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ABSTRACT

The purpose of this research was to determine the relationship between receiver apprehension (RA), an anxiety-related construct associated with inadequate information processing capability, and listening style in the context of the college classroom. Two of the four hypotheses tested indicate no relationship exists between the variables, one hypothesis indicated a negative relationship between the variables, and one hypothesis could not be tested due to insufficient data. Additional research needs to be conducted to determine if relationships do exist between these variables.
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Chapter 1

INTRODUCTION

Parker J. Palmer (1998), author of The Courage to Teach, addresses fear and how it is ever present in the classroom. Parker (1998) states, “Fear is everywhere—in our institutions, in our students, in ourselves—and it cuts us off from everything” (p. 56). Many students express fear, or anxiety, about certain situations they encounter in an academic setting. For example, some students experience test anxiety before taking an exam or anxiety about not knowing what to expect as a new semester begins. Though these particular examples are indirectly related to communication, there are some anxiety-related constructs that are communication based. Such anxieties include, but are not limited to, willingness to communicate (WTC) (McCroskey & Richmond, 1987; Clark, 1989), communication apprehension (CA) (McCroskey, 1970; Behnke & Sawyer, 1999; Allen, Hunter, & Donohue, 1989) and classroom apprehension (CCA) (Neer, 1990).

One particular communication related anxiety central to this study is receiver apprehension (RA). Receiver apprehension is defined as the “fear of misinterpreting, inadequately processing, and/or not being able to adjust psychologically to messages sent by others” (Wheless, 1975, p. 263). In the classroom environment, students are evaluated on how well they process and respond to the information presented.
Consequently, the pressure of evaluation may produce anxiety for some students.

Receiver apprehension, which focuses on anxiety from a listener’s perspective, was separated from communication apprehension as a construct by Wheeless (1975). Since RA and CA are separate constructs, it is important to note the difference between them.

Communication apprehension is defined as “a broad-based fear or anxiety related to the act of communication” (McCroskey & Daly, 1976, p. 68). McCroskey and Daly (1976) note that a high CA individual is “a person for whom apprehension about participating in communication outweighs the projected gain from communicating in a given situation” (p. 68). Communication apprehension is operationalized in McCroskey’s (1970) development of the Personal Report of Communication Apprehension (PRCA), which measures CA in four areas: group discussion, meetings, interpersonal conversations and public speaking as well as other context-specific self-reports. The distinction between CA and RA is the source of the apprehension.

Communication apprehension is associated with the formality of the setting in which the communication occurs (Neer, 1990) and social disapproval (Wheeless, 1975). Communication apprehensive individuals are apprehensive because they are the sources or senders of the message. Receiver apprehension, however, is associated with inadequately processing information and the inability to psychologically adjust to messages sent by others (Wheeless, 1975). Therefore, the distinction between CA and RA is that CA is anxiety experienced as result of sending information, and RA is anxiety experienced as a result of receiving or processing information.

After Wheeless determined that RA was a separate construct from CA, he developed the Receiver Apprehension Test (RAT) by revising several items on the
PRCA, PRCS, and the Test Anxiety Inventory to reflect the receiving dimension of communication apprehension (Wheless, 1975). Since its development in 1975, the RAT has produced valid and reliable results in studies by various researchers (McDowell & McDowell, 1978; Beatty, 1985; Clark, 1989; Scott & Wheless, 1977). One study found that RA was negatively correlated with adequate information processing capability (Beatty, 1981), which confirms the negative impact it may have on student achievement in the classroom. Scott and Wheless (1977) explain that “students who were highly apprehensive about receiving information did not perform as well on objective measures of achievement and outside class projects as did students exhibiting low levels of receiver apprehension” (p. 249). It is important to note that students participating in Scott’s and Wheless’ (1977) study did not perform as well on outside class projects. Hills (1986) describes education itself as “a communication process between society and the individual” (p. 1). Therefore, one can infer that the negative impact of RA may extend beyond the classroom into the daily lives of students and into society.

