dimensions of Internal versus External Control," Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 34 (June, 1970), 226-228.
- Montgomery, Barbara M. and Robert W. Norton, "Sex Differences and Similarities in Communication Styles," Communication Monograph, 48 (June, 1981), 121-132.
- Natale, Michael, "Effects of Induced Elation and Depression on Internal-External Locus of Control," Journal of Psychology, 100 (November, 1978), 315-320.
- Nowichi, S., M. Duke and M. Crouch, "Sex Differences in Locus of Control and Performance under Competitive and Cooperative Conditions," Journal of Educational Psychology, 40 (May, 1973), 482-486.
- Parsons, Oscar A. and John M. Schneider, "Locus of Control in University Students from Eastern and Western Societies," Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 42 (June, 1974), 456-461.
- Payind, Mohammad Alam, "Academic, Personal and Social Problems of Afghan and Iranian Students in the United States," Educational Research Quarterly, 4 (Summer, 1979), 3-11.
- Phillips, Gerald M., "Reticence: Pathology of the Normal Speakers," Speech Monograph, 35 (March, 1968), 39-49.
- Porter, D. Thomas, "An Empirical Appraisal of the PRCA for Meaning Oral Communication," Human Communication Research, 8 (Fall, 1981), 58-71.
- Powers, Williams G., "The Rhetorical Interrogative: Anxiety or Control?" Human Communication Research, 4 (Fall, 1977), 44-47.

Rotter, Julian B., "Generalized Expectancies for Internal versus External Control of Reinforcement," Psychological Monograph, 80 (May, 1966), whole No. 609.

_____, "Some Problems and Misconceptions Related to the Construct of Internal versus External Control of Reinforcement," Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 43 (February, 1975), 56-67.

Sharma, Sala, "A Study to Identify and Analyze Adjustment Problems Experienced by Foreign, Non-European Graduate Students Enrolled in Selected Universities in State of North Carolina," California Journal of Education, 24 (August, 1973), 135-146.

Stevich, R. A., P. N. Dixon, W. K. Willingham and K. Welborn, "Locus of Control and Behavior versus Self-Response Measures of Social Interest," Journal of Individual Psychology, 36 (May, 1980), 183-190.

Wheless, Lawrence R., Keith V. Erickson and Jackie Segars Behrens, "Cultural Differences in Disclosiveness as a Function of Locus of Control," Communication Monograph, 53 (March, 1986), 36-45.

Zakah, Walter R. and Robert L. Duran, "Loneliness, Communicative Competence and Communication Apprehension: Extension and Replication," Communication Quarterly, 33 (Winter, 1985), 50-60.

Zarski, John J., John D. West and Donald L. Bubenzer, "A Factor Analysis of the Social Interest Index-Revised," Journal of Clinical Psychology, 39 (March, 1983), 90-94.

Reports

UNESCO, Formal Programs of International Cooperation between University Institutions: Report of an International Committee of Experts, Paris, France, 1960.

Publications of Learned Organizations

Bournazos, Kimon and Mary K. Leamy, An Exploratory Study Concerning Attitudes of Foreign Students Enrolled at Western Michigan University, Western Michigan University, Kalamazoo, Michigan, 1974.

Brislin, Richard, Learning Styles, Learning across Cultures: Intercultural Communication and International Educational Exchange, edited by Garry Althen, National Association for Foreign Students Affairs, Washington, 1981.

The International Students Committee, Handbook for Academic Advisors of Foreign Students, University of Kentucky, Lexington, Kentucky, 1982.

Unpublished Materials

Ahmed, Marwa k., "Academic Adjustment and Satisfaction with College among Selected Groups of International Students," unpublished doctoral dissertation, North Texas State University, Denton, Texas, 1984.

Al-Saffar, Ahmed Abdullah, "A Survey of International Students' Opinions and Attitudes at the University of Tennessee," unpublished doctoral dissertation, the University of Tennessee, Knoxville, Tennessee, 1976.

Bashore, D. M., "Relationships among Speech Anxiety, IQ and High School Achievement," unpublished master's degree thesis, Illinois State University, Normal, Illinois, 1971.

Burgoon, Judee K., "Unwillingness to Communicate and Conflict as Predictors of Information Processing Behavior in Small Groups," unpublished paper presented at the Convention of the Speech Communication Association, Chicago, Illinois, 1974.

Efran, J., "Some Personality Determinants of Memory for Success and Failure," unpublished doctoral dissertation, Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio, 1963.

Han, Pyung Eui, "A Study of Goals and Problems of Foreign Graduate Students from Far East at the University of Southern California, unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Southern California, Los Angeles, California, 1975.

Kaplan, H. B., "An Evaluation of Social Interest Measures and Their Relationship to Cooperative Behavior," unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Georgia, Athens, Georgia, 1976.

- Lustig, Myron W., "Verbal Reticence: A Reconceptualization and Scale Development," unpublished paper presented at the Convention of the Speech Communication Association, Chicago, Illinois, 1974.
- McCroskey, James C. and Michale E. Sheahan, "Seating Position and Participation: An Alternative Theoretical Explanation," unpublished paper presented at the International Communication Association, Portland, Oregon, 1976.
- Moghrabi, Kamel, "An Analysis of Factors that Influence the Degree of Success and Failure of Foreign Students at Texas A&M University," unpublished doctoral dissertation, Texas A&M University, College Station, Texas, 1966.
- Nenyod, Boonmee, "An Analysis of Problems Perceived by Foreign Students Enrolled in State Colleges and Universities in the State of Texas," unpublished doctoral dissertation, East Texas State University, Commerce, Texas, 1975.
- Olson, Claudia D., "Social Interest in Specified Group of Community College Students," unpublished doctoral dissertation, North Texas State University, Denton, Texas, 1984.
- Omar, Ali A., "Problems of International Students as Perceived by International Students and Faculty in a Public University," unpublished doctoral dissertation, North Texas State University, Denton, Texas, 1985.
- Porter, D. Thomas, "The Effects of Communication Apprehension on Language Behavior," unpublished doctoral dissertation, Florida State University, Tallahassee, Florida, 1974.
- Quiggins, James G., "The Effects of High and Low Communication Apprehension on Small Group Members Credibility, Interpersonal Attraction, and Interaction," unpublished paper presented at the Convention of the Speech Communication Association, Chicago, Illinois, 1972.
- Redding, C. W., "The Psychogalvanometer as a Laboratory in the Basic Courses in Speech," unpublished master's thesis, University of Denver, Denver, Colorado, 1936.
- Sabie, Taha, "Foreign Students Coping with the American Culture at Eight Selected American Universities,"

unpublished doctoral dissertation, George Peabody College for Teachers, Nashville, Tennessee, 1976.

Scott, Michael D., Michael P. Yates and Lawrence R. Wheeless, "An Exploratory Investigation of the Effects of Communication Apprehension in Alternate Systems of Instruction," unpublished paper presented at the International Communication Association, Chicago, Illinois, 1975.

Scott, Michael D. and Lawrence R. Wheeless, "An Exploratory Investigation of Three Types of Communication Apprehension on Students Achievement," unpublished paper presented at the Convention of the Speech Communication Association, San Francisco, California, 1976.

Sulliman, J. R., "The Development of a Scale for the Measurement of Social Interest," unpublished doctoral dissertation, Florida State University, Tallahassee, Florida, 1973.

Weiner, Allen N., "Machiavellianism as a Predictor of Group Interaction and Cohesion," unpublished master's degree thesis, West Virginia University, Morgantown, West Virginia, 1973.