INFORMATION TO USERS

This material was produced from a microfilm copy of the original document. While the most advanced technological means to photograph and reproduce this document have been used, the quality is heavily dependent upon the quality of the original submitted.

The following explanation of techniques is provided to help you understand markings or patterns which may appear on this reproduction.

1. The sign or "target" for pages apparently lacking from the document photographed is "Missing Page(s)". If it was possible to obtain the missing page(s) or section, they are spliced into the film along with adjacent pages. This may have necessitated cutting thru an image and duplicating adjacent pages to insure you complete continuity.

2. When an image on the film is obliterated with a large round black mark, it is an indication that the photographer suspected that the copy may have moved during exposure and thus cause a blurred image. You will find a good image of the page in the adjacent frame.

3. When a map, drawing or chart, etc., was part of the material being photographed the photographer followed a definite method in "sectioning" the material. It is customary to begin photoing at the upper left hand corner of a large sheet and to continue photoing from left to right in equal sections with a small overlap. If necessary, sectioning is continued again — beginning below the first row and continuing on until complete.

4. The majority of users indicate that the textual content is of greatest value, however, a somewhat higher quality reproduction could be made from "photographs" if essential to the understanding of the dissertation. Silver prints of "photographs" may be ordered at additional charge by writing the Order Department, giving the catalog number, title, author and specific pages you wish reproduced.

5. PLEASE NOTE: Some pages may have indistinct print. Filmed as received.

University Microfilms International
300 North Zeib Road
Ann Arbor, Michigan 48106 USA
St. John's Road, Tyler's Green
High Wycombe, Bucks, England HP10 8HR
SMITTER, Roger Dale, 1947-
A STUDY OF SPEAKER EXPECTATION FOR
AUDIENCE RESPONSE.
The Ohio State University,
Ph.D., 1977
Speech

University Microfilms International, Ann Arbor, Michigan 48106
A STUDY OF SPEAKER EXPECTATION
FOR AUDIENCE RESPONSE

DISSERTATION

Presented in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for
the Degree Doctor of Philosophy in the Graduate
School of The Ohio State University

by

Roger Dale Smitter, B.A., M.A.

* * * * *

The Ohio State University

Reading Committee:
Dr. Jack Douglas, Adviser
Dr. Don Cegala
Dr. John Makay

Approved by:

Jack D. Douglas
Adviser
Department of Communication
This dissertation is dedicated to my wife, Jane, whose expectations for its completion never wavered.
I would like to acknowledge the assistance of the reading committee, Dr. Don Cegala and Dr. John Makay, whose contributions improved the quality of the research, and especially the assistance of my adviser, Dr. Jack Douglas, whose guidance and patience in fulfilling his duties contributed not only to the quality of the research but the growth of the researcher.
VITA

January 12, 1947 . . . . Born – Allegan, Michigan

1969 . . . . . . . . B.A., Taylor University, Upland, Indiana

1969-1970 . . . . Teaching Assistant, Speech Department
Ball State University, Muncie, Indiana

1970 . . . . . . . . M.A., Ball State University, Muncie, Indiana

1970-1974 . . . . Instructor, Speech and Theatre Arts
Department, Heidelberg College, Tiffin
Ohio

1974-1976 . . . . Teaching Associate, Department of Communication,
Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio

1976-present . . . . Assistant Professor, Speech Communication and
Theatre Department, Albion College, Albion,
Michigan

PUBLICATIONS

"How High School Students Perceive and Evaluate Evidence," Indiana

"Rex Humbard: American Values via Fundamentalism." Moments in

FIELDS OF STUDY

Major Field: Communication

Studies in Research Methodology. Professor Don Cegala

Studies in Rhetoric. Professor William Brown

Studies in Mass Communication. Professor Joe Foley
# TABLE OF CONTENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DEDICATION</td>
<td>ii</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACKNOWLEDGMENTS</td>
<td>iii</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VITA</td>
<td>iv</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LIST OF TABLES</td>
<td>vi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LIST OF FIGURES</td>
<td>vii</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapter</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I. THEORETICAL RATIONALE, PREVIOUS STUDIES AND HYPOTHESES</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theoretical rationale</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Previous Studies</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hypotheses</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II. PROCEDURES AND DESIGN</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III. RESULTS</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quantitative Analysis</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qualitative Analysis</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV. INTERPRETATION AND CONCLUSIONS</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussion of Quantitative Results</td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussion of Qualitative Results</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conclusions</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implications for Future Research</td>
<td>114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary</td>
<td>115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LIST OF REFERENCES</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APPENDIX</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.</td>
<td>122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
LIST OF TABLES

Table 1: Means of Kuder-Richardson No. 8 Reliability Estimates for Feedback and Expectation Measures ........................................... 62

Table 2: Reliability Estimates for Rankings of Variables Influencing Audience Response .................................................. 62

Table 3: Biserial Correlations of Feedback Measures with Expectation Measures ................................................................. 69

Table 4: Contrast of Peer and Self Feedback Correlation Coefficients Against Instructor and Self Feedback Correlation Coefficients . .................................................. 72

Table 5: Friedman Analysis of Ranks for Variables Affecting Audience Response ............................................................ 74

Table 6: Correlation of Self-Reports of Speaking Experience with Perceived Discrepancy of Feedback from Pre-Speech Expectations .................................................. 76

Table 7: Correlations of Speaking Experience with Rank Assigned Variables Affecting Audience Response .................. 77

Table 8: Factor Analysis of Initial Three Factor Solution with Items Deleted ................................................................. 123

Table 9: Correlation Matrix for Audience Feedback Factors ................................................................. 124
# LIST OF FIGURES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Figure</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Figure 1:</td>
<td>Experimental Design</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Figure 2:</td>
<td>Expectations for Peer Audience Behavior</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Figure 3:</td>
<td>Expectations for Instructor Audience Behavior</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Figure 4:</td>
<td>Perceived Feedback from Peer Audience</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Figure 5:</td>
<td>Perceived Feedback from Instructor Audience</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Figure 6:</td>
<td>Perceived Feedback from Self.</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Mead's (1934) discussion of the significant symbol and generalized other suggested that communicator expectation for receiver response is an essential consideration in the communication process. Berlo (1960) argued that all communication is premised on a prediction by the source of the receiver's probable response (p. 117). Berlo also suggested that the goal of communication is interaction, "the merger of self and other, a complete ability to anticipate, predict and behave in accordance with the joint needs of self and other" (p. 131). Expectations are inherent in any such goal.

Clevenger and Matthews (1971) used the cybernetic model to describe feedforward as the contingencies, goal states, and expectations which a communicator creates from feedback (pp. 124-125). If we conceptualize human communication as a goal-oriented activity in which the communicator selects from an array of possible symbols in constructing a message, then the communicator's expectations for the response to those symbols becomes an important construct in that process. While these writers focused on interpersonal communication, communicator expectations also function in the interaction between speaker and audience.
Although rhetorical and communication theory have recognized the audience as a variable in the communication process (Thonnessen & Baird, 1948, p. 429), it has often been assigned a passive role (Clevenger, 1966, p. 7; Holtzman, 1970, p. 1; Williams, 1964, pp. 55, 76-77), even to the point of viewing receivers as defenseless against the manipulations of the skilled orator (see Woolbert, 1916). Although Hollingsworth (1935) argued that the speaker-audience relationship is a matter of reciprocal influence, contemporary work only has emphasized this position fully and thus suggested the usefulness of examining expectations of the audience response. Bauer (1964) rejected communication models which focused solely on the source, by conceptualizing public speaking as a "transactional process in which two parties each expect to give and take from the deal in approximately equitable values" (p. 319).

Similarly, contemporary literature in audience analysis instructs the speaker to anticipate the audience and speaking situation when preparing to speak. Williams (1964) claimed the classical methods of audience analysis were inappropriate for contemporary use because they assumed an unchanging audience. He proposed the speaker develop a prognosis for the probable audience response (pp. 77-78).

Clevenger (1966) characterized audience analysis as a series of choices which the speaker must make in preparing a strategy: "'Communication strategy' means clarifying one's purpose in speaking and settling upon a course of action calculated to fulfill those purposes" (Clevenger, 1966, pp. 24-25).
Holtzman (1970) suggested "in order to understand audience influence, it is necessary to acknowledge that the immediate source of influence is not the audience itself but the image of the audience that the speaker carries in his own mind" (p. 29). His analysis reflected Boulding's (1956) notion of the image and Mead's (1934) discussion of the generalized other:

For the speaker, his imaged or perceived audience is the only one that exists for him, the only one he responds to. If this image were accurate in every detail on every occasion, the speaker would possess sensitivity, knowledge, and wisdom far beyond any possibility. Perception of an audience is a selective process . . . . Reasonably, the goal of the effective speaker is to learn as accurately as possible the details about listeners that are essential to a given task (Holtzman, 1970, p. 30).

Holtzman also suggested the "preparing speaker is always listening, in effect, to his audience image" and engaging in "an imaged transaction" with them to better meet his goals (pp. 114-115). The goal of audience analysis from this view is the development of appropriate expectations for receiver response:

The final critical concern in audience analysis must be the discovery of the most likely cause of the listener's adherence to the speaker's idea. This discovery involves reasoning . . . from the desired listener contribution to the speaker-listener interaction that will probably cause that contribution. Audience adaptation is the application of the discovered cause in the speaking situation (Holtzman, 1970, p. 111).