Hills (1986) explains that educational communication is “an interaction between individuals transmitting the standards, values and skills of a society” (p. 1). Hills (1986) also notes that “Communication is thus concerned not only with passing information, but also with how an individual receives and processes that information” (p. 89). Because “we spend more of our time as receivers than as sources” (Wheless, 1975, p. 261), it is important to understand more about how receiver apprehension operates in specific contexts. Receiver apprehension is vital to information processing and it is important to know how RA impacts students in the classroom. Since 53 to 90 percent of classroom communication time is spent listening (Cooper, 1995), it is important to understand not
only how RA operates in this context, but also how listening style functions in the classroom environment.

To date there are no published studies yielding information about how listening styles operate in the classroom. However, one can infer that each student brings a distinct listening style in the classroom. Listening style has been divided into four categories of listening preferences. These categories are people-, content-, action- and time-oriented styles and are operationalized by the Listening Styles Profile (LSP-16) (Watson, Barker, & Weaver, 1995). A study conducted after the development of the LSP-16 also determined the validity of the instrument (Watson, Barker, & Weaver, 1995). The reliability of the LSP-16 has also been determined as it has been used in multiple studies (Watson, Barker, & Weaver, 1995; Weaver & Kirtly, 1995; Sargent, Fitch-Hauser, & Weaver, 1997). A more detailed explanation of the four listening styles is addressed in the literature review.

The purpose of this study is to determine the relationship between receiver apprehension and listening style in the context of the college classroom, specifically in the basic communication course students at Indiana University-Purdue University at Indianapolis (IUPUI). Numerous studies have been published about anxiety-related constructs that are communication based. McCroskey (1984) explains, “For over fifty years, communication avoidance, anxiety, and fear have constituted a major concern of social scientists studying communication. In fact, this area represents the oldest continuing effort in the field of communication” (p. 1). Basic communication course students who experience high CA tend to avoid enrolling in communication courses, which could help them gain the experience necessary to reduce their anxiety (Lucas,
2001). This is unfortunate because high CA students “will not be as successful as their low or moderately apprehensive counterparts” (Bourhis & Berquist, 1990, p. 27).

Similarly, RA has been associated with low student achievement (Scott & Wheeless, 1977).

The desire to avoid communication courses presents a problem for students who attend universities such as IUPUI where the basic communication course is a requirement for all undergraduates. Since anxiety plays such a significant role in the communication classroom, it is important to explore the relationship between RA and listening style in this context. However, the benefits this research may yield are not limited to communication students because information processing capability and listening styles are not discipline specific.

Therefore, four hypotheses will be tested:

H1: Students who score high in the people-oriented listening style on the LSP-16 will score high on the RAT.

H2: Students who score high in the content-oriented listening style on the LSP-16 will score low on the RAT.

H3: Students who score high in the action-oriented listening style on the LSP-16 will score high on the RAT.

H4: Students who score high in the time-oriented listening style on the LSP-16 will score low on the RAT.
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REVIEW OF LITERATURE

This study seeks to explore the relationship between receiver apprehension and listening style in the context of the college communication course classroom. The material reviewed in preparation for this study includes literature about listening in the classroom, receiver apprehension in the classroom, listening styles in the classroom and basic communication course students.

Listening in the Classroom

Though no universal definition of listening has been accepted by researchers in the field, the International Listening Association (1996), defines listening as “the process of receiving, constructing meaning from, and responding to spoken and/or nonverbal messages” (p. 1). Glenn (1989) conducted a content analysis of fifty separate definitions of the listening construct used as paradigms for research in the field and discovered that 72% of these definitions include interpreting, 64% include perceiving and receiving, 44% include attending, and 32% include responding. These four concepts alone include both behavioral and cognitive attributes and suggests that there is a significant level of agreement among scholars as to what listening involves, though no one definition has been universally accepted.
McKenzie and Clark (1995) propose a “reflexive” (p. 35) model of listening and also emphasize the importance of cognitive and behavioral attributes. McKenzie’s and Clark’s (1995) model suggests two particular paradigms for conducting research that include an “organismic” (biological/cognitive) model and an “interactionist” (context/behavioral) model (p. 35). The organismic model focuses on cognitive aspects of listening including “hearing, cognition, schema, memory, self-understanding, traits, perception, comprehension, and motivation” (p. 35). The interactionist model includes behavioral aspects of listening including “meaning, management, skills, context, socialization, attending, responding, performance, and functions” (p. 35). It is important to note that these behavioral and cognitive attributes are both associated with information processing, which is extremely important in the classroom setting. Cooper (1995) states that “In the classroom, listening is the main channel of instruction” (p. 39). Listening is the primary method for knowledge acquisition, language development, enhancing our communication ability and for increasing “our understanding of ourselves and others. Listening, then, is an important skill to develop because we cannot be effective in our relationships or our professions without it” (Cooper, 1995, p. 39).

