

2006

## Communication organizational orientations in an instructional setting

David Tibbles  
*West Virginia University*

Follow this and additional works at: <https://researchrepository.wvu.edu/etd>

---

### Recommended Citation

Tibbles, David, "Communication organizational orientations in an instructional setting" (2006). *Graduate Theses, Dissertations, and Problem Reports*. 792.  
<https://researchrepository.wvu.edu/etd/792>

This Thesis is protected by copyright and/or related rights. It has been brought to you by the The Research Repository @ WVU with permission from the rights-holder(s). You are free to use this Thesis in any way that is permitted by the copyright and related rights legislation that applies to your use. For other uses you must obtain permission from the rights-holder(s) directly, unless additional rights are indicated by a Creative Commons license in the record and/ or on the work itself. This Thesis has been accepted for inclusion in WVU Graduate Theses, Dissertations, and Problem Reports collection by an authorized administrator of The Research Repository @ WVU. For more information, please contact [researchrepository@mail.wvu.edu](mailto:researchrepository@mail.wvu.edu).

Communication Organizational Orientations in an Instructional Setting

David Tibbles

Thesis submitted to the College of Arts and Sciences at West Virginia University in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

Master of Arts

in

Communication Studies

Virginia P. Richmond, Ph.D., Chair

James C. McCroskey, Ed.D.

Keith Weber, Ed.D.

Department of Communication Studies

Morgantown, West Virginia

2006

Key Words: Student Orientation, Teacher Credibility, Nonverbal Immediacy, Motivation, Affective Learning, Cognitive Learning

## ABSTRACT

### Communication Organizational Orientations in an Instructional Setting David Tibbles

This study sought to determine if the organizational orientations of upward mobility, ambivalence, and indifference applied to students in the instructional setting. The McCroskey, Richmond, Johnson, and Smith (2004) *Organizational Orientation Measure* was adapted to a classroom setting to measure student orientations, and then the relationships between student orientations and student perceptions of teacher credibility, teacher nonverbal immediacy, student trait motivation, student state motivation, student beliefs and attitudes toward college, student affective learning, and student cognitive learning. Results indicate upward mobility had significant positive correlations with the dependent variables except cognitive learning while ambivalent and indifferent orientations had significant negative correlations with the dependent variables except cognitive learning.

#### Thanks and Dedications:

A special thanks to the members of my committee, Dr. Richmond, Dr. McCroskey, and Dr. Weber, for the support throughout this project and throughout this year. Thank you to the doctorate students who helped me brainstorm and debate the initial ideas of this research project, as well as the masters students who allowed me to run ideas through them. Thanks to Dr. Roy Schwartzman and Pat Johnson, who without their mentoring during my undergraduate years, I probably never would have attempted the rigorous research degree and this project here at West Virginia University. And a final thanks to my parents, who have always stood behind me. I dedicate this research to all the people who helped me reach this goal as well as to those who may find value and use of the findings in this project.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

Title Page	i
Abstract	ii
Thanks and Dedications	ii
Table of Contents	iii
Chapter 1- Introduction	1
Chapter 2- Literature Review	2
Organizational Orientations	2
Upward Mobile	2
Indifferent	3
Ambivalent	3
Nonverbal Immediacy	4
Credibility	5
Motivation	6
Chapter 3- Rationale	6
Research Questions and Hypotheses	7
Chapter 4- Method	11
Participants	11
Procedures and Instrumentation	11
Chapter 5- Results	15
Post hoc Analyses	17
Chapter 6- Discussion	18
References	27
Appendix A- Correlation Table	32
Appendix B- Measurements	34
Appendix C- Student Orientation Factor Loadings	41
Tibbles' Curriculum Vitae	45

# Communication Organizational Orientations in an Instructional Setting

## CHAPTER 1

### Introduction

Work is a necessary component of American society. However, when confronting work, people do not necessarily approach work in the same manner (McCroskey, Richmond, Johnson, & Smith, 2004). For some, the stereotypical American dream may be to become a well-known multi-millionaire, while others may view the American dream as having the finances to raise a family (Richmond, McCroskey, & McCroskey, 2005). How people approach work may impact how they behave inside that situation. For example, people determine which type of job would be desirable based upon their degree of communication apprehension (Daly & McCroskey, 1975; McCroskey & Richmond, 1976). Communication scholars have similarly found the work orientation of an individual can influence the behavior of the individual in the workplace (Goodboy and McCroskey, 2004; McCroskey et al., 2004; Presthus, 1958; Pruden, 1973 Richmond et al., 2005).

Frymier, Shulman, and Houser (1996) used an organizational conceptualization of empowerment in the instructional setting based on the assumptions that motivation is a major factor in both the supervisor/subordinate relationship and the teacher/student relationship. Similarly, students' orientations may play a similar role in affecting their behaviors and perceptions of their teachers as the effects of workers' orientations. While adults' behaviors at work are influenced by their orientation toward work, similarly students' behaviors may be influenced by their orientations toward school. Students have the opportunity to become the best student by receiving the highest grades in the most difficult classes and become the "go to" student in various activities and school organizations. However, some students may just want the

piece of paper at the end of their respective school career. The purpose of this research project is to determine if students exhibit orientations affecting the students' perceptions and behaviors in the classroom.

## CHAPTER 2

### Literature Review

#### *Organizational Orientations*

Presthus (1958) forwarded a theory of organizational orientations, which describes the characteristics of employees to work and function in an organization. The theory proposes three organizational orientations: (a) upward-mobile, (b) indifferent, and (c) ambivalent. While Presthus originally believed organizational culture to be the basis of the orientations, current research now believes the orientations are based on the personality of the individual and consistent regardless of the organization (Presthus, 1978c; Richmond et al., 2005). The theory has received some empirical support (McCroskey et al., 2004; Presthus, 1958; Pruden, 1973). Pruden's (1973) research using satisfaction, career anchorage, alienation, cosmopolitanism, and organizational rank supported the idea that the three orientations are separate constructs.

*Upward-mobile.* Presthus (1978c) describes upward-mobiles as rule and procedure oriented individuals who want to achieve and identify with the organization's goals and work hard to achieve the organization's goals. Upward-mobiles see the organization's authority and policies as legitimate, have high loyalty, and tend not to question the organizations rules and decisions. Upward-mobiles want to succeed in an organization, and advance in the hierarchy of the organization's structure. Upward-mobiles will cultivate work relationships in order to advance in the organization. McCroskey et al. (2004) found upward-mobility to be positively correlated with job satisfaction, self reported immediacy, assertiveness, all three of the credibility

factors (competence, trustworthiness, and goodwill), and extroversion. They found upward-mobility to be negatively correlated with psychoticism and neuroticism. Goodboy and McCroskey (2004) found upward-mobility was positively related to self-reported immediacy and job satisfaction, while being negatively related to ambivalence.

*Indifferent.* Presthus (1978b) describes indifferent individuals as persons who view their lives as separate from work. Indifferent individuals see their relationship with the organization as a business exchange where the organization receives a set amount of time of labor in exchange for a paycheck. Presthus theory proposes indifferent individuals have low identification with the goals of the organization and low loyalty to the organization. Being indifferent is not necessarily negative, in fact, a large proportion of people are indifferent individuals (Richmond et al, 2005). The main identifiable characteristics of indifferent individuals are they do not identify with the organization and work to obtain the financial resources to make a positive life for themselves and their families. Richmond et al. (2005) indicate the characteristics of the indifferent individual as someone who works to live rather lives to work (p. 86). McCroskey et al. (2004) found indifference to be negatively correlated with job satisfaction, assertiveness, and all three of the credibility factors (competence, trustworthiness, and goodwill), and indifference is positively related to psychoticism and neuroticism. Goodboy and McCroskey (2004) found indifference was positively related to Machiavellianism and ambivalence, and indifference was negatively related to immediacy, job satisfaction.

*Ambivalent.* Presthus (1978a) describes ambivalent individuals as introverts who do not adapt well to organizations. Presthus notes ambivalent individuals are generally intelligent, cosmopolitan, and generally specialize in a specific area. These individuals look negatively upon top down authority, and often express complaints against the organizational structure, rules, and

operations. Presthus argues these individuals have value because while the upward-mobile accept the organization's status quo and the indifferent blindly follow the organization's status quo, the ambivalent will continue to critique the organization's policies, rules, regulations, and operating procedures. McCroskey et al. (2004) found that ambivalence is negatively associated with job satisfaction, self-perceived immediate behaviors, responsiveness, extroversion, and all three credibility factors (competence, trustworthiness, and goodwill), and ambivalence is positively associated with neuroticism and psychoticism. Goodboy and McCroskey (2004) found ambivalence was positively related to Machiavellianism, and ambivalence was negatively related to nonverbal immediacy and ambivalence.