Like Clevenger and Matthews, Colburn and Weinberg (1976) described the feedforward process in which the speaker defines probable response:

Feedforward is real. It has meaning and has implications for the student of speech communication. Understanding feedforward . . . is vital to understanding the dynamic process of communication (Colburn & Weinberg, 1976, p. 26).
Recent rhetorical criticism has examined communicator expectation for receiver response. Johannesen (1971) suggested that the speaker's attitude toward the audience is a useful variable for studying the rhetorical process. Black (1970) proposed that any speech contains an implied auditor or "second persons" which represents what the speaker would have the audience become. Booth (1967) and Brockridge (1971) discussed the attitude a communicator could assume toward his audience.

This study will argue that while communication and rhetorical theory recognize communicator expectation for receiver response as an important variable, the variable has seldom been cast at an explicit operational level suitable to the development of testable hypotheses. The literature contains little experimental work on the role of communicator expectations in the public speaking situation.

To focus the research reported here the following questions were posed:

1. How do a speaker's expectations for audience response develop and change over a series of public speaking experiences?
2. How do a speaker's perceptions of audience response vary with expectations for response in subsequent speeches?
3. How do a speaker's evaluations of his own communication effects vary with the development of expectations for audience response?
4. How does a speaker's evaluation of the variables in the public speaking situation vary with the development of expectations?
5. How do a speaker's expectations vary with the amount of experience the speaker has in public speaking?

Theoretical Rationale

Since few communication scholars have posed empirical questions concerning the role of expectations for audience response, development
of a theoretical rationale is tenuous. Cybernetic theory, with its emphasis on feedback as a means of self-correction (Ashby, 1957, 1960; Boulding, 1956; Laszlo, 1969, 1972; and MacKay, 1967), when coupled with Mead's (1934) analysis of communication provides a basis for three propositions which constitute part of the rationale for this study.

Proposition I: An examination of communication phenomena should account for those variables which affect the interaction of communicators within an environment.

Cybernetic theory requires variables relevant to the interaction of the speaker and audience be examined as a system of interrelated components. Examination of isolated variables is inadequate to explain communication events. The cybernetic model is a useful analogue for conceptualizing communication as a process which is systemic, purposive, and involves growth and decay of relationships over time (Florence, 1973).

Ashby (1957) defined a system as any set of variables selected from among those available in a situation such that the structural relationship among them is appropriate to explaining their operation (p. 40). The variables taken together would have a natural association such that the exclusion of one will cause the system to function capriciously (Ashby, 1960, p. 25). Thus, an investigator should select those variables which best explain the system (Ashby, 1957, p. 106).

Watzlawick, Beavin, and Jackson (1967) defined a system as a set of relationships between objects and their attributes such that any object is ultimately specified by its attributes. In a communication system, the "objects" are not individuals but rather "persons-communicating-with-other-persons" (p. 120).
Laszlo (1972) suggested three fundamental characteristics of a systems perspective useful to the present research: systems (1) are wholes with irreducible parts, (2) maintain themselves in a changing environment, and (3) generate a response to their environment (pp. 27-67). These characteristics suggest the importance of feedback to a system. A speaker making use of audience feedback to adjust his messages illustrates the principles in action.

How might the cybernetic model be applied to the interaction of speaker and audience? Eisenson et al. (1963) suggested a model of the public speaking situation comprised of polarization, social facilitation, and circular response processes (pp. 274-275) which is applicable to a systems orientation. The model suggests the three processes are mutually dependent and reactive.

Polarization defines reciprocal roles for speaker and audience in which each becomes the focus of attention for the other. With social facilitation, responses to the speaker by one portion of the audience affect other audience members. Circular response is the process by which the speaker assesses the adequacy of his efforts by reading audience response and then develops expectations for future audience reactions. Eisenson et al. described it as "the effect on the speaker of the response of his hearers and the consequent reinforcement or modification of his own communication behavior and its subsequent effect upon hearers" (1963, p. 275). These three processes relate two subsystems, speaker and audience, such that each subsystem functions as an environment for the other.
The environment of a system is made up of those variables which affect the system and may be changed by the system's behavior (Ashby, 1960, p. 36). MacKay (1967) described the interaction of environment and system as a "dialogue." Change and adaptation is possible for both with use of the comparator function by which a system compares the feedback received from the environment against expectations (p. 255).

When an organism affects its environment and the environment affects the system, feedback exists (Ashby, 1960, p. 37). Within such a system all relevant components must be accounted for. By conceptualizing the speaker-audience interchange as a system, we are required to examine those components of the system which the speaker perceives as important in affecting the audience response and those sources of feedback which he utilizes in developing expectations for future responses. Testing isolated variables can never provide adequate explanations of such a system. Rhetorical theorists list a number of variables, including topic, occasion, task, and social context in addition to the audience. As the essential tool for developing expectations feedback must be examined in light of all these components.

Proposition II: Feedback from a receiver provides the information by which a source assesses the effect of his messages and develops expectations for future responses.

Eisenson et al. (1963) clearly identified feedback as a key component of their model. Use of the label circular response is important in that the authors recognized feedback as more than a simple overt listener response. It is the process in which the listener provides the source with information useful to his continued performance. Their label is in line with the cybernetic model and thus delineates the nature of expectations.
Wiener (1954) defined feedback as the control of a system "on the basis of its actual performance rather than its expected performance" (p. 36). With feedback, a system makes use of the information provided by the observation of its effects in past performances to guide future efforts (Wiener, 1954, p. 47). Definitions of feedback in communication literature parallel Wiener's (1954):

What feedback does for the communicator is provide him with essential information concerning his success in accomplishing his objectives. In doing so, the feedback controls future messages. Whether the speaker is talking to one or one hundred, he has the two-fold task of (1) observing and interpreting audience reactions and (2) readjusting his next message in light of his observations and interpretations (Samovar and Mills, 1972, p. 33).

Feedback may be negative or positive. Watzlawick, Beavin, and Jackson's definition closely parallels those provided by Ashby (1957, p. 81) by suggesting negative feedback is information provided by a receiver which aids the source in adjusting behavior toward communication goals through deviance compensation. Negative feedback provides stability in a communication relationship by stimulating the decrease or cessation of source behavior while positive feedback increases instability:

In the case of negative feedback, information is used to decrease the output deviation from a set of norms or biases. . . while in the case of positive feedback, the same information acts as a measure for amplification of the output deviation and is thus positive in relation to the already existing trend toward a standstill or disruption (Watzlawick et al., 1967, p. 31).

Feedback represents a systematic relationship by which the source gains information relative to its efforts in communicating with a receiver, thus reducing uncertainty for the source (Smith, 1973). Feedback in the public speaking situation provides the speaker with information by which
he can determine the success of his communication and develop expectations for future responses.

Johnson and Klare (1962) described internal feedback loops, which do not cross the boundaries which relate a system to its environment, and external feedback loops, which do cross boundaries (p. 151). A public speaker receives feedback via both loops. His message crosses his output boundary and is received by the audience which then generates a response. The speaker also observes his own behavior and can, as Mead suggests, become an object to himself by making use of the internal loop. In this study, the external feedback loop is that information which the speaker receives from his audience which allows him to assess the effect of his communication on them. Internal feedback loops permit the speaker to observe himself interacting with the audience.

Although he did not use the word, Mead (1934) discussed feedback by arguing that a self concept develops only as a person engages in social interaction and receives a response from others. Persons are dependent on the responses to aid them in identifying who they are in any situation (Mead, 1934, p. 135). Similarly, Mead suggested that the meaning of any communication arises out of a three-fold relationship between the communication of one person, the adjutive response to that communication by a second person, and the resultant social interaction which is set in motion. Meaning is thus found in the feedback (Mead, 1934, pp. 75-76). His discussion of feedback processes also raises the issue of expectations for feedback.
The significant term in this research is expectation. Laszlo (1969) described a process in which a system develops an internal representation of its environment and then "projects" that structure onto the environment. Boulding (1956) called this projection the "image," the individual's subjective knowledge of his environment which functions to guide behavior (p. 6). Clevenger and Matthews (1971) used the terms anticipation and predictions to explain expectation as a form of feedforward (p. 136). Mead (1934) used the generalized other and Me concepts to describe a person's internal representation of the attitudes others hold toward him. This representation, which in the public speaking context becomes the speaker's image of his audience, functions in the development of expectations.

In accord with Boulding, Holtzman suggested that a speaker's image of his audience changes as a result of feedback (Boulding, 1956, pp. 6-14; Holtzman, pp. 29-31). In this light, expectation for response is the subjective knowledge which a speaker has for the manner in which the audience will respond to his message based on feedback received and is subject to change over time as additional feedback is received.

**Proposition III**: A communicator creates expectations for response in selecting symbols for communicating and thus operates within a process which is goal-governed and purposeful.

Although again he did not use the word, feedforward occupied a dominant position in Mead's thinking in that he used expectation for response to account for symbolic behavior. According to Mead, the social process derived from the use of gestures, "that phase of the individual act to which adjustment takes place on the part of the other individuals in the social process of behavior" (Mead, 1934, p. 46). He added, "Gestures
become significant symbols when they implicitly arouse in an individual making them the same response which they explicitly arouse, or are supposed to arouse, in . . . the individuals to whom they are addressed" (Mead, 1934, p. 47). A significant symbol occurs when a communicator chooses a set of symbols with an expectation for receiver response: 
"... if the response can be given in terms of an attitude utilized for the further control of action, then the relation of that stimulus and attitude is what we mean by a significant symbol" (Mead, 1934, p. 96). The expectation is premised on the meaning the communicator attaches to the symbol. The assumption that the meaning is shared is confirmed, denied, or modified by feedback. Cushman summarized Mead:

Significant gestures involve two phases: First the individual making the significant symbol places himself in the position of the individual to whom the gesture is addressed; second, from the point of view of the other, the individual then views the content of his own gesture (Cushman, 1969, p. 6).