Wolff, Marsnik, Tracey, & Nichols (1983) explain, “Humans listen before they speak, speak before they read, and read before they write” (p. 24). Listening provides the foundation for both oral and written communication skills yet it is taught the least in our educational system (Adler and Rodman, 2000). One can infer that listening is taught less in the classroom because it is an internal process that is not externally observable. Additionally, it could be that no one has taught educators how to teach listening (Gilbert, 1988).
Regardless of the reasons listening is not emphasized in the majority of curricula, it is a skill that can be learned and sharpened. A pioneer in the field of listening, Ralph G. Nichols, (1957) explains “Listening is a collection of identifiable skills. It can be improved through training and practice just as are reading, writing, and speaking” (p. 3). Cooper (1995) states, “Preparing students to be successful in-class listeners provides clear motivation for student learning and an opportunity for immediate and relevant application” (p. 46). O’Hair, O’Hair, and Woodena (1988) conducted a study regarding enhancing listening skills as a prerequisite to improve study skills. They confirmed that over a two-month period, 85% of the students who participated reported actual improvement in their listening skills (O’Hair, O’Hair, & Wooden, 1988). These same students also reported “good listening skills were extremely vital not only in the classroom, but also in everyday life” (O’Hair, O’Hair, & Wooden, 1988, p. 120). This study supports the inference that teaching effective listening skills in the classroom increases listening comprehension and that the benefits of doing so extend beyond the classroom.

**Receiver Apprehension in the Classroom**

Moreover, a study conducted by Fitch-Hauser, Barker, and Hughes (1990) confirmed that a linear relationship exists between listening comprehension and receiver apprehension when listening comprehension was measured by the Brown-Carlsen Listening Test. Therefore, the higher the receiver apprehension score, the higher the probability exists that students will not possess adequate listening comprehension.
As stated earlier, receiver apprehension is defined as "...the fear of misinterpreting, inadequately processing, and/or not being able to adjust psychologically to messages sent by others" (Wheeless, 1975, p. 263). In one study, Wheeless (1975) determined that receiver apprehension was a separate dimension of communication apprehension and the Receiver Apprehension Test (RAT) was developed to determine "how various people feel about receiving communication" (p. 265). Wheeless was motivated to study receiver apprehension as a separate aspect of communication apprehension because "we spend more of our time as receivers than sources" (p. 261).

Receiver apprehensive students "do less well academically" and "have difficulty taking notes" (Cooper, 1995, p. 255). Cooper (1995) also notes that receiver apprehensive students have difficulty understanding conversations, which affects their ability to engage in successful interpersonal communication in the classroom.

Additionally, according to Beatty and Payne (1981), an individual with cognitive complexity processes information with "greater ease and 'flexibility'" rather than "cognitively simpler ones" (p. 365). In a college classroom, the ability to quickly process complex information is vital for comprehension of higher order content. Fitch-Hauser and Hughes (1988) assert that "listening and cognitive processing are inexorably linked" (p. 76) and add that, "human information processing is somehow an integral part of the receiving dimension of communication" (p. 76). How these phenomena operate in the classroom setting is of extreme importance if educators are to take a proactive approach to reduce the anxiety of students and increase overall listening effectiveness.

An additional study by Beatty (1981) asserts that receiver apprehension is associated with cognitive backlog. Cognitive backlog is defined as "a function of
continued and persistent inputs of information which is either difficult to assimilate into existing attitude structures or is input at an unmanageable rate” (Beatty, 1981, p. 277). Beatty’s (1981) study found that there was a “significant positive correlation between magnitude of cognitive backlog and receiver apprehension” (p. 280). Consequently, it is likely that when a student experiences cognitive backlog, inadequately processed information negatively impacts student success. The success of any student is linked to adequately processing information. Chesebro and McCroskey (1998) explain, “Findings that receiver apprehension is related to reduced information processing effectiveness are relevant to the instructional context” (p. 2). The same study by Chesebro and McCroskey (1998) states, “the research on receiver apprehension implies that apprehensive receivers listen in different ways than non-apprehensive receivers” (p. 2). The cumulative literature about receiver apprehension supports the notion that there may be a link between RA and listening style.