### *Nonverbal Immediacy*

The immediacy principle is "People are drawn toward persons and things they like, evaluate highly, and prefer; and they avoid or move away from things they dislike, evaluate negatively, or do not prefer" (Mehrabian, 1971, p. 1; Richmond & McCroskey, 2000). Teachers' use of nonverbal immediacy has shown to be consistently related to students' affective learning (Allen & Shaw, 1990; Plax, Kearney, McCroskey, & Richmond, 1986), affect toward instructor (Allen & Shaw, 1990; Chesebro & McCroskey, 2001), affect for the course (Chesebro & McCroskey, 2001), behavioral commitment (Allen & Shaw, 1990), state motivation (Chesebro and McCroskey, 2001; Christensen & Menzel, 1998; Christophel, 1990; Christophel & Gorham, 1995; Frymier & Shulman, 1995; Richmond, 1990), and perceived cognitive learning (Chesebro & McCroskey, 2001). Teachers' use of nonverbal immediacy has also been shown to influence the amount of contact, length of contact, and satisfaction of communication students have with teachers outside of the classroom (Jaasma and Koper 1999; Knapp and Martin, 1996).

In an organizational context, Richmond and McCroskey (2000) found employees' use of immediate behaviors and their supervisors' immediate behaviors were reciprocated. Supervisors' use of immediate behaviors was positively correlated with all three dimensions of perceived supervisor credibility (competence, trustworthiness, and goodwill), social attraction, task attraction, and a positive attitude toward their supervisor.

### *Credibility*

Source credibility is the degree a person perceives a message source being seen as competent, trustworthy, and having goodwill (McCroskey & Teven, 1999). Competence is the degree the source is perceived as being an expert and having high qualifications in the subject matter, trustworthiness is the degree a person is perceived as having character and being honest, and goodwill is the degree the source is perceived as having positive intent toward the receiver (McCroskey & Teven, 1999, p. 90). Only when a person is viewed as having credibility will the person influence the views of the audience (McCroskey, 1971). The teacher, as a sender of knowledge has been found to be an influential variable in the cognitive and affective learning process (Thweatt, & McCroskey, 1998) in part by increasing recall (Wheless, 1975), and competency and caring influenced future message selection affect for content (Wheless, 1974). Frymier and Thompson (1992) examined the correlations of credibility factors to teacher's use of affinity seeking strategies. Among the correlations, nonverbal immediacy was positively correlated with both competence and caring.

In an organizational setting, Falcione, McCroskey, and Daly (1977) found subordinates' perception of supervisors' competence and character was positively correlated with subordinate satisfaction of the supervisor, satisfaction with work, satisfaction with promotions, and satisfaction with co-workers. McCroskey and Richmond, (2000) found competence was

positively correlated with supervisor assertiveness and responsiveness, and subordinate responsiveness. Trustworthiness was positively correlated with supervisor assertiveness and responsiveness and subordinate assertiveness and responsiveness. Goodwill was positively correlated with supervisor responsiveness and subordinate responsiveness.

### *Motivation*

While trait motivation has a baseline effect on student motivation, Richmond, Lane, and McCroskey (2006) summarize the current view of student motivation as students learning the content they want to learn when they want to learn the content. As stated above, state motivation is positively correlated with teachers' use of immediacy behaviors (Chesebro and McCroskey, 2001; Christensen & Menzel, 1998; Christophel, 1990; Christophel & Gorham, 1995; Frymier & Shulman, 1995; Richmond, 1990).

## CHAPTER 3

### Rationale

Organizational orientations theory was designed to help explain how people perceive and accommodate the culture of a work environment (Presthus, 1978c). The theory explains why people react to their supervisor or fellow employees a certain way. Once a person's orientation is identified, the theory can predict how that person may react and accommodate future interactions (Presthus, 1978a; 1978b; 1978c). In this respect, organizational orientations are the foundation on which an individual's behaviors and motivations in an organization are founded. Applying organizational orientation theory to the educational setting is fruitful because communication scholars will have a better understanding of how students view school, react to their perceived role, and potentially behave in the working world.

Furthermore, an educational setting may help provide means to a deeper understanding of organizational orientations. In the working world, if an employee does not work well with the organization (e.g. the ambivalent worker), then the employee can either be fired, transferred, or quit and find a new job. However, when a student and a teacher have difficulties adapting in the educational organization, the individuals must survive together until the end of the semester. Even when the semester is over, if neither the student nor the teacher leaves the organization, the likelihood of the two people communicating in the instructional setting again are high (e.g. advisor/advisee relationship; membership to the same department; teacher teaches other required courses). The teacher's communication toward the student in these future interactions may be influenced by the teacher's perceptions of the student's orientation.

#### *Research questions and hypotheses*

The purpose of this study was to determine if students exhibit organizational orientations in the school environment and if so how these orientations affect the perspectives and behaviors of the student. The fundamental question to be tested in this research regards the validity of the modified Organizational Orientation Scale (OOS) in the instructional setting. Because previous research has found upward mobiles to be negatively related to ambivalent and indifferent, and indifferent and ambivalent to be positively related in the work setting, the orientations in the modified OOS should generate similar correlations. Therefore, the following hypotheses are posited:

H1: The upward mobile orientation will be negatively correlated with the ambivalent and indifferent orientation.

H2: Indifferent and ambivalent orientations will be positively correlated.

Organizational orientations have been found to influence subordinates' perception of their supervisors' (Goodboy & McCroskey, 2004; McCroskey et al., 2004). In the instructional setting, where the communication has information and persuasion goals, credibility plays an immensely important role (Thweatt & McCroskey, 1998). Because one of the teacher's goals is to inform and persuade content rather than to supervise, the effects of credibility may have larger implications in the classroom than in the workplace. Understanding the relationship between student orientation and perceived credibility is critical. Therefore, the following hypotheses are posited:

H3: The upward mobile orientation will be positively correlated with student perceptions of instructor competence, trustworthiness, and goodwill.

H4: The indifferent and ambivalent orientations will be negatively correlated with student perceptions of instructor competence, trustworthiness, and goodwill.

Prior research has examined how organizational orientations are associated with the nonverbal behaviors of people (Goodboy & McCroskey, 2004; McCroskey et al., 2004). Applying the immediacy principle to the instructional setting, one would predict students use more immediate behaviors in classes they like than in classes they don't like (Mehrabian, 1971). However, applying organizational orientation theory to students, one would predict upward-mobile students would try and find value and affect in all classes regardless of content, and indifferent and ambivalent students would likely be less immediate in class regardless of affect for content. Understanding the relationship between the orientation of the student and the behaviors the student exhibits in class may help explain why students act in certain ways and predict how the students will act in other classes.

Applying the immediacy principle to the instructional setting, one would predict teachers are more immediate to students who are active in the class and give extra effort to learn the content. Of the three student orientations, the upward-mobile student would likely have more favorable perceptions toward the class. The teachers are likely to be more immediate to the students who present more positive views of the class and the class content. Therefore, the following hypotheses are posited:

H5: The upward-mobile orientation will be positively correlated with perceptions of teachers' nonverbal immediacy.

H6: The indifferent and ambivalent orientations will be negatively correlated with perceptions of teachers' nonverbal immediacy.

Frymier and Shulman (1995) describe the frustration teachers have when they are trying to teach students content when the students' state motivation is anywhere but learning the content. As Frymier and Shulman note, teachers can do little regarding outside-the-classroom factors impacting a student's state motivation, but the teacher can control the communication behaviors in the classroom. In order to help teachers address state motivation issues in students, identifying factors which may effect a student's state motivation in every class would help teachers develop activities suited to reach each type of student. Is motivating a student a one-size-fits all endeavor, or perhaps certain activities would better reach a class filled with upward-mobile students while certain activities would better reach ambivalent students or indifferent students? Understanding the individual differences regarding each student and the relationship with motivation could help teachers understand how to teach most effectively. Therefore, the following research question is proposed:

RQ1: What is the relationship between each organizational orientation and trait and state motivation in students?

Organizational orientations have been found to be a factor in work satisfaction (Goodboy & McCroskey, 2004; McCroskey et al., 2004). Organizational orientation theory might help explain why students perceive school either positively or negatively. As previously stated, upward-mobiles try to identify with the rules and goals of the organization (Presthus, 1978c), indifferent individuals do not identify with the organization (Presthus, 1978b) and work for the paycheck (McCroskey et al., 2004), and ambivalent individuals reject the organization (Presthus, 1978a). Understanding how the orientations of students relate to students' perceptions of school and classes may help explain the behaviors students exhibit in school. Therefore, the following hypotheses are posited:

H7: The upward-mobile orientation will be positively correlated with affect for instructor and learning.

H8: The indifferent and ambivalent orientation will be negatively correlated with affect for instructor and learning.

H9: The upward-mobile student will have more positive general and specific attitudes toward school than the indifferent and ambivalent orientations.

Because an ultimate goal in instructional organizations is to pass on learning and help students produce high quality work (Frymier et al., 1996), the following research question is posed:

RQ2: What are the correlations between cognitive learning and the student orientations?

## CHAPTER 4

### Method

#### *Participants*

Participants were 413 (199 men, 208 women, and 6 undisclosed) undergraduate students enrolled in communication courses at a Mid-Atlantic university. Participants' ages ranged from 18 to 42 years with an average age of 20.56 years.