Mead's analysis of expectation was developed further in the generalized other construct. Persons experience their social selves only through the response of others. They become objects to themselves when they assume an attitude toward themselves which, they believe, others hold toward them. This organization of attitudes is the generalized other (Mead, 1945, p. 138). Persons act in accordance with the expectation they have for the response of the generalized other. An audience or "audiences-in-general" surely constitutes such a generalized other (see Sarbin and Allen, 1968, pp. 529-533).

The function of expectation becomes more explicit in Mead's I and Me constructs. The Me is the organized social structure in which the
person finds himself, the expectation which the individual has for the response he will receive in communicating with the generalized other. The I is the individual's unique response to the situation and calls out a response from the Me (Mead, 1934, p. 178). The I and Me interaction is situation-bound in that a person may have an I and Me for a variety of tasks (Mead, 1934, p. 199). The individual develops expectations for probable responses to his communication and acts accordingly.

Mead's analysis applies to the public speaking situation in two forms. First, audience analysis literature suggests the speaker should develop an expectation appropriate to his knowledge of the audience. The writers suggest the speaker develop a set of significant symbols which will arouse in the audience the meaning they arouse in himself. Such symbols arise only from knowledge of the audience as a generalized other: a collection of attitudes which the speaker believes the audience holds concerning him, his topic, the occasion, and other factors which influence their response. The speaker begins to develop an expectation or an image (Holtzman, 1970) for his audience. Perceived audience response then provides information about the validity and usefulness of such expectations and thus confirms or modified this image. With repeated interaction with audiences, the speaker derives a self-as-speaker concept from the audience reactions. The concept of audience begins to take on the characteristics of a generalized other for the speaker and thus a Me develops for such situations. In facing a new speaking situation the speaker develops an I as a response to the Me in that new situation. The interaction of these two concepts guides the speaker through audience analysis and message preparation.
The link of Mead's analysis to the public speaking situation is revealed in Eisenson's et al. model (1963). The emergence of a generalized other and of significant symbols would suggest that a polariza-
tion of audience and speaker roles was occurring for the speaker. Following Mead, this emergence is contingent on the operation of a circular response in which the speaker uses audience response. Although its conceptual link is less straightforward, the social facilitation concept is useful here in allowing for speaker observation of intra-audience communication. Such communication may facilitate the process by which the speaker generalizes the attitudes which he presumes the audience holds toward him.

Mead's interest was at the dyadic level of social interaction and in the development of a global notion of the self-concept. His thinking serves as an analogue in an examination at the more macroscopic level of the public speaking situation. Mead's analysis, with its view of communication as choice-governed and as a process dependent on circular response, is also congruent with systems thinking.

The practical syllogism (Von Wright, 1971, pp. 96-108) provides an explanatory mode appropriate to seeing communication as purposeful, goal-governed and dependent on circular response. Law-bound conceptualizations of communication reduce symbolic behavior to mere movement within an S-R paradigm by failing to allow for choice or intent on the part of the symbol user. Yet, communication is more adequately explained as action, involving choice and intent, rather than as movement alone, involving only stimulus and response (Capella, 1972). Under the practical syllogism, the problems of accounting for symbol behavior within law-like explanations can be
avoided since what the communicator intends to do is posited as explanatory to his behavior. The logic of the syllogism allows for the flexibility and goal-orientation inherent in a symbol system.

The practical syllogism take the form:

A intends to bring about p.
A considers that he cannot bring about p unless he does a.
Therefore, A sets himself to do a. (Von Wright, 1971, p. 96).

The communicator (A) intends to arouse a response (p) in his receivers. He believes that he cannot arouse this response without adequate preparation and audience analysis (a). He sets about to do this analysis, a major part of which is the development of appropriate expectations based on his knowledge of the audience as a generalized other. However, no specific expectations or actions are entailed in the process. The speaker has flexibility in selecting significant symbols according to his expectations.

In summary of this rationale, communicator expectations for receiver response occupy an important position in the literature of communication and rhetorical theory. The development of expectations is fundamental to audience analysis. Systems theory and Mead's symbolic interaction theory, when cast in the logic of the practical syllogism, provide a theoretical rationale for considering the role of expectations for response in the public speaking task. In this rationale, three propositions provide (1) a systems approach to the public speaking task, (2) a focus on the interaction of feedback and feedforward processes, and (3) a conception of communication as goal-oriented activity. Analysis of previous studies which have involved communicator expectations for receiver response will show that systems and Meadian approaches to the study of
feedback and symbol systems have been neglected in communication.

Previous Studies.

Indexes of communication literature (Thompson, 1967; Matlon & Matlon, 1976) show no experimental studies which explicitly measured expectation for receiver response as a communication construct but offer a few in which the construct was implied as a tangential concern with an examination of feedback. Infante and Fisher (1974) claimed little systematic investigation had been devoted to the speaker's pre-message perceptions:

If we accept the assumption that the cognitive activity of communicators prior to a message is an important part of the communication process, then the detection of pre-message perceptions and the discovery of variables which influence such perceptions should contribute to a more complete understanding of the entire process (Infante & Fisher, 1974, p. 49).

Neither index included a heading for "expectation for response." Thompson had no heading for "feedback," classifying feedback studies under "reward." Such a classification is symptomatic of the limitations of experimental work in feedback for it implies the S-R paradigm in which a message is presented and the audience responds in a linear manner. Adaptation and choice provided for in the practical syllogism are missing in such a model. The corollary to feedback, feedforward, is overlooked entirely.

Fortunately, previous work does provide for propositions regarding the function of communication expectations. These propositions are used to organize this review of previous research.
Proposition IV: Expectations for audience response are significant in the pre-speech cognitive activities of a public speaker.

Infante and Fisher (1974) manipulated the knowledge speakers had about an unseen audience prior to a speech on an assigned topic and measured the Ss' assessment of (1) their anxiety about speaking, (2) their estimate of achieving success when speaking and (3) the importance of that success for them. Ss who believed they would speak reported significantly more anxiety than a control group not expecting to speak. However, manipulations of audience attitude toward topic and speaker produced no significant differences in reported anxiety. Ss rated the importance of success higher when the audience was unfavorable rather than favorable toward their topics. The researchers concluded that while expectations for presenting a speech heightened anxiety, audience attitude toward the topic and speaker had little effect on anxiety arousal. Such a conclusion is counter to an intuitive understanding of the nature of the speaker-audience relationship and casts doubt on the appropriateness of their manipulations of expectations.

Hazen and Kiesler (1975) in three separate studies examined a speaker's selection of arguments relative to (1) anticipated audience response, (2) anticipated channels for receiving feedback and (3) the nature of the speaking task. In the first study, the greater the anticipated audience's opposition to the assigned topic, the more frequently Ss selected arguments (developed by the experimenters) which allegedly demonstrated the existence of a problem rather than arguments designed to present a solution to a problem posed in the topic. In the second
study, Ss led to believe they would receive feedback via a post-speech interview with the audience chose more problem-centered (rather than solution-centered) arguments than those expecting feedback via less personal channels. In the third study, no significant difference in argument selection was found between Ss instructed to develop an informative message and Ss instructed to develop a persuasive message. Hazen and Kiesler concluded: "Messages strategies are planned with possible audience rejection in mind, particularly if that rejection may have to be received by personal feedback" (1975, p. 68). While hardly compelling, the conclusion supports the effect of communicator expectations for response on communicator behavior.

In separate but similar studies, Zimmer and Bauer (1956) and Schramm and Danielson (1958) told Ss they would speak to an audience which was either favorable or opposed to their assigned topic. Zimmer and Bauer offered Ss arguments for use in the speech which were either congruent or incongruent with the anticipated audience's attitudes. Schramm and Danielson gave Ss arguments which were congruent and arguments which were incongruent with the audience's position. In both studies, the dependent measure was the Ss' recall, at a later date, of the arguments. Zimmer and Bauer found Ss given congruent arguments recalled significantly more of the arguments than Ss given incongruent arguments. Schramm and Danielson found that Ss recalled significantly more of the congruent than incongruent arguments.

Brown (1970) and Brown and Garland (1971) operationalized Goffman's (1967) notion of "face saving" as the sacrifice of tangible reward to avoid embarrassment and suggested that such face saving is mediated by
the expectation of feedback from an audience. Brown led Ss to believe they would talk to an audience about their experiences in an experimental task. He found (1) Ss who had done an embarrassing task and believed their audience was ignorant of the nature of the task sacrificed more reward in recounting their experiences than did Ss expecting a knowledgeable audience and (2) Ss sacrificed more reward when they anticipated the audience would serve an evaluative rather than a non-evaluative function.

Brown and Garland found that face-saving behavior was significantly greater when (1) Ss were made to feel incompetent rather than competent in performing before an audience, (2) when the audience were acquaintances of the Ss rather than strangers and when Ss expected evaluative rather than non-evaluative feedback from the audience.

Borman and Shapiro (1962) employed a Meadian analysis of the self to hypothesize that a speaker led to believe his audience perceived him as confident and poised would report less anxiety than a speaker not so led. Students in public speaking classes were matched on the basis of their self-reports of speech anxiety. Only one of each pair was told by the experimenters he had been judged by classmates to be one of the most confident speakers in the class. On a subsequent classroom speech, Ss receiving the manipulation reported significantly less anxiety than those not so manipulated. Borman and Shapiro concluded that the "speaker's perceived confidence is a function of his own self-image" (1962, p. 256).