Listening Style in the Classroom

Each student brings a distinct listening style into the classroom. The Listening Styles Profile (LSP-16), developed by Watson, Barker, & Weaver (1995), is a sixteen-item self-report test that determines how individuals prefer to listen. These listening styles were developed by “Conceptualizing listening preferences as attitudes, beliefs, and predispositions about the how, where, when, who and what of information reception and encoding” (Sargent, Fitch-Hauser, & Weaver, 1997, p. 2). The LSP-16 categorizes listening styles in four areas: people-, action-, content-, and time-oriented styles.
Individuals who prefer the people-oriented listening style are concerned with the feelings of others and "tried to find areas of common interests with others and respond empathetically to them" (Watson, Barker, & Weaver, 1995, p. 3). Individuals who score high in the content-oriented style prefer to receive "challenging or complex information" (Watson, Barker, & Weaver, 1995, p. 3) and individuals who score high in the action-oriented style prefer to receive "error free presentations" and become "easily frustrated when listening to a disorganized presentation" (Watson, Barker, & Weaver, 1995, p. 3). The fourth style is the time-oriented style. Time-oriented listeners are known for their "brief or hurried interactions with others" and "let others know how much time they have to listen" (Watson, Barker, & Weaver, 1995, p. 3).

Listening styles also include a relational element. For example, a study conducted by Weaver and Kirtley (1995) explored the relationship between listening styles and empathy. Though the relationship between listening styles and empathy was not statistically significant, Weaver noted that people-oriented style listeners tend to be "sympathetic but not empathetic with regard to another in an aversive situation" (p. 7). Weaver and Kirtley (1995) conclude that "the results of this investigation highlight the different aspects of empathy typically associated with the people, action, content, and time listening styles" (p. 7). Since some of the attributes of the four listening styles are linked to how individuals relate to one another, exploring the relationship between receiver apprehension and listening style could yield positive interpersonal communication benefits both inside and outside of the classroom.
Basic Communication Course Students

Researchers in the field of communication have been searching for ways to reduce student anxiety for decades (Bourhis & Allen, 1992). A study conducted by Brooks and Platz (1968) suggests that just participating in public speaking courses may reduce anxiety for some students. Basic communication course students provide the ideal population for this study because numerous anxiety-related studies have been conducted using them as a sample population. For example, basic course students have been used as a sample population for studies about public speaking anxiety (CA) (Behake & Sawyer, 1999; Scott & Wheeless, 1977), classroom apprehension (Neer, 1990), and receiver apprehension (Scott & Wheeless, 1977; McDowell & McDowell, 1978).

One can infer that communication apprehensive, basic communication course students are likely to experience RA associated with psychologically difficult messages, as a result of the instructor explaining public speaking assignments. Schumacher and Wheeless (1997) support this inference by stating, “if an interactant is a highly trait-receiver apprehensive and enters a particular situation that is already known to cause apprehension, then the level of state-receiver apprehension might actually intensify or magnify” (p. 5). Therefore, the relationship between CA and RA cannot be ignored.

It is imperative that educators comprehend and attempt to reduce the anxiety students encounter in the classroom if students are to succeed in an academic environment. To gain a better understanding of anxiety in the classroom, the relationship between receiver apprehension and listening styles were closely examined in the context of the basic communication classroom at IUPUI.
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METHODS

The Basic Course at IUPUI

All undergraduate students at Indiana University-Purdue University at Indianapolis (IUPUI) are required to enroll in Communication R110, a basic communication course. Communication R110 includes teaching basic communication theory (which includes a chapter about listening), ethics, critical thinking, audience analysis, and public speaking (informative and persuasive). This requirement alone may produce anxiety in some students. Behrke and Sawyer (1999) note that anxiety related to public speaking is "highest during the anticipatory period, before speaking begins" (p. 165).