#### *Procedures and Instrumentation*

Using a convenience sample, participants completed the *Student Orientation Measure* (SOM) created from a modified version of the *Organizational Orientations Measure* (OOM) (McCroskey et al., 2004), the *Generalized Belief Measure* (McCroskey & Richmond, 1996) of college being valuable, the *Generalized Attitude Measure* (McCroskey & Richmond, 1996) toward college, the Nonverbal Immediacy Scale-Observer Measure (NIO-O) (Richmond, McCroskey, & Johnson, 2003), the Affective Learning Scale (ALS) (McCroskey, 1994), the Cognitive Learning Measure (Richmond, Gorham, & McCroskey, 1987), the Source Credibility Scale (SCS) (McCroskey & Teven, 1999), Richmond's motivation scale for trait motivation (Richmond, 1990), and Richmond's motivation scale for state motivation (Richmond, 1990). The participants were instructed to complete the OOM, the trait motivation scale, the Generalized Attitude Measure, the Generalized Belief Measure, and the participants were then instructed to complete the NIO-O, the ALS, the SCS, Cognitive Learning Scale, and the state motivation scale regarding the class before last technique (Plax et al., 1986). Appendix B, Measurements, has the items to all scales used in the study.

The *Student Orientations Measure* consists of three sections modified from the *Organizational Orientations Measure* (McCroskey et al., 2004), each section measuring one of

the organizational orientations where respondents answer on a five point Likert type scale (1 = *strongly disagree* to 5 = *strongly agree*). The first section consists of 18 items measuring upward-mobile student orientation. The second section consists of 20 questions measuring the ambivalent student orientation. The third section consists of 12 questions measuring the indifferent student orientation. The scales were modified to reflect an educational view rather than the business world. In order for the scales to reflect an educational section, certain words were substituted for others. The word “work” when used as a general noun was changed to the word “school. The word “work” when used as a specific noun was changed to the word “class” or “classroom.” The word “money” was changed to “grade,” and when the item’s context was geared toward obtaining more money or “easy money,” then the item’s context was modified to reflect obtaining a higher grade or an “easy A.” Appendix A consists of the modified items of the OOM. The original reliabilities for the scale were as follows: (a) the upward-mobile dimension had an alpha reliability of .84, (b) the ambivalent dimension had an alpha reliability of .89, and (c) the indifferent dimension had an alpha reliability of .79. In the current study, the upward-mobile dimension had an alpha reliability of .82 ( $M = 63.67, SD = 8.24$ ), the ambivalent dimension had an alpha reliability of .90 ( $M = 47.72, SD = 10.79$ ), and the indifferent dimension had an alpha reliability of .87 ( $M = 33.56, SD = 8.22$ ).

The *Generalized Attitude Measure* is a six item bio-polar measure where participants circled on a scale of one to seven their agreement toward each adjective in response to the concept: *College*. Reliabilities have generally been between .85 and .95 (McCroskey, 2006a). The reliability for this study was .89 ( $M = 35.78, SD = 5.82$ ).

The *Generalized Belief Measure* is a five item bio-polar measure where participants circled on a scale of one to seven their agreement toward each adjective in response to the

sentence: *College is valuable to me*. Reliabilities have generally been over .90 (McCroskey, 2006b). The reliability for this study was .85 ( $M = 30.99$ ,  $SD = 4.98$ ).

The *Motivation Scale* (Richmond, 1990) is a five item seven step bi-polar scale measuring the motivation of the student. The scale was used twice with different directions to measure trait motivation and state motivation. Following procedures similar to Frymier and Shulman (1995) who adapted the Richmond scale, participants were asked to respond to the following statement: *My feelings for studying for school in general is:*. Using these instructions, Frymier and Shulman (1995) reported an alpha reliability of .86. The reliability for this study was .89 ( $M = 23.16$ ,  $SD = 6.64$ ). To measure state motivation, participants were asked to respond to the following statement: *My feelings for studying for the class prior to this one is:*. Initial reliability for the state motivation measure was .94 and the current reliability for the state motivation scale was .92 ( $M = 22.01$ ,  $SD = 8.26$ ).

The *Nonverbal Immediacy Scale- Observer Report* is a 26 item Likert-type scale (1 = *never* to 5 = *very often*) measuring the participants' perception of their teachers' usage of immediate behaviors. The scale had an initial coefficient alpha reliability of .92 (Richmond, McCroskey, & Johnson, 2003). The current study had a coefficient alpha reliability of .91 ( $M = 92.91$ ,  $SD = 15.43$ ).

The *Source Credibility Scale* consists of bi-polar items where the participants respond to their perceptions of their teacher. This scale consisted of three sections: a) six items measure the students perceived competence of their instructor, b) six items measure the perceived trustworthiness of their instructor, and c) six items measure the perceived goodwill of their instructor. In the original study, the alpha reliability of the competence dimension was .85, the alpha reliability of the trustworthiness dimension was .92, and the alpha reliability of the

goodwill dimension was .92. In the current study, the competence dimension had an alpha reliability of .92 ( $M = 34.20$ ,  $SD = 7.04$ ), the trustworthiness dimension had an alpha reliability of .91 ( $M = 35.03$ ,  $SD = 6.52$ ), and the goodwill dimension had an alpha reliability of .89 ( $M = 29.45$ ,  $SD = 7.81$ ).

The *Affective Learning Scale* consists of four sets of four item bi-polar scales where participants circled on a scale of one to seven their agreement toward each adjective. The first two sets measure affective learning and include four items measuring affect for content and four items measuring the likelihood of taking future classes in the content. The second set measures affect for instructor and the likelihood of taking future classes with the instructor. Both sections have consistently produced alpha coefficient reliabilities over .90 (McCroskey, 1994). The affective learning measure in this study had a coefficient alpha reliability of .90 ( $M = 40.40$ ,  $SD = 11.25$ ), and the instructor had a coefficient alpha reliability of .94 ( $M = 40.62$ ,  $SD = 12.68$ ).

The *Cognitive Learning Measure* consists of two questions asking participants to rate how much they learned in their previous class and how much they could have learned with the ideal instructor (Richmond, Gorham, & McCroskey, 1987). Students were asked to respond on a range of 0-9 for each item, with 0 meaning the student learned nothing and 9 meaning the student learned more than in any other class he/she had. The final score has a range of zero to nine, where the higher numbers represent the potential learning lost from an ideal teacher to the actual teacher ( $M = 1.41$ ,  $SD = 1.70$ ). Twenty-eight of the participants completed the scale incorrectly, showing their cognitive learning, even with a perfect teacher, was negative. Their responses were deleted from the analyses.

## CHAPTER 6

### Results

Hypothesis H1 predicted the upward mobile orientations would be negatively correlated with the ambivalent and indifferent orientations. Upward mobile had a significant negative correlation with ambivalent ( $r = -.51, p = <.0001$ ) and with indifferent ( $r = -.57, p = <.0001$ ). Hypothesis 2 predicted indifferent and ambivalent would be positively correlated. Indifferent and ambivalent orientations had a significant and positive correlation ( $r = .65, p = <.0001$ ). Hypotheses H1 and H2 were supported.

Hypothesis H3 predicted the upward mobile orientation would be positively correlated with student perceptions of instructor competence, trustworthiness, and goodwill. Upward mobile had a significant and positive correlation with competence ( $r = .23, p = <.0001$ ), trustworthiness ( $r = .24, p = <.0001$ ), and goodwill ( $r = .24, p = <.0001$ ). Hypothesis H4 predicted ambivalent and indifferent would be negatively correlated with competence, trustworthiness, and goodwill. Ambivalent had a significant negative correlation with competence ( $r = -.27, p = <.0001$ ), trustworthiness ( $r = -.32, p = <.0001$ ), and goodwill ( $r = -.29, p = <.0001$ ). Indifferent had a significant negative correlation with competence ( $r = -.22, p = <.0001$ ), trustworthiness ( $r = -.28, p = <.0001$ ), and goodwill ( $r = -.27, p = <.0001$ ). Hypotheses H3 and H4 were supported.

Hypothesis H5 predicted upward mobile would be positively correlated with perceptions of teachers' nonverbal immediacy. Upward mobile had a significant positive correlation with perceptions of teachers' nonverbal immediacy ( $r = .11, p = .03$ ). Hypothesis H6 predicted indifferent and ambivalent would be negatively correlated with perceptions of teachers' nonverbal immediacy. Indifferent ( $r = -.17, p = .0006$ ) and ambivalent ( $r = -.23, p = <.0001$ ) had

significant negative correlations with perceptions of teachers' nonverbal immediacy. Hypotheses H5 and H6 were supported.