In each of these studies, Ss were led to believe they would communicate to an audience while their knowledge about the audience was manipulated. Although in most of the studies (Brown, 1970; Brown & Garland,
1971; Hazen & Kiesler, 1975; Infante & Fisher, 1974; Schramm & Danielson, 1958; Zimmer & Bauer, 1956) Ss did not appear before an audience and receive feedback, the manipulations of expectations for feedback exerted an effect on the speaker's cognitive processes. As will be noted in Proposition VII, failure to allow for feedback presents problems. Also, since only Infante and Fisher explicitly measured expectations, the studies merely suggest a role for expectations.

**Proposition V:** Observed audience response affects a speaker's expectations for subsequent audience response.

Theorists examined above (Clevenger, 1966; Colburn & Weinberg, 1976; Hollingsworth, 1935; Holtzman, 1970) all suggested speakers should observe audience feedback as part of an ongoing process of audience analysis. Such feedback informs the speaker of the impact of his efforts and thereby provides information necessary for subsequent adaptation. The theorists suggest that expectations develop as feedback is monitored.

Studies in support of this fifth proposition indicate observations of audience feedback may affect speaker expectations. No attempt was made to measure expectations in these studies, however. The focus was on the effect of feedback on speaker behavior only.

Two studies (Miller, Zavos, Vlandis & Rosenbaum, 1961; Miller, 1964) established a paradigm in which "negative" feedback was operationalized as an overt audience response indicating disagreement, dissatisfaction, or inattentiveness; "positive" feedback was an overt response indicating opposite audience attitudes; and allegedly "neutral" feedback was the absence of overt audience response. Feedback was thus conceived of not as a relationship between communicators within a cybernetic model but as
a form of reward or punishment within an S-R paradigm.

Miller et al. (1961) and Miller (1964) had Ss present a speech on an assigned topic to a one-member audience which provided a reinforcement which was either the same or different from that given a speaker who was a confederate of the experimentors. In both studies Ss who received a treatment less favorable than the one they had observed the confederate receiving produced significantly more nonfluencies than Ss whose treatment was identical to the one given the confederate. No main effect on fluency measures was found for Ss receiving negative feedback in contrast to Ss receiving positive feedback.

Miller (1964) concluded "the sequence of responses to successive speakers had greater impact upon delivery than did approval or disapproval of the speaker himself" (Miller, 1964, p. 114). He offered two explanations: differing reinforcements may have (1) produced a violation of expectancies which in turn led to a disruption of the speaking pattern or (2) may have heightened motivational factors which created a disruptive influence on the speaker. Miller suggested that feedback to a speaker is not an isolated event but rather is perceived as part of a sequence of events in which expectations play an important role (1964, p. 115).

The linkage between feedback and apparent expectation development was also found within a single speech. Employing the rationale, design and operations used by Miller to vary feedback treatments across equal intervals of a single speech, Vlandis (1964) found significant variations in nonfluencies only when the feedback was first positive and then negative. Likewise, Flesher (1969) used a trained audience to give
speakers an attentive response during initial portions of their speeches and then manipulated attentiveness levels during the remainder of each speech. She found fewer changes between the second and third intervals of the speeches than between the first and second, suggesting that a speaker's pattern of verbal behavior was established by the middle of the first speech and was more resistant to change than in earlier portions of the speech.

Sereno (1965) varied audience response across two successive speeches by Ss. When feedback to the second speech was less favorable than that given the first, Ss exhibited an increase in nonfluencies and a decrease in utterance rate. When the second feedback treatment was more favorable than the first, utterance rate increased and nonfluencies decreased. He suggested "reinforcement given for the second speech in a series is influential both because of its own characteristics and because of its relation to earlier responses" (Sereno, 1965, p. 261).

Rhodes and Frandsen (1975) found that Ss who had received instruction in feedback utilization (1) exhibited significantly fewer nonfluencies and a higher rate of utterance and (2) reported more confidence when speaking before an audience which provided feedback cues indicative of disagreement than did Ss without such instruction. The training apparently prepared Ss to adapt to negative audience responses. Such adaptation is linked to the development of expectations for response in that the trained speakers apparently developed a better projection or image for their audience environment. These projections of possible reactions and the development of strategies to deal with the reactions became a frame of reference for the Ss as they interpreted audience
feedback.

These studies suggest audience response observed by the speaker provides information concerning the audience's function as a generalized other for the speaker. Feedback provides information which allows the speaker to develop a map for projecting into that environment a message based on expectations. However, by focusing solely on fluency measures, the explanatory principle was reduced to a linear causal model: if the speaker received "negative" feedback, then his speech pattern was disrupted. The studies permitted little flexibility in the speakers' selection of symbols. Although the development of expectations for response was used to explain results, no attempt was made to measure the expectation construct.

While the Rhodes and Frandsen study suggested experience in receiving feedback is useful to developing communication skills, a number of studies have suggested that speech anxiety decreases as practice is gained in public speaking (Thompson, 1967, p. 176). Examination of student's experiences prior to enrollment in public speaking classes found that Ss rated as more proficient in speaking had more speech experience than those rated less proficient (Chenowith, 1940, pp. 587-588) and that Ss who experienced high levels of anxiety in speaking had less training in speaking (Gilkinson, 1943; Low & Sheets, 1951). Jensen (1976) found that measures of experience in public speaking were the best predictor from among a number of variables for a student's score on speech anxiety measures.

Using an experimental design to study the effects of speech experience, Karns (1969) had four experienced speakers each prepare two
separate manuscript speeches for presentation to an audience trained to
provide no overt response and to an audience trained to give both positive
and negative responses. He found no significant difference in speaker
fluency across the two audience treatments but did find that "essential
changes" in manuscript content occurred at a rate significantly higher
than chance following negative audience response. As with Chanowith,
Gilkinson, Low and Sheets and Rhodes and Frandsen, Kern's work indicates
that experience in public speaking aids a speaker in adjusting to the
demands of the speaking situation. Apparently, the experienced speaker
has a better set of expectations for audience response and thus experi­
ences less anxiety and is better able to adjust to the demands of the
situation.

The studies under Proposition V imply a not surprising principle:
persons who have had experience in public speaking demonstrate less
anxiety and are better able to adapt to the demands of the speaking
situation than those who have had less experience. Under a Meadian
interpretation, the experienced speakers have had more opportunity to
develop a set of expectations for dealing with the generalized other of
"audience." In cybernetic theory, the experienced speakers have had an
opportunity to map their environment and establish appropriate projec­
tions for that environment.

**Proposition VI:** Communicator expectations for audience
response affect the speaker's interpretation of observed
audience response.

Barwind (1969) used dissonance theory to suggest that speakers
receiving audience feedback inconsistent with previous experiences would
change their attitude toward their task, audience, topic and themselves
more than Ss receiving feedback consistent with experiences. He assumed that speakers classified as "skilled" by their classroom instructors would expect a favorable response while "unskilled" speakers would expect an unfavorable response. He found Ss receiving feedback inconsistent with presumed expectations changed evaluations of the audience more than evaluations of self or topic. Those receiving unexpected negative feedback derogated the audience while those receiving unexpected positive feedback rated the audience more favorably than prior to the speech. Self-concept measures remained unchanged.

Gardiner (1972) led Ss to expect either a favorable or unfavorable audience response and then had trained audience members provide cues which were either consistent or inconsistent with these presumed expectations. He hypothesized that a violation of expectations would affect Ss' rating of their performance and audience. He found (1) Ss who expected and received negative responses rated their own performance more favorably than Ss who expected positive responses and received negative ones and (2) Ss who received positive responses rated the audience more favorably than Ss who received negative responses. He found no support for a third hypothesis that Ss who expected positive but received negative responses would rate the audience more favorably than Ss expecting and receiving negative responses.

Jensen (1975) hypothesized that (1) high anxiety speakers would perceive favorable audience feedback as less favorable than low anxiety speakers and (2) low anxiety speakers would perceive unfavorable feedback as more favorable than high anxiety speakers. As with Barwind, Jensen presented no support for his major assumption: that high and low
anxiety speakers had differing expectations for audience response. Ss presented a single speech and received either favorable or unfavorable feedback from a trained audience.

A significant main effect was found for the feedback manipulations on only two of the five scales (Jensen, 1969) used to measure perceptions of feedback. Jensen suggested that speakers are subject to selective perception, based on their presumed expectations, when interpreting audience response. His results were confounded by the finding of a significant difference in dependent measures across the two separate audiences used in the study, pointing up the difficulties of manipulating audience response.

Although limited in number and hindered by a host of methodological problems, these studies indicate a speaker's expectations for audience response affect his interpretations of that response. Unfortunately, the studies assumed the existence of the expectation construct without testing for it.

Proposition VII. Communicator expectation for receiver response as a construct has not been operationalized at a level appropriate to capturing the logic of (1) the process by which feedback and feedforward states interact over time and (2) the factors of choice and intention in communication.

The methodologies employed in the studies cited above provide support for this proposition. As developed in the rationale, a conceptualization of communication as a goal-oriented process in which choice is important in the interaction of feedforward and feedback states is essential to understanding expectations. Mead's (1934) analysis clearly suggested that interaction over time is important in
the development of the self and generalized other. With its emphasis on the exchange of information between system and environment, cybernetics also demands a process orientation. The practical syllogism as an explanatory mode for the operation of expectations suggests that an S-R paradigm is inadequate to account for complex communication behavior. With this overview in mind, each of the two subpoints of the proposition will be examined.