Sample

A convenience sample composed of students enrolled in Communication R110, the basic communication course, at IUPUI during the Summer, 2001 session was obtained for this exploratory study. Approximately 10 sections of Communication R110 are offered in the spring and fall semesters at IUPUI. Each section is comprised of approximately 25 students, yielding a total population of 250 students. A sample size of
was obtained for this study. These students were asked to voluntarily participate in this study without receiving any inducement to do so.

Data was collected using two, self-report instruments: the Receiver Apprehension Test (RAT) (Appendix A) and the Listening Styles Profile (LSP-16) (Appendix B). The researcher contacted instructors of Communication R110 to solicit their students' participation in this study. The researcher administered these self-report items to students in these courses. Students were informed that participation in this study was strictly voluntary and that there were no repercussions for non-participation. Students were also informed that if any psychological discomfort was experienced as a result of completing the self-report instruments, participation in the study could be terminated at students' discretion without penalty. A sample of the instructions read to students before self-report instruments were completed is located in Appendix C.

The researcher also asked students to note the following on the self-report instruments: first-generation college student status (yes/no), their class level (freshman, sophomore, junior or senior), gender, age, and ethnicity. The researcher collected this data to look for trends associated with RA and listening style. The sample consisted of \( N=96 \) after incomplete self-report instruments were deleted from the study. Ages of the participants ranged from 17 to 49 years of age.

**Data Collection**

Students recorded their own responses to these pencil and paper based, self-report instruments, but raw scores were manually tabulated by the researcher. The RAT and the LSP-16 were stapled together so that each RAT score and listening style could be input
into a Microsoft Excel spreadsheet and analyzed for correlations using the Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient (Pearson r) method. The researcher also analyzed the data for trends among gender, ethnicity, age, class, and first-generation status among students by observing percentages of the population in each demographic category.

Data Analysis

The purpose of this study was to analyze the strength of association between receiver apprehension and listening styles within the context basic communication course classroom at IUPUI. The Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient (Pearson r) is the most widely utilized correlation coefficient when analyzing two sets of quantitative data (Patten, 1997; Levine, Berenson, & Stephan, 1998) and was employed for this study. The level of statistical significance was set at \( p < .05 \) for this study because this has served as the “agreed-upon maximum of erroneous inference for some time” (Bowers & Courtwright, 1984).

Raw scores were recorded for the RAT and the LSP-16. Receiver apprehensive individuals had raw scores of 62 or higher (Cooper, 1995). The raw scores from the Receiver Apprehension Test (RAT) and the Listening Styles Profile (LSP-16) were input into Microsoft Excel software by the researcher and a Pearson r for the RAT and each of the four listening styles was calculated by the software.

Of the 99 self-report instruments collected for this study, three of the instruments were discarded due to incomplete data. Out of the total 96 \( N=96 \) completed self-report
instruments, five individuals had the same score for more than one of the four listening styles.

The purpose of this study was to determine the nature of the relationship between RA (the independent variable) and the action-, content-, people-, and time-oriented listening styles (the dependent variables). A Pearson $r$ was computed for RA and each one of the four listening styles to determine the strength of the relationship between RA scores and listening style scores. According to Levine, Berenson, and Stephan (1998), correlation analysis seeks to measure the "degree of association between two variables" (p. 557).
RESULTS

A Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient (Pearson r) was calculated for the scores from the Receiver Apprehension Test (RAT) and each of the four listening styles as reported on the Listening Styles Profile (LSP-16). A raw score of 62 and above was the baseline for receiver apprehension (Cooper, 1995).

The following hypotheses were tested for this study:

H1: Students who score high in the people-oriented listening style on the LSP-16 will score high on the RAT.

H2: Students who score high in the content-oriented listening style on the LSP-16 will score low on the RAT.

H3: Students who score high in the action-oriented listening style on the LSP-16 will score high on the RAT.

H4: Students who score high in the time-oriented listening style on the LSP-16 will score low on the RAT.

According to Bowers’ and Courtwright’s (1984) table of “Critical Values for the Pearson r” (p. 351), based on a sample size of 100, a correlation coefficient must be .1946 or greater to be statistically significant when the level of significance is set at (p<.05). This table was used to determine statistical significance for this study.