Hypothesis H7 predicted upward mobile would be positively correlated with affect for instructor and affect for content. Upward mobile had a significant positive correlation with affect for instructor ( $r = .19, p = <.0001$ ) and affect for content ( $r = .25, p = <.0001$ ). Hypothesis H8 predicted indifferent and ambivalent would be negatively correlated with affect for instructor and affect for content. Indifferent had a significant negative correlation with affect for instructor learning ( $r = -.24, p = <.0001$ ) and affect for content ( $r = -.35, p = <.0001$ ), and ambivalent had a significant negative correlation with affect for instructor ( $r = -.25, p = <.0001$ ) and affect for content ( $r = -.31, p = <.0001$ ). Hypothesis H9 predicted upward mobile orientation would have more positive generalized beliefs and generalized attitudes toward school than the indifferent and ambivalent orientations. Upward mobile had significant positive correlations with generalized beliefs about school ( $r = .33, p = <.0001$ ) and generalized attitudes about school ( $r = .32, p = <.0001$ ). Ambivalent had significant negative correlations with the generalized beliefs about school ( $r = -.35, p = <.0001$ ) and generalized attitudes about school ( $r = -.45, p = <.0001$ ). Indifferent had significant negative correlations with the generalized beliefs about school ( $r = -.31, p = <.0001$ ) and generalized attitudes about school ( $r = -.31, p = <.0001$ ). Hypotheses H7, H8, and H9 were supported.

RQ1 inquired about the relationship between student orientation and trait and state motivation in students. Upward mobile had significant positive correlations with trait motivation ( $r = .51, p = <.0001$ ) and with state motivation ( $r = .30, p = <.0001$ ). Ambivalent had significant negative correlations with trait motivation ( $r = -.49, p = <.0001$ ) and with state motivation ( $r = -.31, p = <.0001$ ). Indifferent had significant negative correlations with trait motivation

( $r = -.55, p = <.0001$ ) and with state motivation ( $r = -.36, p = <.0001$ ).

RQ2 inquired about the relationship between student orientation and cognitive learning. An insignificant relationship was found between upward mobile and cognitive learning ( $r = -.10, p = .06$ ). Ambivalent had a significant positive relationship with cognitive learning ( $r = .13, p = .01$ ). Indifferent had a significant positive relationship with cognitive learning ( $r = .15, p = <.01$ ).

#### *Post hoc analyses*

Since the correlations between ambivalence and indifference were higher than expected compared to previous research, an exploratory factor analysis using a Varimax rotation was used to ensure the student orientations were separate dimensions of the construct. Appendix C (Student Orientation Factor Loadings) includes the factor loadings for each of the items in the student orientation scale. Results supported a three factor model for the three orientations. Three factors emerged having an Eigenvalue over 1.0 and accounting for at least 5% of the variance. The first factor had an Eigenvalue of 12.47 accounting for 25% of the variance, the second factor had an Eigenvalue of 3.23 accounting for 6% of the variance, and the third factor had an Eigenvalue of 2.26, accounting for 5% of the variance. All other factors did not meet this criteria.

One item on the upward mobile scale, four items on the ambivalent scale, and no items on the indifferent scale had higher loadings on the other factors. Item eight on the upward mobile factored higher on the ambivalent scale. Items 3, 9, and 13 on the ambivalent measure had higher loadings on the upward mobile scale while item 15 had a higher loading on the indifferent scale. With the predominance of items having the greatest strength with the expected construct, the strength of the items on the factors, as well as the high correlations the student orientations had with the dependent variables in the study suggest the three orientations are separate constructs.

## CHAPTER 7

### Discussion

This study sought to adapt the reliable and valid measure of organizational orientation (McCroskey et al, 2004) to students based on the Presthus (1958) theory of organizational orientations and apply the measure to determine how student orientations affect several instructional outcome variables. The results suggest overwhelming support for the application of the theory into the instructional realm. The student orientations accounted for a range of 1% to 30% of the variance of the dependent variables. The orientations also accounted for between 26% to 42% variance of the predicted relationships (H1 and H2) between the orientations. Because the measure found results accounting for high variance combined with the factor analysis showing each orientation is in fact a separate construct, these results show the student orientation instrument to be reliable and valid, and the tool offers a lot of information about how the personality of students predicts their behaviors and how teachers behave toward students with different orientations.

With the exception of cognitive learning, the results indicated upward mobility was positively related to the outcome variables while ambivalence and indifference had negative relationships with the outcome variables. This study examined positive and desired outcome variables, which implies upward mobile students have an advantage to succeeding in school. This finding certainly is not ground breaking, as of course a student who in various ways rebel, constantly finds fault, and/or complains about school (ambivalent) or a student who simply does not find value or does not desire to go to school will have a more negative educational experience. However, the upward mobile orientation had substantially different outcomes compared to the ambivalent and the indifferent orientations.

Results supported the hypotheses suggesting the upward mobile student would perceive their instructor to have higher credibility while the ambivalent and indifferent student would likely see their instructor to have lower credibility. Upward mobile people, according to Presthus' (1978c) construct and supported in the organizational setting by McCroskey et al. (2004), see their supervisors, management, and organization as positive, good, and correct. The same likely holds true with student orientations. Students with the upward mobile orientation perceive their teachers to be competent in their subject matter, have the students' interests at their heart, and to care about their students. In essence, an upward mobile student will perceive their teacher as a smart person who wants him/her to learn the content and be successful. The ambivalent and indifferent orientation has the opposite effect. The more a student is ambivalent or indifferent, the more they will see their instructor as non-credible.

Interestingly, the ambivalent student has a greater negative correlation with all three dimensions than the indifferent student. These findings also fall in line with the Presthus theory. Indifferents may have negative feelings of teacher credibility because they may see the teacher as having the same life view of their own: the teacher is teaching this class because he/she has too, and the teacher does not really care about how the student does in class. After all, how can a student really know if the teacher was given the book at the beginning of the semester and developed a lecture off of the points in the textbook?

The ambivalent may have more negative views because they view the teacher to have more ill will toward the student. According to Presthus (1978a), the ambivalent person questions top down authority. Ambivalents question authority likely because of the credibility issue. If a student does not believe teachers to be knowledgeable in their content area, have their best interest at heart, nor want the student to succeed, the student is often going to complain or reject

the authority of the teacher. One of the more intriguing items on the ambivalent dimension in the scale is the degree the participant believes he/she is smarter than the teacher. When people without any collegiate degree walk into a class believing they are smarter than their professors with doctorate degrees, than a feeling of superiority against the instructional organization and complaining is likely to ensue.

Results also supported the projected relationships between the student orientations and students' perceptions teacher immediacy which suggested upward mobiles will perceive their teacher to use more immediate behaviors while ambivalent and indifferent would perceive less immediate teacher behaviors. The upward mobile had a very small positive correlation with teacher immediacy accounting for 1% of the variance. Ambivalent and indifferent had negative correlations accounting for 5% and 3% of the variance respectively. The student orientations accounted the least amount of variance with the immediacy outcome than any other outcome. However, what are these variances accounting for? Two possible explanations exist: (a) a perception explanation and (b) an actual behavior explanation.

First, the orientation may account for perceptual issues. Fitting with the theory, upward mobiles may perceive such little immediacy because they perceive their teachers' behaviors as normal and expected. They probably think little when the teacher walks around the room checking on students' progress or when the teacher leans toward students to help them with problems. Ambivalents again perceive a more negative outcome than indifferents. As discussed above in the credibility discussion, ambivalents are likely to perceive the teacher to have less competence and caring toward the student or toward other students. The student may perceive the teacher to behave less immediate because the student is either looking for bad behaviors or automatically assumes fault on the teacher. This explanation is similar to deception research

which has shown when a person in a conversation decides the other is either lying or telling the truth, an attribution of lying or honesty is applied to their conversational partner throughout the rest of the conversation (Buller, Strezyzewski, & Hunsaker, 1991). In this case, if a student wants to find fault, the student will find fault. Indifferents however, probably perceive the teacher as behaving as little as possible to successfully complete the job. The ambivalent would have a higher negative correlation with teacher immediacy than the indifferent because the ambivalent student is likely using more active scanning to find negative attributions toward the teacher.

The actual behavior explanation enters the realm of the dark side of communication. Based on the immediacy principle that “people are drawn toward persons and things they like, evaluate highly, and prefer; and they avoid or move away from things they dislike, evaluate negatively, or do not prefer” (Mehrabian, 1971, p. 1), teachers probably enjoy more and perceive more positively communicating with upward mobile students than indifferent students and especially ambivalent students. Because upward mobile students perceive their teachers as credible, have affect for the class, have more motivation, and more positive perceptions of school (these items to be discussed later), the teacher probably finds these students enjoyable to talk to. While teachers may not move away from indifferent students, teachers probably do not seek communication and behave immediately more than required because of perceptions the student ultimately doesn’t complain, but doesn’t care either, which explains the tiny negative correlation between indifferent and immediacy. However, ambivalents are most likely to challenge the teacher’s authority and cause confrontation. Teachers will probably place a negative evaluation and be less immediate toward the student, even when they have to interact with the student.