Many of the studies reviewed examined feedforward without looking at feedback. Although a process view of communication is fundamental to understanding communication theory (see Berlo, 1960, p. 24; Brooks & Scheidel, 1968; Smith, 1972), none of the studies reviewed here employed a methodology appropriate to capturing the feedback-feedforward interaction process. In several studies (Brown, 1970; Brown & Garland, 1971; Gardiner, 1972; Hazen & Kiesler, 1975; Infante & Fisher, 1974; Schramm & Danielson, 1958; Zimmer & Bauer, 1956), Ss were told about an audience without having contact with it. Perhaps as a result, manipulations of expectations were not perceived by the Ss as the researchers intended. An anticipated audience described as "opposed" to the speaker's topic was not perceived as more difficult to persuade than an audience described as "in favor of" the topic (Hazen & Kiesler, 1975). An audience described as "unfavorable" toward the S and his topic aroused no more anxiety in the S than did an audience described as "favorable" toward S and topic (Infante & Fisher, 1974). These findings suggest the problems of attempting to induce an expectancy for audience response without adequately providing Ss with experiences appropriate to developing expectations based on feedback. Hazen and Kiesler (1975), Infante and
Fisher (1974), Schramm and Danielson (1958), and Zimmer and Bauer (1956) did not indicate whether their Ss had experience in speaking prior to the experiment. Similarly, Barwind (1969), Gardiner (1972), Flesher (1969), Jensen (1975), Miller (1964), Miller et al. (1961), and Vlandis (1964) had Ss speak to a previously unencountered audience. Without some experience in the task of speaking to an audience, Ss would have little opportunity to develop what Mead would call a "self-as-speaker" concept and manipulations of audience reactions would have little impact (Infante & Fisher, 1974, p. 49). When encountering a new audience, a speaker with limited platform experience would have little from which to draw in establishing an expectancy for response in speaking to that audience. In much of this research, Ss were students enrolled in public speaking courses and were fulfilling course requirement by participating in the studies. Thus, for Ss encountering an unknown audience, which they would probably not see again, the matter of seeking a favorable audience response and establishing expectations to that end may have been unimportant. Generalization beyond the experimental setting is difficult.

Obviously, on occasion a speaker is told about the attitudes of an unknown, unseen audience without having previously received feedback from it. But, in such situations, the speaker has an opportunity to address the audience, receive feedback from it, and thus add to his "image" of audience as a generalized other and to his fund of expectations for audience response. By giving Ss a "one-shot" experience the studies truncated the communication process, providing only for feedforward without accounting for feedback.
While the studies reviewed under Proposition IV attempted to induce feedforward without appropriate feedback experiences, studies in the Miller paradigm (Miller, 1964; Miller et al., 1961; Flesher, 1969; Rhodes & Frandsen, 1975; Sereno, 1965; Vlandis, 1964) investigated only the feedback portion of the process without measuring what expectations the feedback may have generated. An increased level of anxiety, as measured by speaker fluency, was presumed to result from a violation of expectations for audience feedback. While the notion of expectation was employed in the explanation of results, it was not measured. This omission was due in part to the conceptualization of feedback as reward or punishment. It is at this point of incompleteness of design that Smith (1973) and Clement and Frandsen (1976) direct a number of criticisms at feedback studies, stating that the cybernetic model, in which feedback is the information "fed back" into a system to control future behavior, was ignored. Similarly, Mead's notion of the development of the self-concept and generalized other via feedback is not found in these studies.

Borman and Shapiro (1962) provided the best approximation of the Meadian and cybernetic notion of process in that their manipulations were linked to the Ss' past experience in the classroom. However, they too failed to measure the expectations which they assumed had developed. Also, the change in the anxiety levels of the Ss may have been due to the presumably high-credible source of the feedback, the experimenter, rather than the intended source, the classroom audience.

Another major criticism is that almost all of the studies made assumptions about the presence of expectations in Ss. However, Barwind
(1969) and Jensen (1975) rested their entire rationale on untested assumptions. Barwind assumed that "skilled" speakers expected a favorable audience response while "unskilled" speakers expected the opposite. Jensen assumed a similar difference for low in contrast to high anxiety speakers. While the assumptions may appear reasonable, the researchers placed Ss in a new speaking situation, outside their normal classroom, where expectations may have changed. Such an interpretation is reasonable given that Ss were novice speakers whose self-as-speaker and audience-as-generalized-other concepts may not have developed a consistent structure. In failing to measure expectations, the researchers failed to provide support for these major assumptions. Jensen's results, which found only two significant differences out of five tests, suggest some of the problems. As with the Gardiner study (1972), an obvious step would have been to complete the cycle of measuring the Ss' expectations for feedback after they had experienced the manipulated audience response.

The practical syllogism presented above suggests the communicator exercises choice and intent in the selection of symbols. However, the studies reviewed here often provided limited choice for the S by making little attempt to use a phenomenological perspective in operational definitions. In all but the Borman and Shapiro (1962), Gardiner (1972) and Karns (1969) studies, speech topics were specified by the experimenters. Barwind (1969), Miller (1964), Miller et al. (1961), Sereno (1965), and Vlandis (1964) all provided Ss with possible arguments or topics. Hazen and Kiesler (1975) established a priori whether arguments given Ss were problem- or solution-centered, apparently without attempting to determine how Ss perceived the arguments.
In another failure to assume a phenomenological perspective, Miller (1964), Miller et al. (1961), and Vlandis (1964) employed no check of their feedback manipulations. In administering the various feedback treatments, the studies assumed "the speaker attaches value of approval or disapproval to certain reactions or lack of reactions in an audience and that these values in turn affect the degree of anxiety which he experiences" (Vlandis, 1964, p. 116). Thus, the feedback manipulations were devised without regard to phenomenological concerns of the Ss' perceptions. A causal model in which feedback supposedly produces an automatic response dominated these studies.

An equally fundamental problem with the Miller paradigm is the operationalization of feedback as overt audience response only and not as information provided by the audience. For example, the studies used a "neutral" feedback treatment in which the audience supposedly exhibited no overt verbal or nonverbal cues. As Watzlawick et al. (1967) argue, a person "cannot not communicate" since information is always transmitted in a relationship (pp. 48-51). Obviously, the S may have interpreted "neutral" feedback as a negative response. The audience was providing no response in a situation where the communicator was seeking such to establish the validity of his self-concept and generalized other. The researchers made no attempt to measure the apparent choices the speaker had in interpreting the information provided by the feedback.

Such fundamental discrepancies plague much of the work on feedback. Recent reviews of feedback literature have argued that few studies used
experimental designs appropriate to the feedback phenomena (Gardiner, 1969), that most failed to make appropriate use of the cybernetic model (Smith, 1973), and that the research has focused only on the effects of feedback on communicator behavior without examining the complex set of variables related to feedback (Clement & Frandsen, 1976). Thus, we know little of how feedback affects the development of expectation states in the communicator.

Although plagued by many methodological problems already discussed, two studies which attempted to identify the manner in which speakers perceive feedback are relevant here. Dickens and Kruger (1969) attempted to discover how well speakers assess audience response. Although they found that experienced speakers were more accurate than inexperienced speakers in assessing audience acceptance of their ideas, the differences were not significant, and that inexperienced speakers showed a greater increase in accuracy over the intervals of measurement than did experienced speakers. Under a Meadian interpretation, the findings suggest the inexperienced speakers, having more to learn about the generalized other as audience, developed more from the interaction than the experienced speakers.

Like Dickens and Kruger, most studies have operationalized feedback as a unidimensional construct. However, Jensen (1969) suggested feedback is multidimensional. He had students describe the behavior of their public speaking class audiences and from the adjectives obtained developed a set of bipolar scales. The responses to the scales by a separate group of students were submitted to a number of factor analyses which produced five dimensions accounting for over 90% of the total
variance: attentiveness, restless activity, acceptance, receptivity, and involvement. However, the involvement dimension contained only two scales and several of the items identified as constituting a dimension had loadings of less than .50 on that dimension. More importantly, Jensen reported no reliability or validity data and provided no theoretical rationale for predicting a five dimensional structure. His study did suggest, however, "that relatively untrained speakers not only can but do observe specific audience behaviors even when not instructed to do so" (Jensen, 1969, p. 77). His study also indicated that a unidimensional approach to the study of feedback is inadequate.

Overview of Previous Studies. The literature reviewed here reveals a number of experimental designs and methodological problems. Audience analysis literature suggests that expectations for receiver response should be a prime concern of public speakers. Although all the research was at least tangentially relevant to the notion of expectations, none of it dealt explicitly with the function of the construct in the process of communication. While results may be interpreted in light of the cybernetic model and Mead, the studies relied on a linear causal process model rather than the systems paradigm or the practical syllogism in providing an explanation.

Given these limitations the previous studies suggested a number of conclusions relevant to further exploration of the role of expectations. Studies relevant to the fourth proposition indicate that the expectation of interaction with an audience affects a speaker's pre-speech cognitions. These studies failed to provide an explanation of the role of expectations, however, in that they did not adhere to the theoretical rationale
developed earlier. With the exception of Borman and Shapiro (1962), the studies failed to account for communication as process, restricting the audience to an anticipated role only and thus eliminating the experience of receiving feedback. The problems of induced expectations were evident. The studies gave Ss no opportunity to test their expectations against an actual audience response and thus did not allow for completion of the feedforward-feedback-feedforward cycle.

Relevant to the fifth proposition, the literature suggested that the perception of feedback may generate expectations for anticipated feedback. While providing for feedback, the studies did not measure the assumed expectations generated by the feedback. Additionally, the operationalization of feedback was inappropriate in light of the cybernetic model and Mead.

Finally, the literature relevant to the sixth proposition suggests a speaker's expectations influence his perceptions of feedback. Again, expectations were assumed but not measured and the operational definitions were inappropriate to the theoretical rationale.