Results of the Pearson r calculated for RAT scores above 62 and people-oriented listening style revealed that no relationship (0.063883627) exists between these two
variables. Therefore, the null hypothesis is accepted and H1 was not supported in this study. The correlation coefficient calculated for the RAT scores above 62 and the content-oriented listening style (-0.810158175) revealed that no relationship exists between these two variables. Again, the null hypothesis is accepted and H2 is not supported in this study. The Pearson r calculated for RAT scores above 62 and the action-oriented listening style revealed an indirect or negative relationship between these two variables (-1.00) and therefore, H3 is not supported in this study. Due to limited sample size, a Pearson r could not be calculated for RAT scores above 62 and the time-oriented listening style. Only one participant rated time-oriented style as the predominant listening style. Therefore, the findings for H4 are inconclusive.

Since no provision is made for scoring combined listening style preferences, a correlation coefficient could not be calculated for the five individuals who scored above 62 on the RAT and had two or more listening style preferences.
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DISCUSSION

The purpose of this study was to determine the relationship between Receiver Apprehension (RA) and listening style in the context of the basic communication course classroom at Indiana University-Purdue University at Indianapolis (IUPUI). In this chapter, the tested hypotheses and rationale for them will be discussed, the demographic data and observed trends will be explained, the limitations of this study will be discussed, and finally the implications for future research will be discussed. The sampling error rate for this study was plus or minus 5 percentage points based on a population of 250 and a sample size of \( N=96 \).

Four hypotheses were tested to determine the relationship between RA and listening style. The rationale for H1 is that the people-oriented listening style deals directly with how individuals relate to one another. The researcher believed that because of this relational element, the people-oriented style would be more likely to be receiver apprehensive because RA also includes a relational element (Wheless, 1975). The results of this study indicate that H1 was not supported and therefore the null hypothesis was accepted.

Hypothesis 2 (H2) indicates that individuals who score high in the content-oriented listening style should score low on the RAT. The rationale for this hypothesis is
that content-oriented listeners prefer to receive challenging or complex information (Watson, Barker, & Weaver, 1995) and cognitive complexity has been negatively correlated with RA (Beatty, 1981). However, H2 was not supported by this study and the null hypothesis was accepted.

Action-oriented listeners become frustrated when presentations are disorganized (Watson, Barker, & Weaver, 1995). The rationale for this hypothesis is that teacher clarity has been associated with reducing state-receiver apprehension (Chesebro & McCroskey, 1998). In other words, the more clear and organized manner in which the information is presented, the less likely receiver apprehension is to occur in the context of the classroom. The correlation coefficient calculated for H3 indicated an indirect or negative relationship and therefore, H3 was not supported by this study.

The results of H4 are inconclusive. Only one participant in this study indicated a preference for the time-oriented listening style. Because of this limitation, no correlation coefficient could be calculated rendering the findings inconclusive.

Demographic data was collected for this study to see if any trends could be observed with relation to age, ethnicity, class standing, gender, and first-generation college student status. Significant demographic trends observed from the data will be discussed in relation to RAT scores above 62 and each of the four listening styles.

Of the participants who scored high in the people-oriented listening style and scored above 62 on the RAT, 49% were male and 51% were female. Sixty-seven percent were between the ages of 18-25. Forty-four percent of the participants in this listening style indicated first-generation college student status. The ethnic breakdown for the people-oriented listening style and high RAT score is 74% Caucasian, 5% Hispanic, 3%
African-American, 3% Asian, 5% Aggregate and 10% did not indicate ethnicity.

Freshman comprise 26% of this category while sophomores comprise 28% of people-oriented listening style, receiver apprehensives. It is important to note the high percentages of individuals in the 18-25 age category, the Freshman and Sophomore category, and the first-generation college student status category. Though there are limitations to this research, one can infer from these high numbers that younger individuals who are first-generation college students may be more likely to be receiver apprehensive.

The content-, action-, and time-oriented style demographic data with RAT scores above 62 shows no significant trends. The findings from this demographic data are inconclusive. It is important to note that of the total number of participants in this study (N=96), 85% indicate a preference for the people-oriented listening style.

The limitations of this study cannot be ignored. Since a convenience sample was used, the reliability and validity of this research is limited. Employing a random sample at multiple sites would not only increase the reliability and validity of the study, but also may produce significant findings. Additionally, it should be noted that no provision is made for scoring two or more listening style preferences on the LSP-16. Though initial research during the development of the instrument shows that 40% of the sample indicated a preference for two or more listening styles (Watson, Barker, & Weaver, 1995), no instructions for combined scoring are provided with the instrument.