The next set of hypotheses examined the relationships between the student orientations and satisfaction with school based on the attitudes and beliefs about college. Upward mobiles

had positive perceptions of college on both the generalized attitude (10% of the variance) and generalized belief (11% of the variance) measures. Ambivalents had negative perceptions of college on both the attitude (20% of the variance) and belief (12% of the variance). Similarly, indifferents had negative perceptions of college on both the attitude (10% of the variance) and belief (9% of the variance). Again, the upward mobile orientation tended to have positive views of college, the indifferents had negative perceptions of college, and the ambivalents had stronger negative perceptions of college. These findings are consistent with Presthus' theory. Upward mobiles would likely see college as the logical next step in their career or a natural challenge. Interestingly, ambivalent students have stronger negative perceptions than the indifferent students. Presthus (1978a) argues ambivalent people tend to be intelligent and specialists in an area. These students may see themselves as masters of the content without a degree, and see college as not a valuable tool, but as a waste of time. Indifferent students may see classes as a waste of time for a different reason: they have other things they would rather be doing, probably resulting in a less strong negative perception.

Upward mobility was found to have positive levels of affective learning for both content (accounting for 6% of the variance) and instructor (accounting for 4% of the variance). Similar to the previous outcome variables, the ambivalent orientation had a negative relationship with both affect for content (10% of the variance) and affect for instructor (4% of the variance), and the indifferent orientation had a negative relationship with both affect for content (12% of the variance) and affect for the teacher (5% of the variance). While the results for upward mobility at first appears small. However, when considering students were asked to report on the last class they had attended, a class potentially outside their major or outside their prime interest, the results show the upward mobiles will likely find value and appreciate any class or teacher they

have, regardless of the class. This suggestion is further supported and explained in more detail in the next discussion of the results with state and trait motivation. Both ambivalent and indifferent students have tendencies to dislike the content and the teacher, again, these results are likely due to different reasons. Ambivalents likely dislike the teacher due to perceiving the teacher to have less credibility and dislike being told what to do or how to think. Indifferent students enjoy things outside of school and work. Even if the indifferent student is training for their number one career choice, that student probably is not a fan of the content. The indifferent person chooses a career (and college for that career) so that he or she can afford to enjoy the activities outside of work.

Upward mobility was found to be strongly positively correlated with trait and state motivation. Upward mobility accounted for 26% of the variance of trait motivation and 9% of the variance for state motivation. Ambivalence and indifference was found to be strongly negatively correlated with trait and state motivation. Ambivalence accounted for 24% of the variance of trait motivation and 10% of the state motivation. Indifference accounted for 30% of the variance of trait motivation and 13% of the variance of state motivation. These results provide the greatest insight on why upward mobiles have larger advantages at school. Upward mobile students simply will try hard and have a drive to succeed regardless of their situation. Similarly, indifferent students have an apathy issue, where they simply do not care. When a student has little drive to succeed, when faced with adversity, these students will look for a way out or do as little work as possible. Because indifferents feel their life starts after school, indifferents may be more likely to drop out of school or skip classes. Ambivalents, as Presthus (1978a) points out, tend to be intelligent and specialists in a certain area, and while they complain, they still have some sort of drive to succeed. Perhaps this reasoning is why they have

more motivation than the indifferents; because ambivalents specialize or have some interest in a content area at school or perhaps are involved in a school sponsored activity, a feeling indifferents may lack.

The ambivalent and indifferent trait and state motivation may provide a meaningful difference between orientation outcomes in instructional and organizational settings. According to the theory (Presthus, 1978a) and also suggested by McCroskey et al. (2004), in an organizational setting, ambivalents often have a more difficult time adapting to the organizational structure than indifferents. In the organizational setting, ambivalents will likely leave or be fired until they find a place in an organization fitting with their specialization and attitudes. However, in the instructional setting, the specialization or interest may be the link keeping them motivated to attend and stay in school.

In regards to the second research question, upward mobility was not significantly correlated with learning loss. This finding is not surprising as upward mobile students tend to have high affect for their teachers and the content as well as perceive their teachers as credible and immediate (See Appendix A, Correlation Table), and when students perceive higher levels of these outcome variables, students would likely perceive they learned everything they could in their classrooms. Twenty-eight of the participants had negative cognitive learning scores, and were deleted from the analyses, and likely many other participants were confused about the items. The ambivalent and indifferent orientations were significantly positively correlated with cognitive learning loss. These findings coincide with Prestus' theory and the other results in this study. The ambivalent and the indifferent orientations are negatively related to all the outcome variables which help create lower levels of perceived learning loss. Considering the ambivalent and indifferent orientations have high-moderate negative correlations with state and trait

motivation, likely the ambivalent and indifferent oriented students don't place as much work into the learning activities or at least don't take the learning activities as serious as the upward mobile student. Keep in mind, the correlations between the student orientations and cognitive learning loss are small, accounting for at most 2% of the variance. This is most likely due to the fact regardless of how a student perceives an activity, the student still has to participate, as the teacher, with legitimate power, is still in the classroom.

While the sample used in this study did include a large age range, including 23 people above the age of 22, the typical age of college seniors, the study offers a limited ability to generalize the findings to the k-12 education world or adult education. The relationships in these similar but different populations may produce different findings. Future research should look specifically at these populations. In addition, future research should examine the teacher relationships with students with different orientations. Could the reason upward mobiles perceive their teachers to have positive qualities be because teachers actually behave more positively toward these students? Chances are teachers do have more affect for some students and less affect for other students, and despite teachers' best intentions, they probably behave differently toward students of different orientations.

In conclusion, the findings of this study present a very positive picture for the upward mobile student. These students appear to have very positive perceptions of school (generalized belief, generalized attitude of school, and affect for content), positive perceptions of their teachers (teacher credibility, teacher nonverbal immediacy, and affect for teacher), and tools to help them be successful at school (trait motivation and state motivation). For the 12-16 years people will be in educational institutions, upward mobiles probably enjoy school more and probably feel more success at school than their ambivalent and indifferent counterparts. Further,

how students are oriented and behave at school are possibly decent predictors of how people will be oriented and behave in the workplace.

## References

- Allen, J. L., & Shaw, D. H. (1990). Teachers' communication behaviors and supervisors' evaluation of instruction in elementary and secondary classrooms. *Communication Education, 39*, 308-322.
- Andersen, J. F. (1979). Teacher immediacy as a predictor of teaching effectiveness. *Communication Yearbook, 3*, 543-559.
- Buller, D. B., Strezyzewski, K. D., & Hunsaker, F. G. (1991). Interpersonal deception: II. The inferiority of conversational participants as deception detectors. *Communication Monographs, 58*, 25-40
- Chesebro, J. L., & McCroskey, J. C. (2001). The relationship of teacher clarity and immediacy with student state receiver apprehension, affect, and cognitive learning. *Communication Education, 50*, 59-68.
- Christensen, L. J., & Menzel, K. E. (1998). The linear relationship between student reports of teacher immediacy behaviors and perceptions of state motivation, and of cognitive, affective, and behavioral learning. *Communication Education, 47*, 82-90.
- Christophel, D. M. (1990). The relationship among teacher immediacy behaviors, student motivation, and learning. *Communication Education, 39*, 323-340.
- Christophel, D. M., & Gorham, J. (1995). A test-retest analysis of student motivation, teacher immediacy, and perceived sources of motivation and demotivation in college classes. *Communication Education, 44*, 292-306.
- Daly, J. A., & McCroskey, J. C. (1975). Occupational desirability and choice as a function of communication apprehension. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 22*, 309-313.
- Falcione, R. L., McCroskey, J. C., & Daly, J. A. (1977). Job satisfaction as a function of

- employees' communication apprehension, self-esteem, and perceptions of their immediate supervisors. *Communication Yearbook, 1*, 363-375.
- Frymier, A. B., & Shulman, G. M. (1995). "What's in it for me?": Increasing content relevance to enhance students' motivation. *Communication Education, 44*, 40-50.
- Frymier, A. B., Shulman, G. M., & Houser, M. (1996). The development of a learner empowerment measure. *Communication Education, 45*, 181-199.
- Frymier, A. B., & Thompson, C. A. (1992). Perceived teacher affinity-seeking in relation to perceived teacher credibility. *Communication Education, 41*, 389-399.
- Goodboy, A. K., & McCroskey, J. C. (2004, April). *Machiavellian communication in the workplace: The influences of the Machiavellianism trait in an organizational setting*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Eastern Communication Association, Boston, MA.
- Jaasma, M. A., & Koper, R. J. (1999). The relationship of student-faculty out-of-class communication to instructor immediacy and trust and to student motivation. *Communication Education, 48*, 41-47.
- Knapp, J. C., & Martin, M. M. (2002, April). Out-of-class communication: The development and testing of a measure. Paper presented at the meeting of the Eastern Communication Association, New York City, NY.
- McCroskey, J. C. (1971). Ethos, credibility, and communication in the real world. *North Carolina Journal of Speech, 4*, 24-31.
- McCroskey, J. C., Hamilton, P. R., & Weiner, A. N. (1974). The effect of interaction behavior on source credibility, homophily, and interpersonal attraction. *Human Communication Research, 1*, 42-52.