Based on the theoretical rationale and review of previous studies, an alternative research strategy is mandated. Such a strategy would (1) account for the process by which expectations develop in interaction with feedback, (2) explore the relationships between the speaker's experience and perception of feedback and other variables which he believes affect such feedback, (3) allow for interpretations within the choices provided by the practical syllogism, and (4) permit feedback to occur without manipulation in the speaker-audience interaction.
Hypotheses

The hypotheses of this study were developed from Mead's (1934) explication of the self, generalized other and I and Me concepts, the cybernetic model of the public speaking situation developed in the rationale, Boulding's (1956) analysis of the image, the studies of audience analysis and the feedback studies. A definition of terms is presented first.

In accord with Boulding's (1956) and Holtzman's (1970) discussion of the image, Williams' (1964) notion of prognosis, and Colburn and Weinberg's (1976) discussion of feedforward, expectation for response will be operationalized as the speaker's expressed prediction of the manner in which the audience will react during his speech presentation.

Similar to Eisenson et al. (1963), a public speaking situation will be one in which (1) a person assumes the role of communicator and addresses a group of persons who assume the polar role of listeners so that (2) social facilitation occurs among the auditors, and (3) a pattern of circular response ensues between the communicator and his listeners. The public speaking situation will not involve informal discussion or group discussion where the speaker-listener roles are constantly exchanged. Rather, it will be those situations in which a person prepares a message in advance and stands before the auditors to present that message while the auditors provide feedback.

Feedback will be the information obtained by the speaker about audience reception from the circular response pattern. The speaker assesses the extent to which the observed response deviates from pre-speech expectations. The feedback is transmitted simultaneously through
an external feedback loop, which provides information from the speaker's environment or audience, and an internal feedback loop, which the speaker uses to become an object to himself and assess his own speaking behavior.

A speech is presented in a particular context and the responses to it are subject to a number of factors in that context. Situational factors will be the elements in the speech situation which the speaker believes affect the response he receives from his audience.

One element in the situation is the presence of audience members who serve as evaluators for the speaker. Such audience members have the assigned role, as in the speech classroom, of providing the speaker with information about the effectiveness of his speech. Other audience members may serve a less well defined role.

When speaking to an audience, a speaker draws from previous experiences which he considers similar to the one he is facing. Such speaking experiences will be those which the speaker regards as similar to the task he experiences in this study.

Rationale for hypotheses. Mead (1934) described the self-concept as a product of social interaction with a generalized other. A public speaker, especially one with little experience in speaking, may have a weakly defined "self-as-speaker" concept. The situation of public speaking may be a unique communication experience for him. Even for experienced speakers, new speaking tasks represent new situations, with new audiences functioning as a generalized other. For both the novice and experienced speaker, a "self-as-speaker" concept develops to deal with each generalized other encountered in the presentation of a speech.
Such a concept may in the initial stages of interaction with audiences be unstable, subject to change according to the response of the audience, and heavily reliant on the audience's response for a definition of appropriate behavior. The speaker may not be able to distinguish this self-as-speaker from the audience response which initially defines it. However, as this self makes use of audience responses, it begins to develop an anchor for judging its own behavior. The internal as well as external feedback loops begin to function as the speaker learns to play the role of an audience member listening to and evaluating himself.

In this process of observing the audience's response and observing the self, the speaker begins to develop a repertoire of expectations for response. Upon the receipt of feedback, the expectation provides an anchor against which the feedback can be compared. Based on this feedback, new expectations develop. In Mead's terms, a unique contribution to the situation, an I, comes into being in counterpart to what had previously been established, the Me. With additional experience in speaking, the fund of expectations increases and becomes more stable. The speaker becomes less reliant on the immediate response of the audience as a means of evaluating his performance and projecting to the next performance.

The previous studies suggest a similar interpretation. Feedback information from an external source becomes internalized as part of the speaker's self concept and produces a lowered anxiety level (Borman & Shapiro, 1962). A change in the favorability of feedback provided to
two successive speakers (Miller, 1964; Miller et al., 1961), within one speech (Flesher, 1969; Vlandis, 1964), and in successive speeches by a single speaker (Sereno, 1965), generated changes in speaker behavior which are explainable in light of the arousal of expectations. Audience feedback inconsistent with what was assumed to be the speaker's expectations generated changes in the speaker's assessment of the speaking situation (Barwind, 1969; Gardiner, 1972; Jensen, 1975). Speakers trained in feedback utilization were better able to cope with unfavorable audience response than those not trained (Rhodes & Frandsen, 1975). Speakers with more experience were better able to cope with the communication task than those with less experience (Chenowith, 1940; Gilkinson, 1943; Jensen, 1976; Low & Sheets, 1951) and were able to demonstrate an ability to change prepared speeches to meet the contingencies of the situation (Karns, 1969).

The first hypothesis suggests a "self-as-speaker" concept emerges over a series of speaking experiences and becomes less dependent on audience response as experience is gained:

**Hypothesis 1:** Correlations between measures of a speaker's self-evaluation of a speaking performance and that speaker's expectations for audience response on a subsequent speech will exhibit a greater rise in magnitude relative to other source of feedback as the speaker gains speaking experience.

A speaker may perceive various generalized others in his audience and may believe that the response of particular audience members is more important than others. Such audience members may be perceived to have expertise so that they can function as evaluators.
Hypothesis 2: Measures of a speaker's evaluation of his own performance will be more highly correlated with the observed feedback of audience members who serve an evaluative function than audience members who do not serve an evaluative function.

Mead's analysis suggested that a speaker should, after a series of speeches, begin to view the emerging concept of self-as-speaker as an increasingly important factor in determining audience response. The anchor for the speaker will move away from audience and context factors toward himself.

Hypothesis 3: Over a series of speeches, a speaker will attach increasing importance to himself relative to other variables in the speaking situation as a factor affecting audience response.

The person who has had greater opportunity to perform before audiences has a larger fund of experiences from which to draw in developing expectations for audience response than the novices. The speaker who has had more experiences from which to form a generalized other should have a stronger image of expected audience response. He should encounter viewer surprises in the audience response (Dickens & Kruger, 1969; Karns, 1969) and should see himself rather than other factors as more important in affecting the audience response (Barwind, 1969).

Hypothesis 4: The amount of a speaker's experience in public speaking will be negatively correlated with the discrepancy between pre-speech expectations and perceived audience response.

Hypothesis 5: A speaker's assessment of his experience in speaking will be positively correlated with his rating of self as a factor affecting audience response.
Summary

This chapter has attempted to establish a rationale for studying communicator expectations for audience response in the public speaking situation. The notion of expectation was shown to be a concept fundamental to understanding audience analysis. Cybernetic theory suggested research must take a holistic perspective and that feedback is linked to expectation in the control of a system. Mead's analysis of the generalized other, significant symbol, and I and Me concepts established a framework for understanding how expectations and a self-as-speaker concept develop. Elsenon's et al., model of the public speaking situation was shown to be congruent with the Meadian and cybernetic analyses.

A review of previous research revealed a lack of work which focused on expectation per se. When the notion of expectation was a tangential or implicit concern, it was found to have an effect on a speaker's pre-speech cognitive state. Also, studies of feedback in which expectation was an implicit concern revealed that feedback observed during a speech affect a speaker's expectation for subsequent audience response and that pre-speech expectations affect a speaker's interpretation of the response he observes.

Most importantly, the review argued that none of the studies allowed for the interaction and joint development of feedback and expectation states as part of a process of choice and intent by the communicator. Thus, the studies failed to capture the notion of expectation as a communication concept. As employed in these previous studies, the notion of expectation was not consistent with the work in audience analysis. Five hypotheses were developed which demand a research
design to account for process and choice in the development of expectations. The next chapter will describe the research design for testing these hypotheses.
Subjects

Ss were students enrolled in Communication 105, The Communication of Ideas and Attitudes, during Summer Quarter, 1976, at Ohio State University. Two sections of the course, enrolling 31 and 28 students respectively, were taught by two graduate student instructors. Although originally the design called for all 59 students to serve as Ss, absenteeism reduced this number such that 41 completed all speaking assignments. Also, at each data collection period, a few Ss failed to provide usable responses by either failing to complete the measures or incorrectly responding to portions of the instrument. However, while the number of Ss within each data collection period varied due to incomplete responses, care was taken to include in the analysis only those Ss who had the experience of giving all speeches specified in the research design.

Measures of Expectation and Perceived Feedback

As noted in the review, the only research concerned with feedback as a multidimensional construct (Jensen, 1969) provided no reliability or validity data and little justification for the emergent factor structure. Use of Jensen's scales is thus questionable. Even greater problems exist for measuring expectations in that no such scales were
uncovered in the review.

However, the expectation for feedback presumably exists along the same dimensions as perceived feedback. The speaker, having experienced audience feedback, expects audience response on subsequent speeches will be similar. Mead's (1934) discussion of the generalized other and the cybernetic analysis of a system's environment are premised on the assumption of regularity of structure in that environment. Thus, an attempt was made in a series of pilot studies to develop an instrument to assess the speaker's perception of audience feedback and expectation for subsequent feedback.

**Pilot Study I.** During Winter Quarter, 1976, students in five sections of Communication 105 generated adjectives which described their audience's reaction during a speech. Adjectives were also drawn from discussions of feedback in public speaking texts and from descriptions of audience feedback manipulations in the studies reviewed in Chapter 1.

A problem arose in predicting the dimensions of audience feedback for a factor analytic study. As Williams (1964) and Clevenger (1966) have noted, little empirical work has focused on audience behavior. However, Hollingsworth (1935) suggests a speaker faces five tasks when addressing an audience: (1) gaining attention, (2) stimulating interest in the topic, (3) impressing the audience (a task not well clarified), (4) convincing the audience of his purpose, and (5) providing direction for audience response (pp. 19-27). Each task represents a type of audience response and therefore can serve as a basis for developing the dimensions of audience feedback.
Audience behaviors used as manipulations in previous studies suggested similar factors. Miller (1964), Miller, *et al.* (1961), Sereno (1965), and Vlandis (1964) manipulated the audience's acceptance of the speaker's message, thus paralleling Hollingsworth's task of convincing the audience. Fleshner (1969) manipulated the audience's attentiveness. Jensen (1975) manipulated both attention and acceptance.