Though this research yields no significant findings with regard to the relationship between RA and listening style preferences, it is important for research to continue in an effort to reduce RA in the context of the college classroom.
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APPENDIX A

The Receiver Apprehension Test (RAT)

The following statements refer to how various people feel about receiving communication. Indicate how much these statements relate to how you feel by marking whether you (1) strongly disagree, (2) disagree, (3) are undecided, (4) agree, or (5) strongly agree. Please record your first impression. There are no right or wrong answers.

_____ 1. When listening to people in authority I always find it easy to put together exactly what was said.

_____ 2. I occasionally have difficulty listening in a group discussion because I am worried about adjusting and adapting to the ideas.

_____ 3. I sometimes have difficulty concentrating on what others are saying.

_____ 4. I find it easy to concentrate on what is being said.

_____ 5. At times I have difficulty concentrating on instructions others give me.

_____ 6. It is sometimes difficult for me to make sense out of what others are saying.

_____ 7. I sometimes feel uncomfortable when listening to others' ideas.

_____ 8. I almost never have difficulty understanding test items that I have to read.

_____ 9. It is at times hard to listen or focus on what other people are saying unless I know them well.

_____ 10. At times I feel tense when listening as a member of a social gathering.

_____ 11. Receiving new information sometimes makes me somewhat afraid.

_____ 12. I have no fear of misunderstanding what I read.

_____ 13. My thoughts occasionally become confused and jumbled when reading important information.

_____ 14. I am sometimes afraid that I will misread instructions.

_____ 15. I have no fear of listening and adjusting to others' views.

_____ 16. I am sometimes afraid that I will not completely understand what is said.

APPENDIX B

Listening Styles Profile-16

Indicate how much these statements relate to how you using the following scale: "Always" (4), "Frequently" (3), "Sometimes" (2), "Infrequently" (1), and "Never" (0). Record your first impression. There are no right or wrong answers.

_____ 1. I focus my attention on the person's feelings when listening to them.

_____ 2. I am frustrated when others don't present their ideas in an orderly, efficient way.

_____ 3. I prefer to listen to technical information.

_____ 4. When hurried, I let the other person(s) know that I have a limited amount of time to listen.

_____ 5. When listening to others, I quickly notice if they are pleased or disappointed.

_____ 6. When listening to others, I focus on any inconsistencies and/or errors in what's being said.

_____ 7. I prefer to hear facts as evidence so I can personally evaluate them.

_____ 8. I begin a discussion by telling others how long I have to meet.

_____ 9. I become involved when listening to the problems of others.

_____ 10. I jump ahead and/or finish thoughts of speakers.

_____ 11. I like the challenge of listening to complex information.

_____ 12. I interrupt others when I feel time pressure.

_____ 13. I nod my head and/or use eye contact to show interest in what others are saying.


_____ 15. I ask questions to probe for additional information.

_____ 16. I look at my watch or clocks in the room when I have limited time to listen to others.

---

APPENDIX C

The following instructions were read to participants before completed the two self-report instruments (RAT and LSP-16) used for data collection in this study.

I am nearing completion of a master's degree at Indiana State University and would like to have your participation in a study, which will help me complete my master's thesis. I am requesting that you fill out two self-report instruments which will take approximately 10 to 15 minutes for completion of both. Before I administer these instruments, I need to inform you of the following:

1. Participation in this study is strictly voluntary. No compensation will be provided to you by the researcher for your participation. Non-participation has no effect on your grade. If at any time you experience psychological discomfort as a result of the questions on the self-report items, your participation may be terminated without penalty or repercussion.

2. If you do decide to participate, please fill out both self-report instruments completely. Incomplete instruments cannot be used in this study. Please provide your gender, age, ethnicity, class (Freshman, Sophomore, Junior, Senior), and first-generation college student status (yes/no).

3. Please do not put any personal identifiers on these instruments, such as your name or social security number. These items are for this study only and will not be traced back to you in any way nor used for other purposes.

Thank you for your time, participation, and cooperation. Voluntary participation in studies such as this helps researchers understand more about human communication.
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