- McCroskey, J. C., & Richmond, V. P. (1976). The effects of communication apprehension on the perception of peers. *Western Speech Communication, 40*, 14-21.
- McCroskey, J. C., & Richmond, V. P. (1996). *Fundamentals of human communication: An interpersonal perspective*. Prospect Heights, IL: Waveland Press.
- McCroskey, J. C., & Richmond, V. P. (2000). Applying reciprocity and accommodation theories to supervisor/subordinate communication. *Journal of Applied Communication Research, 28*, 278-289.
- McCroskey, J. C., & Richmond, V. P. (2006) Understanding the audience: Student's communication traits. In T. P. Mottet, V. P. Richmond, & J. C. McCroskey (Eds.), *Handbook of instructional communication: Rhetorical and relational perspectives* (pp. 51-66). Boston: Pearson.
- McCroskey, J. C., Richmond, V. P., Johnson, A. D., & Smith, H. T. (2004). Organization orientations theory and measurement: Development of measures and preliminary investigations. *Communication Quarterly, 52*, 1-14.
- McCroskey, J. C., Sallinen, A., Fayer, J. M., Richmond, V. P., & Barraclough, R. A. (1996). Nonverbal immediacy and cognitive learning: A cross-cultural investigation. *Communication Education, 45*, 200-211.
- McCroskey, J. C., & Teven, J. J. (1999). A reexamination of the construct and its measurement. *Communication Monographs, 66*, 90-103.
- Myers, S. A. (2002). Perceived aggressive instructor communication and student state motivation, learning, and satisfaction. *Communication Reports, 15*, 113-121.

- Myers, S. A., & Rocca, K. A. (2001). Perceived instructor argumentativeness and verbal aggressiveness in the college classroom: Effects on student perceptions of climate, apprehension, and state motivation. *Western Journal of Communication, 65*, 113-137.
- Plax, T. G., Kearney, P., McCroskey, J. C., & Richmond, V. P. (1986). Power in the classroom vi: Verbal control strategies, nonverbal immediacy and affective learning. *Communication Education, 35*, 43-55.
- Presthus, R. (1978a). Patterns of accommodation: Ambivalents. In R. Presthus, *Organizational society* (2<sup>nd</sup> Ed., pp. 228-251). New York: St. Martin's Press.
- Presthus, R. (1978b). Patterns of accommodation: Indifferents. In R. Presthus, *Organizational society* (2<sup>nd</sup> Ed., pp. 184-227). New York: St. Martin's Press.
- Presthus, R. (1978c). Patterns of accommodation: Upward mobiles. In R. Presthus, *Organizational society* (2<sup>nd</sup> Ed., pp. 143-183). New York: St. Martin's Press.
- Presthus, R. V. (1958). Toward a theory in organizational behavior. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 16*, 48-72.
- Pruden, H. O. (1973). The upward mobile, indifferent, and ambivalent typology of managers. *Academy of Management Journal, 16*, 455-464.
- Richmond, V. P. (1990). Communication in the classroom: Power and motivation. *Communication Education, 39*, 181-195.
- Richmond, V. P., Gorham, J. S., & McCroskey, J. C. (1987). The relationship between selected immediacy behaviors and cognitive learning. In M. L. McLaughlin (Ed.), *Communication Yearbook 10* (pp. 574-590). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Richmond, V. P., Lane, D. R., & McCroskey, J. C. (2006). Teacher immediacy and the teacher-

- student relationship. In T. P. Mottett, V. P. Richmond, and J. C. McCroskey (Eds.), *Handbook of instructional communication: Rhetorical & relational perspectives* (pp. 167-193). Boston: Pearson Education.
- Richmond, V. P., & McCroskey, J. C. (2000). The impact of supervisor and subordinate immediacy on relational and organizational outcomes. *Communication Monographs*, 67, 85-95.
- Richmond, V. P., McCroskey, J. C., & Johnson, A. E. (2003). Development of the Nonverbal Immediacy Scale (NIS): Measures of self- and other-perceived nonverbal immediacy. *Communication Quarterly*, 51, 502-515.
- Richmond, V. P., McCroskey, J. C., & McCroskey, L. L. (2005). Organizational orientations and communication traits. In V. P. Richmond, J. C. McCroskey, & L. L. McCroskey, *Organizational communication for survival: Making work, work* (3<sup>rd</sup> Ed., pp. 84-95). Boston: Pearson Education.
- Roach, K. D., Richmond, V. P., & Mottet, T. P. (2006). Teachers' influence messages. In T. P. Mottet, V. P. Richmond, & J. C. McCroskey (Eds.), *Handbook of instructional communication: Rhetorical and relational perspectives* (pp. 117-139). Boston: Pearson.
- Thweatt, K. S., & McCroskey, J. C. (1998). The impact of teacher immediacy and misbehaviors on teacher credibility. *Communication Education*, 47, 348-358.
- Wheless, L. R. (1974). The effects of attitude, credibility, and homophily on selective exposure to information. *Speech Monographs*, 41, 329-338.
- Wheless, L. R. (1975). Relationship of four elements to immediate recall and student-instructor interaction. *Western Speech Communication*, 39, 131-140.

Appendix A  
Correlation Table

Student Orientations	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14
1. upward mobility	X	-.51	-.57	.33	.32	.51	.30	.23	.26	.24	.19	.25	-.10*	.11
2. ambivalence	-.51	X	.65	-.35	-.45	-.49	-.31	-.27	-.32	-.29	-.25	-.31	.13	-.23
3. indifference	-.57	.65	X	-.30	-.31	-.55	-.36	-.22	-.28	-.27	-.24	-.35	.15	-.17
<u>Satisfaction</u>														
4. generalized belief	.33	-.35	-.30	X	.70	.37	.12	.36	.37	.20	.13	.20	-.06*	.13
5. generalized attitude	.32	-.35	-.30	.70	X	.39	.19	.35	.42	.24	.18	.28	-.07*	.17
<u>Motivation</u>														
6. trait motivation	.51	-.49	-.55	.37	.39	X	.36	.24	.29	.29	.21	.25	-.17	.16
7. state motivation	.30	-.31	-.36	.12	.19	.36	X	.42	.39	.49	.66	.59	-.49	.41
<u>Teacher Credibility</u>														
8. competence	.23	-.27	-.22	.36	.35	.24	.42	X	.72	.65	.21	.25	-.39	.40
9. character	.26	-.32	-.28	.37	.42	.29	.39	.72	X	.69	.56	.39	-.31	.44
10. caring	.24	-.29	-.27	.20	.24	.29	.49	.65	.69	X	.64	.43	-.43	.51

<u>Affective / Cognitive Learning</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>7</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>9</u>	<u>10</u>	<u>11</u>	<u>12</u>	<u>13</u>	<u>14</u>
11. affect for instructor	.18	-.25	-.24	.13	.18	.21	.66	.64	.55	.64	X	.64	-.56	.54
12. affect for content	.25	-.31	-.35	.20	.28	.25	.59	.25	.39	.43	.64	X	-.39	.33
<u>13. cognitive learning</u>	<u>-.10*</u>	<u>.13</u>	<u>.15</u>	<u>-.06*</u>	<u>-.07*</u>	<u>-.17</u>	<u>-.49</u>	<u>-.39</u>	<u>-.31</u>	<u>-.43</u>	<u>-.56</u>	<u>-.39</u>	<u>X</u>	<u>-.37</u>
14. immediacy	.11	-.23	-.17	.13	.17	.16	.41	.40	.44	.51	.54	.33	-.37	X

*Note.* All values are significant,  $p < .05$  unless otherwise noted.\* denotes an insignificant finding

## Appendix B

## Measurements

*Student Orientation Scale*

Instructions: Please indicate the degree to which you agree or disagree with each of the statements below by recording your response in the space before each item. Use the following response options:

5 = Strongly agree    4 = agree    3 = undecided    2 = disagree    1 = Strongly Disagree.

- \_\_\_\_\_ 1. I generally try my best to do what my teacher wants me to do.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 2. If I had the choice, I would choose the acceptance of my teacher over the acceptance of my peers any time.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 3. One of my goals is to take a tough class and excel at it.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 4. I would like to be the top student in my class.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 5. I firmly believe that if I work hard enough, one day I will be right at the top.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 6. I am good at school and I love it.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 7. Most of all, I really want to be recognized for the excellent work that I do.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 8. I think moving up in school is not worth all the work you have to do.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 9. Sometimes I think I am a workaholic.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 10. I want to take classes that can really teach me something.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 11. Everyone tells me I am a really good student.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 12. I want to take classes which have a lot of intangible rewards.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 13. Ordinarily, I feel good about what I have accomplished when I am done with my day's work
- \_\_\_\_\_ 14. I would be willing to work hard to be the top student in class.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 15. Since I am really good at what I do, I will be a top performer in class.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 16. What I want most in a class is the possibility of learning something important.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 17. Any assignment worth doing is worth doing as well as I can.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 18. I am a very creative worker.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 19. Other than a grade, the classes I have taken have had little to offer me.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 20. The content in classes I have taken is of very low quality.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 21. I have generally been satisfied with classes I have had.