Thus five dimensions of audience feedback were hypothesized for the pilot study. Hollingsworth's term *impression* was interpreted, based on his brief discussion (Hollingsworth, 1935, p. 24), as understanding. Also, his label, *direction*, was used to group adjectives describing audience responsiveness under the rationale that a speaker seeks a response from the audience to indicate that his efforts have had an effect on directing their action or thought. Bipolar adjective scales with a seven-point response alternative were then developed. Examination of the student responses as well as a thesaurus, a dictionary, textbook descriptions of audience response and the writer's experience of functioning as an audience for classroom speeches provided antonyms for the adjectives.

Each of the resulting sixty-two adjective pairs were tentatively categorized under one of the five hypothesized dimensions. Using a table of random numbers seven of the scales in each category were selected for the next stage of the pre-testing process resulting in a preliminary scale of 34 items. A 34-item limit was chosen because *S*s would be asked in the next phase of pre-testing to respond to the items following a speech presentation in class. It was felt that a longer instrument would be too difficult for students to complete in class.
Immediately following a speech.

_58 for the next pre-testing phases were drawn from five sections of Communication 105 which had not been used to generate the adjectives. A total of 118 _58 completed the 34-item Audience Feedback scale following their final speech in the course. _58 were instructed to mark one of the seven responses on each scale which best described their assessment of the way the audience responded during their speeches.

The responses were submitted to a number of factor analyses using the Soupac Factor Analysis program available from the Ohio State Computer facilities. In each solution, a common factor analysis model was used with the program instructed to account for 100% of the variance and the factor extraction cutoff level set at an eigenvalue of 1.00. A four-factor solution produced a factor suggesting a "responsiveness" dimension and a factor suggesting an "attentiveness" dimension. Considerable overlap appeared for two other factors, however. Less overlap was present in a three-factor solution in that while the "responsiveness" and "attentiveness" dimensions again appeared, a dimension suggesting "acceptance" also emerged. This solution appeared to be the most readily interpretable.

As a further test of the factor structure, the three- and four-factor solutions were reanalyzed with items having a loading of .50 or less on a primary factor deleted. As a result, what had originally been the four-factor solution emerged with only three factors which closely resembled the original three-factor solution. This three-factor solution was retained and is reported in Appendix A. Apparently the hypothesized "acceptance" and "understanding" and "attention" and "interest"
factors had collapsed to form three rather than four factors.

Such results are not surprising, given the tenuous state with which the factors were hypothesized and the nature of the stimuli being judged. Audience response is a continuous phenomenon which may be perceived as a gestalt rather than as discrete. The intercorrelation matrix of the three dimensions, also reported in Appendix A, indicates the three dimensions are highly related.

It should be further noted that factor 1, labeled "responsiveness" accounted for 65.48% of the common variance. Recalling Mead's discussion of the need for response to messages to create meaning, such dominance by the factor is not surprising. Speakers who are learning communication skills, especially those who are completing a final speech in an introductory course, may be attuned to any indication of an overt audience response.

Kuder-Richardson No. 8 reliabilities were calculated for each of the factors using the Wherry Multivariante Program Package available at the Ohio State University Computer Facilities. Reliabilities were .936 for the responsiveness factor, .918 for the acceptance factor and .857 in the attentiveness factor.

Three items from each of the three dimensions were selected for inclusion in the final form of the measuring instrument. Selection was based on the magnitude of the standard deviation of each scale and the item-by-total correlation of that scale with the dimension. Because S's would be asked to complete five sets of scales and give a speech during each of four class sessions, the number of scales employed was limited so as not to overburden S's patience.
**Pilot Study II.** In the second pilot study, students enrolled in Communication 105 during Spring Quarter, 1976, completed the feedback and expectation scales during their first speech assignment. Prior to the speech they indicated their expectations for the response they believed they would receive from their classmates and from their instructor. Following the speech, Ss indicated their perceptions of the feedback from their classmates and instructor and their estimate of how they would have responded had they been members of the audience listening to their speeches.

Measures of expectation for two separate sources were used on the belief that the instructor, who functions as an evaluator in the classroom, represents a separate audience for the speaker. This assumption is premised on a number of grounds: (1) The author has observed during seven years of teaching public speaking that novice speakers often address the instructor, while ignoring the peer audience. (2) For most college students, the classroom has been a situation in which the teacher dominates the communication pattern. Thus, when called upon to assume the unnatural role of addressing the class and thereby exerting influence on it, the student may continue to look to the instructor as a locus of power. (3) Finally, the instructor is often the sole evaluator in that he assigns a grade to the student's performance. The author has found that students often reject an option to be "graded" by peers, arguing that the instructor alone is qualified to evaluate their speeches. Thus, while peers constituted the bulk of the audience, the instructor was considered in this study to be a separate audience for which expectations would develop.
The perceived feedback from peer audience and instructor was also measured separately. However, a third source of feedback, self, was added in light of Johnson and Klare's (1962) discussion of internal and external feedback loops. When presenting a speech, the speaker hears himself and evaluates his performance. In Mead's terms, the speaker becomes an object to himself, constituting a third audience from which feedback can be obtained.

In this second pilot study, the K-R No. 8 reliabilities remained high (above .80). However, the response pattern revealed a severe skewedness toward the favorable end of each of the scales, with few responses beyond the neutral point. Further examination of the data suggested that, a seven-point scale with a "neutral" midpoint response was semantically inappropriate. For example, with the "attentive-inattentive" item, a neutral response may have been interpreted as meaning the audience exhibited no attentive behavior. If so, the remaining response alternatives which were intended to tap degrees of inattentiveness, were useless.

It was decided to eliminate the bipolar adjectives and shorten the scales to five response alternatives along which Ss could indicate the degree to which the audience response was indicative of the adjective. Thus, Ss could indicate whether the audience was "totally," "mostly," "somewhat," "a little" or "not at all" attentive. This instrument became the Expectations-Feedback Questionnaire employed in the next pilot study.
**Pilot Study III.** The third pilot study was conducted to assess the validity of the measuring instruments and to test some of the problems arising from repeated measures design. In this pilot, Ss were students enrolled in Communication 225 during Spring Quarter, 1976, at Ohio State University. Ss were divided into three groups. During the first day of the study, one group presented a persuasive speech to two different audiences and completed the Expectations-Feedback Questionnaire before and after each speech. Another group also presented two speeches but completed a different set of scales which, they were told, measured their assessment of the strength of their arguments. A third group merely observed the other two groups present their speeches. All Ss then returned on a second day and completed the expectation measure prior to a speech presentation. Kuder-Richardson No. 8 reliability estimates were .843, .880 and .673 for the responsiveness, acceptance and attentiveness factors, respectively.

**Validity data.** The factor analysis in the first pilot study suggested one measure of validity. Although the five-factor structure which had been tentatively hypothesized did not emerge, the three dimensions which did emerge, with the accompanying high reliabilities, appeared to be appropriate to a conceptualization of feedback as might be perceived by public speakers. The domination by the responsiveness factor was consistent with a Meadian analysis. Further, the overlap among the dimensions suggested that the feedback was perceived as a gestalt and not as discrete dimensions as one might expect for an ongoing process.
In addition to face validity, construct validity was provided by a test of the scales to detect differences in expectations among Ss with differing speaking experiences incorporated into the third pilot study.

If the scales provided a valid measure of perceived audience feedback and expectations for feedback, then persons who had not had experience in public speaking should respond differently from those with experience. Presumably their expectations for audience response would be different and such differences would suggest a construct validity for the scales.

In the third pilot study, those Ss who had merely observed during the first day of the study were led to believe they would present a speech on the second day. Prior to their speech, they completed the expectancy measure, as did the Ss who had spoken. Analysis of the differences of the responses across all scales produced a t of 2.859 (df = 16) which was significant at the .02 level for a one-tailed test. Ss who had not previously spoken had expectations for more favorable responses than the Ss who had spoken. These results suggest that the scales are capable of detecting differences in expectations based on experience.

Practice effect. Because the procedures called for data collection at three separate points in time using the same set of scales, a practice effect was anticipated. The Ss' familiarity with the measurement instruments after a number of exposures to it may have produced an error variance. The problem was compounded in that the rationale developed in chapter one suggested expectations for and perceptions of feedback will change systematically with repeated experiences in speaking. It is
difficult to separate out those changes due to the repeated experience of speaking and those due to a possible practice effect from previous use of the instrument.

However, the practice effect can be used to an advantage by having the Ss become familiar with the measurement tool prior to the data collection. Presumably previous exposure to the instrument would tend to wash out the practice effects and equalize them among Ss.

The third pilot study tested this assumption. One group of Ss completed the Expectation-Feedback questionnaire four separate times while another group completed it only once. Both groups had presented two speeches and anticipated giving a third when they completed the instrument on the second day of the study. Thus, the groups had similar experiences except for exposure to the scales. Analysis revealed a non-significant value for $t$ of $-1.3125$ (df = 16) for the difference in their responses. These results suggested that practice effect may not be a significant source of error, provided Ss have exposure to the instrument a number of times.