- \_\_\_\_\_ 22. The schools I have attended wouldn't have cared less if I live or die – and I feel the same way about them.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 23. I really dislike the rules and regulations I am forced to live with at school.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 24. I am usually unhappy in every class.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 25. Teachers and administrators at schools are incompetent.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 26. When I am at school, I wish I were somewhere, almost anywhere, else than where I am.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 27. The procedures and regulations of schools I have attended have generally been quite reasonable.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 28. I find it difficult to adopt the demands of most schools.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 29. Generally, I don't like the rules schools make me follow.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 30. I don't really like most of the students and teachers I have at my school.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 31. I have attended really good schools.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 32. Most schools have unreasonable expectations for students like me.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 33. Most of the time, a halfhearted effort is all I feel I need to give at school.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 34. I really hate most schools and classes I have attended.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 35. One teacher is about like any other, a pain in the backside.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 36. What I want most at school is to be left alone.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 37. Frankly, I am smarter than most of my teachers.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 38. I have been unhappy just about every class and school I have attended.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 39. My life begins when I get out of school
- \_\_\_\_\_ 40. If I found this class was not easy, I would look for an easier class.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 41. A class is a class – everyone has to be somewhere.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 42. I am generally indifferent to classes. One class is about the same as another.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 43. Generally, I just do as much as is required by my class.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 44. I sometimes skip classes, whether I am sick or not.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 45. I don't care much about my classes, as long as I receive good grades.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 46. When class is over, life begins.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 47. One class is pretty much like any other class.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 48. If I found out the class was difficult, I would quickly look for another class.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 49. School is something I have to do, not something I want to do.

\_\_\_\_\_ 50. When it comes to choosing a class, “show me the easy A!”

*Generalized Belief Measure*

On the scales below, please indicate the degree to which you believe the following statement: “College is valuable to me.” Numbers “1” and “7” indicate a very strong feeling. Number “2” and “6” indicate a strong feeling. Numbers “3” and “5” indicate a fairly weak feeling. Number “4” indicates you are undecided or do not understand the adjectives themselves. There are no right or wrong answers.

51. Agree	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Disagree
52. False	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	True
53. Incorrect	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Correct
54. Right	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Wrong
55. Yes	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	No

*Generalized Attitude Measure*

On the scales below, please indicate your feelings about: “College” Numbers “1” and “7” indicate a very strong feeling. Number “2” and “6” indicate a strong feeling. Numbers “3” and “5” indicate a fairly weak feeling. Number “4” indicates you are undecided or do not understand the adjectives themselves. There are no right or wrong answers.

56.	Good	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Bad
57.	Wrong	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Right
58.	Harmful	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Beneficial
59.	Fair	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Unfair
60.	Wise	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Foolish
61.	Negative	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Positive

*Trait Motivation*

My feelings about studying for school in general is:

62. motivated	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	unmotivated
63. excited	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	bored
64. uninterested	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	interested
65. involved	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	uninvolved
66. dreading	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	looking forward to it

*Teacher Credibility Measure*

For the following measures, please indicate your level of agreement based on you or your teacher in the class immediately preceding this one.

Please indicate your impression of your teacher in the class prior to this one by circling the appropriate number between the pairs of adjectives below. The closer the number is to an adjective, the more certain you are of your evaluation.

- |                                  |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |                                       |
|----------------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---------------------------------------|
| 67. intelligent                  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | unintelligent                         |
| 68. untrained                    | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | trained                               |
| 69. inexpert                     | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | expert                                |
| 70. informed                     | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | uninformed                            |
| 71. incompetent                  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | competent                             |
| 72. bright                       | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | stupid                                |
| 73. honest                       | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | dishonest                             |
| 74. untrustworthy                | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | trustworthy                           |
| 75. honorable                    | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | dishonorable                          |
| 76. moral                        | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | immoral                               |
| 77. unethical                    | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | ethical                               |
| 78. phony                        | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | genuine                               |
| 79. cares about me               | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | doesn't care about me                 |
| 80. has my<br>interests at heart | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | doesn't have my<br>interests at heart |
| 81. self-centered                | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | not self-centered                     |
| 82. concerned with<br>me         | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | not concerned with<br>me              |
| 83. insensitive                  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | sensitive                             |
| 84. understanding                | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | not understanding                     |

*Affect for Content*

I feel the content in the class previous to this class is:

- |              |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |           |
|--------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|-----------|
| 85. Bad      | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | Good      |
| 86. Valuable | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | Worthless |

87. Unfair	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Fair
88. Positive	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Negative

My likelihood of taking future courses in the content previous to this class is:

89. Unlikely	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Likely
90. Possible	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Impossible
91. Improbable	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Probable
92. Would	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Would not

*Affect for Instructor*

Overall, the instructor I have in the class prior to this one is:

93. Bad	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Good
94. Valuable	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Worthless
95. Unfair	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Fair
96. Positive	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Negative

Were I to have the opportunity, my likelihood of taking future courses with the instructor prior to this one would be:

97. Unlikely	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Likely
98. Possible	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Impossible
99. Improbable	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Probable
100. Would	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Would not

*Nonverbal Immediacy- Other Report*

DIRECTIONS: The following statements describe the ways some people behave while talking with or to others. Please indicate in the space at the left of each item the degree to which you believe the statement applies TO THE TEACHER IN THE CLASS PRIOR TO THIS ONE use the following 5-point scale:

1 = Never      2 = Rarely      3 = Occasionally      4 = Often      5 = Very Often

101. \_\_\_\_\_ He/she uses her/his hands and arms to gesture while talking to people.
102. \_\_\_\_\_ He/she touches others on the shoulder or arm while talking to them.
103. \_\_\_\_\_ He/she uses a monotone or dull voice while talking to people.
104. \_\_\_\_\_ He/she looks over or away from others while talking to them.
105. \_\_\_\_\_ He/she moves away from others when they touch her/him while they are talking.
106. \_\_\_\_\_ He/she has a relaxed body position when he/she talks to people.

107. \_\_\_\_ He/she frowns while talking to people.
108. \_\_\_\_ He/she avoids eye contact while talking to people.
109. \_\_\_\_ He/she has a tense body position while talking to people
110. \_\_\_\_ He/she sits close or stands close to people while talking with them.
111. \_\_\_\_ Her/his voice is monotonous or dull when he/she talks to people.
112. \_\_\_\_ He/she uses a variety of vocal expressions when he/she talks to people.
113. \_\_\_\_ He/she gestures when he/she talks to people.
114. \_\_\_\_ He/she is animated when he/she talks to people.
115. \_\_\_\_ He/she has a bland facial expression when he/she talks to people.
116. \_\_\_\_ He/she moves closer to people when he/she talks to them.
117. \_\_\_\_ He/she looks directly at people while talking to them.
118. \_\_\_\_ He/she is stiff when he/she talks to people.
119. \_\_\_\_ He/she has a lot of vocal variety when he/she talks to people.
120. \_\_\_\_ He/she avoids gesturing while he/she is talking to people.
121. \_\_\_\_ He/she leans toward people when he/she talks to them.
122. \_\_\_\_ He/she maintains eye contact with people when he/she talks to them.
123. \_\_\_\_ He/she tries not to sit or stand close to people when he/she talks with them.
124. \_\_\_\_ He/she leans away from people when he/she talks to them.
125. \_\_\_\_ He/she smiles when he/she talks to people.
126. \_\_\_\_ He/she avoids touching people when he/she talks to them.

*State Motivation Measure*

My feelings about studying for the class prior to this one is:

- |      |               |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |             |
|------|---------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|-------------|
| 128. | Motivated     | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | unmotivated |
| 129. | excited       | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | bored       |
| 130. | uninterested  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | interested  |
| 131. | involved      | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | uninvolved  |
| 132. | dreading      | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | looking     |
|      | forward to it |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |             |

*Cognitive Learning Measure*

Please answer the following two questions based on the class prior to this one. Please answer in the space provided.

133. \_\_\_\_\_ On a scale of 0-9, how much did you learn in this class, with 0 meaning you learned nothing and 9 meaning you learned more than in any other class you've had.

134. \_\_\_\_\_ How much do you think you could have learned in the class had you had the ideal instructor? (Use the same 0-9 scale).

*Demographics*

Please circle the response most appropriate to you:

Age: \_\_\_\_\_

Gender:      Male              Female

You are a:    Freshman      Sophomore    Junior              Senior

## Appendix C

## Student Orientation Factor Loadings

Upward Mobile Items	Amb.	Ind.	Up M.
1. I generally try my best to do what my teacher wants me to do.	-.19	-.14	<u>.48</u>
2. If I had the choice, I would choose the acceptance of my teacher over the acceptance of my peers any time.	.16	-.25	<u>.28</u>
3. One of my goals is to take a tough class and excel at it.	-.05	-.35	<u>.50</u>
4. I would like to be the top student in my class.	-.13	-.06	<u>.58</u>
5. I firmly believe that if I work hard enough, one day I will be right at the top.	-.23	-.07	<u>.51</u>
6. I am good at school and I love it.	-.22	-.34	<u>.54</u>
7. Most of all, I really want to be recognized for the excellent work that I do.	-.06	-.04	<u>.58</u>
8. I think moving up in school is not worth all the work you have to do.	<u>-.41*</u>	-.23	.25
9. Sometimes I think I am a workaholic.	.01	-.16	<u>.42</u>
10. I want to take classes that can really teach me something.	-.24	-.11	<u>.36</u>
11. Everyone tells me I am a really good student.	-.11	-.18	<u>.48</u>
12. I want to take classes which have a lot of intangible rewards.	-.02	-.021	<u>.35</u>
13. Ordinarily, I feel good about what I have accomplished when I am done with my day's work	-.10	-.02	<u>.48</u>
14. I would be willing to work hard to be the top student in class.	-.16	-.18	<u>.70</u>
15. Since I am really good at what I do, I will be a top performer in class.	.03	-.15	<u>.63</u>

16. What I want most in a class is the possibility of learning something important.	-14	-17	<u>.46</u>
17. Any assignment worth doing is worth doing as well as I can.	-20	-18	<u>.40</u>
18. I am a very creative worker.	.10	-18	<u>.19</u>

---

<u>Ambivalent Items</u>	<u>Amb.</u>	<u>Ind.</u>	<u>Up M.</u>
1. Other than a grade, the classes I have taken have had little to offer me.	<u>.42</u>	.33	-.16
2. The content in classes I have taken is of very low quality.	<u>.47</u>	.22	-.15
3. I have generally been satisfied with classes I have had.	.22	.07	<u>-.36*</u>
4. The schools I have attended wouldn't have cared less if I live or die – and I feel the same way about them.	<u>.56</u>	.10	-.13
5. I really dislike the rules and regulations I am forced to live with at school.	<u>.63</u>	.09	-.11
6. I am usually unhappy in every class.	<u>.67</u>	.14	-.10
7. Teachers and administrators at schools are incompetent.	<u>.58</u>	.10	-.13
8. When I am at school, I wish I were somewhere, almost anywhere, else than where I am.	<u>.47</u>	.38	-.17
9. The procedures and regulations of schools I have attended have generally been quite reasonable.	.27	<.01	<u>-.30*</u>
10. I find it difficult to adopt the demands of most schools.	<u>.65</u>	.12	-.03
11. Generally, I don't like the rules schools make me follow.	<u>.62</u>	.16	-.05
12. I don't really like most of the students and teachers I have at my school.	<u>.69</u>	-.04	-.04

13. I have attended really good schools.	.22	-.02	<u>-.40*</u>
14. Most schools have unreasonable expectations for students like me.	<u>.52</u>	.17	-.02
15. Most of the time, a halfhearted effort is all I feel I need to give at school.	.39	<u>.45*</u>	-.31
16. I really hate most schools and classes I have attended.	<u>.73</u>	.24	.26
17. One teacher is about like any other, a pain in the backside.	<u>.62</u>	.33	-.13
18. What I want most at school is to be left alone.	<u>.62</u>	.18	-.15
19. Frankly, I am smarter than most of my teachers.	<u>.53</u>	.04	-.08
20. I have been unhappy just about every class and school I have attended.	<u>.63</u>	.22	-.27

Indifferent Items	Amb.	Ind.	Up M.
1. My life begins when I get out of school	.29	<u>.37</u>	-.20
2. If I found this class was not easy, I would look for an easier class.	.31	<u>.44</u>	-.27
3. A class is a class – everyone has to be somewhere.	.13	<u>.61</u>	.01
4. I am generally indifferent to classes. One class is about the same as another.	.32	<u>.55</u>	-.07
5. Generally, I just do as much as is required by my class.	-.07	<u>.60</u>	-.01
6. I sometimes skip classes, whether I am sick or not.	.10	<u>.44</u>	-.26
7. I don't care much about my classes, as long as I receive good grades.	.21	<u>.66</u>	-.29
8. When class is over, life begins.	.28	<u>.64</u>	-.16
9. One class is pretty much like any other class.	.42	<u>.61</u>	-.12
10. If I found out the class was difficult, I would quickly look for another class.	.34	<u>.51</u>	-.18

11. School is something I have to do, not something I want to do.	.35	<u>.58</u>	-.18
12. When it comes to choosing a class, "show me the easy A!"	.24	<u>.69</u>	-.17

---

\* = item loaded on a non-expected factor.

## Curriculum Vitae

David Tibbles

Home:  
152 Harrison  
Council Bluffs, IA 51503  
(712) 326-9347  
dtibbles@hotmail.com

Work:  
Waynesville H.S.  
200 GW Lane  
Waynesville, MO 65583  
(573) 774-6401  
dtibbles@hotmail.com

*Education*

Master of Arts	West Virginia University	Expected: August, 2006
Major: Communication Studies	Concentration: Theory and Research	GPA: 3.70/4.0
Thesis Title: <i>Communication Organizational Orientations in the Instructional Setting</i>		

Bachelor of Science in Education	Northwest Missouri State University	December, 2004
Major: Speech/theatre education	Minor: Music	GPA: 3.49/4.0

*Academic Interests*

Instructional Communication, Interpersonal Communication, and Research Methods

**Professional Convention Research Presentations**

Sidelinger, R., Tibbles, D., Godorhazy, A. L., & Ayash, G. (2006, April). Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Eastern Communication Association, Philadelphia, PA.

Tibbles, D., & Schwartzman, R. (2005, April). *Rhetorical dimensions of the post-September 11<sup>th</sup> grieving process*. Competitively selected top paper in the rhetorical theory and criticism division presented at the annual meeting of the Central States Communication Association, Kansas City, MO.

**Research Under Review**

Tibbles, D., & Schwartzman, R. (April, 2005). Rhetorical dimensions of the post-September 11<sup>th</sup> grieving process. *Communication Studies*.

**Research in Progress**

Goodboy, A. K., Chory-Assad, R. M, Baker, K., Hixon, N., & Tibbles, D. (2006). Organizational dissent as a function of organizational justice.

## **Completed Research Projects**

(Thesis) Tibbles, D. (2006). Communication organizational orientations in the instructional setting.

Sidelinger, R., Tibbles, D., Godorhazy, A. L., & Ayash, G. (2006, April). Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Eastern Communication Association, Philadelphia, PA.

Tibbles, D. (2006). The Fall of an American Icon: Adelphia and Rigas Family Impression Management in Times of Fraud.

Tibbles, D. (2006). How Do You Come Up With Funny Stuff?: An Examination of Cognitive Processing and Humor Orientation.

Tibbles, D. (2006). Out-of-class communication and affect, immediacy, and empowerment.

Tibbles, D., & Ayash, G. (2006). The relationship between perceived message sensation value and trait variables in marijuana public service announcements

## *Teaching Experience*

### **Guest Instructor**

West Virginia University, Morgantown, WV (2005– 2006)

Comm 112: Small Group Communication (Spring 2006)

Comm 306: Organizational Communication (Fall 2005)

Northwest Missouri State University, Maryville, MO (2005)

Persuasive Communication- Community Liaison for the Communication Consultant Corps. Grant funded by the Missouri Campus Compact

### **Course Assistant**

West Virginia University, Morgantown, WV (2005 – 2006)

Comm 112: Small Group Communication (Spring 2006)

Comm 316: Intercultural Communication (Spring 2006)

Comm 306: Organizational Communication (Fall, 2005)

Comm 308: Nonverbal Communication (Fall, 2005)

**High School**

Waynesville High School, Waynesville, MO (2006 – current)

Composition, speech, and debate instructor.

Abraham Lincoln High School, Council Bluffs, IA (2005)

Long term substitute: Taught four sections of academic speech and three sections of honors speech.

Albany High School, Albany, MO (2004).

Student teacher: Taught one section of debate, two sections of speech, one section of honors speech, and assisted with two sections of freshman English and one section of honors early start senior composition.

**Forensic Coach**

Waynesville High School, Waynesville, MO (2006 – current)

Director of Forensics

Northwest Missouri State University, Maryville, MO (2004 – 2005)

Assistant student coach of individual events. Attended and judged tournaments, held private coaching session with students, and ran a team worknight once a week.

Albany High School, Albany, MO ( Fall, 2004)

Assistant coach.

*Honors*

Qualified AFA-NIET in extemporaneous speaking (2001).

Qualified AFA-NIET in communication analysis (2004).

Qualified NFA nationals in impromptu and extemporaneous speaking (2001).

Qualified NFA nationals in impromptu, extemporaneous speaking, and persuasive speaking (2002).

Qualified NFA nationals in impromptu, extemporaneous speaking, and persuasive speaking (2003).

Qualified NFA nationals in impromptu, extemporaneous speaking, persuasive speaking, informative speaking, and communication analysis (2004).

*Computer Knowledge*

SAS

Microsoft Office Products (Word, Excel, PowerPoint, and Access)

**Professional Memberships**

Eastern Communication Association (ECA)