**Measures of Factors Affecting Audience Response**

In the first pilot study, Ss were asked to indicate in addition to the adjectives describing audience response, what factors in the situation they believed affected the manner in which the audience responded while they were speaking. Examination of the open-ended responses suggested six general categories: (1) the speaker, (2) the speaker's presentation of the message, (3) the speaker's topic, (4) the members of the audience, (5) the instructor in the course and (6) the physical setting (e.g., room) in which they spoke. The categories are in
agreement with the speech texts which suggest that a speaker attempt to account for his topic, the audience, the occasion of the speech, and his own role as speaker in developing strategies for presenting a message.

As a result of this analysis, a measure for tapping the Ss' estimates of the factor affecting the response of the audience was developed using the six factors. In the final instrument, Ss were asked to rank order these six factors as to the importance they attached to each as an element of the situation affecting the audience's response to them. An additional category of "other" was provided with space for the student to describe what additional factors they believed to have affected the response.

Measures of Experience in Public Speaking

At the beginning of the academic term in which the data were collected, Ss were asked to (1) describe the extent of their training and experience in giving speeches and to (2) estimate the number of times they had stood before an audience and given a speech. This estimate was used as a measure of their experience in public speaking.

One advantage of this measure was that it allowed Ss to identify the number of experiences which they perceived as similar to the experiences which they would have in Communication 105. The responses thus represent the Ss' interpretation of their experience in public speaking. Jensen (1976) used a similar method.

Final Form of Measures

In its final form, the Expectation-Feedback Questionnaire contained five separate sets of the nine adjective items selected for use. Each of the three dimensions, responsiveness, acceptance and attention, was
represented by three adjectives presented in a randomly determined order. The first two sets tapped the Ss' expectations for classmate and instructor response prior to a speech. The next three sets, completed following a speech, tapped the Ss' perceptions of classmate, instructor and self-response. The expectation measures used Likert-type response alternatives in which Ss indicated the extent to which the audience could be described by each of the nine adjectives listed. The scales used to tap perceptions of audience feedback were constructed in accord with the cybernetic model. Recalling that a system may receive negative feedback, which serves to stabilize behavior by providing information useful for reducing deviations from expected states, or positive feedback, which serves to destabilize behavior by leading to development of new expectations, the response alternatives allowed Ss to indicate whether audience response had been as expected or less favorable than expected (thus constituting negative feedback) or had been more favorable than expected (thus constituting positive feedback).

The questionnaire included two additional tasks for Ss. Prior to and following each speech, Ss were to rank order six variables as factors affecting audience response. Also, prior to each speech, Ss were asked to write a brief essay indicating in their own words what they expected the audience to do while they were speaking. The inclusion of this task was to make the questionnaire appear to be an integral part of course work and not simply an extra task to be completed for a research project. It was hoped that the experience of formulating and verbalizing expectations would be of service to the students. The essays were also included to supplement the findings of the quantitative analysis and to
provide heuristic insights for further research. A copy of the Expectation-Feedback Questionnaire is included in Appendix B, along with the form used to tap Ss' recall of public speaking experience.

Data Collection

As described in the rationale for this study, speakers' expectations develop over time as feedback is received in a series of speaking experiences. Collection of data at only one point in time was therefore inappropriate to such a process concept. The method employed was a modification of a repeated measures design.

Students in Communication 105 typically present three speeches during a ten-week academic term: (1) a personal interest message, (2) an issues message, and (3) a value message. Data collection occurred during the presentation of the issues message. In this assignment, students presented a five-minute speech in which they stated their position on a contemporary issue and offered arguments in support of that position.

Students usually present the speech once to the entire class and when not speaking serve as audience members for other speakers. The speeches consume six or seven class periods. This procedure was altered to accommodate data collection.

During the fourth week of the quarter, students were told of the procedure for the issues message, having already presented their personal interest messages. Ss were placed in twelve groups of four or five persons each and presented their issues message to these small groups twice before presenting the speech to the entire class. Ss were told the two "practice sessions" would be part of the regular classroom
assignment and would represent an opportunity to sharpen their speeches prior to the presentation to the entire class. They were also told by their instructors that the sessions would be used to gather data which would be used to "better understand the needs of students enrolled in this course."

The researcher enlisted the aid of ten undergraduate and graduate students to serve as proctors for the practice sessions. All had extensive experience in public speaking with participation in forensics competition and advanced public speaking courses. Six of the ten had taught public speaking courses at the college level. Essentially, the proctors were to serve the evaluator function similar to that of the S's classroom instructor. So that S would perceive the proctors as evaluators, each proctor was instructed to announce to his section that he was (1) the instructor for the day and (2) would give a criticism at the end of the speech. Also, the proctors were instructed to insure that the S completed the questionnaire prior to and following the practice speeches.

Ss were randomly assigned to the practice sessions with care taken that, when possible, each would have a completely different set of classmates and a different proctor for an audience during the two sessions. Repetition of proctors occurred for only two students.

On the day prior to each practice session during the regular class hour Ss were given a set of instructions concerning the practice sessions, telling them what room they had been assigned to and what to do prior to and upon arrival at the practice session. They were also given an Expectation-Feedback Questionnaire and were instructed to complete the first three pages prior to arrival at the session and to complete the
last two pages after they had spoken. Proctors collected the questionnaires at the end of the practice sessions.

In both sections of Communication 105, the practice sessions were conducted during the regularly scheduled class hour in rooms other than the one used for regular class sessions. In section A, the practice sessions were held on Tuesday of the fifth week and Monday of the sixth week. In section B, the sessions were conducted on the Wednesday and Friday of the fifth week. The assignment for the issues message was given to the Ss at least seven days prior to their first practice sessions. More uniformity in the interval between speeches for the two sections was initially desired. However, availability of rooms and proctors for a single time period dictated the schedule used. The speeches to the entire class began in both sections two days following the end of the practice sessions. Ss completed the questionnaire prior to and following this speech also, thus yielding measures of expectations for feedback and perceptions of feedback at three separate points in time.

As a means of minimizing a possible practice effect by generating familiarity with the scales, Ss completed the expectation portion of the questionnaire during the first week of the term when they also indicated the extent of their experience in public speaking and completed the entire questionnaire in conjunction with their personal interest message. As a further check on the possibility of a practice effect, six Ss selected at random did not complete the questionnaire until the beginning of the second practice session. These Ss were given a form similar in appearance to that being completed by the experimental group but which
asked them to assess the quality of their speech. The responses of this control group to the Expectation-Feedback Questionnaire at the second practice session could then be compared to the responses of those who had two previous exposures to it. The presence of statistically significant differences in scores would suggest a practice effect for repeated exposures to the instrument.

**Summary of Experimental Design**

The research design employed in this study is represented in Figure 1 where

- **E** = measure of speakers' expectations for audience response using both scales and open-ended questions
- **FB_p** = measures of speakers' perceptions of feedback from non-evaluating (peer) audience members
- **FB_i** = measure of speakers' perception of feedback from evaluating (instructor) audience members
- **FB_s** = measure of speakers' self-evaluation in speaking
- **R** = measure of speakers' ranking of factors affecting audience feedback
- **PI** = speaker presentation of personal interest message
- **IM_1** = speaker presentation of issue message in first practice session
- **IM_2** = speaker presentation of issue message in second practice session
- **IM_3** = speaker presentation of issue message before entire class
The design thus met the criteria established in the literature review in that the notion of process and the relationships between feedback and expectancies were incorporated into the design. Further, Ss were permitted choice in the development and alternation of messages and feedback was not manipulated but allowed to occur within a natural setting.
CHAPTER 3

RESULTS

The third chapter contains (1) an overview of the problems encountered in the study which may have affected results, (2) a report of the reliabilities and comparisons performed on the data, and (3) the results of the quantitative and qualitative analyses.

Overview of Research Problems

The critical problem encountered in this research was suggested in the review of previous studies: communicator expectation for audience response is an unexplored construct. The review suggested that only a limited number of studies have made expectation even a tangential concern. Studies of the effect of audience feedback on speaker behavior have employed a truncated conceptualization of the interaction of feedback and feedforward states. In short, no paradigm existed to serve as a model.

As a result of the problem orientation, a number of smaller but equally troublesome problems arose. As noted in the rationale for the study, an attempt to understand the interaction of feedback and feedforward must acknowledge the process nature of communication. Yet, few researchers have addressed the problems of studying communication as a process (Brooks & Scheidel, 1967; Smith, 1973), making the establishment
of appropriate parameters for tapping the development of dependent variables difficult. Those parameters chosen were determined by pragmatic concerns of S availability, time restraints of the academic term, and the structure of the course from which the Ss were drawn. A preferable alternative would have been to establish parameters from a theoretical stance.

Finally, the N used in the study was small. Some attrition is expected whenever Ss are asked to participate over an extended period of time. Unfortunately, 54% of the students enrolled in one section of Communication 105 did not participate in the second practice session, thus eliminating them from subsequent analysis. This loss was attributed to two problems. First, the teaching associate for the section involved apparently did not stress the importance of participation in the research project. Ss may have felt that participation in an additional "practice" session was unnecessary. This fact, coupled with humid weather conditions of the day of the data collection may explain the attrition rate. The second practice session in the other section was held several days later when weather conditions returned to normal. The other instructor also had made the practice sessions an integral part of the course. Loss of Ss reduced the validity and reliability of the test results and the effects are unknown but probably enlarge the beta error, increasing the probability of rejecting the hypotheses.

Quantitative Analysis

Before examining each hypothesis, the reliability of the measuring instruments, the use of a control group to check for practice effects, and comparisons between the two sections employed must be noted.
To facilitate discussion, measures of the Ss' expectations for response from peer (classmate) audience and from instructor will be referred to as PEX and IEX, respectively. Measures of Ss' perceptions of feedback from the peer audience, instructor, and self-feedback will be designated by PFB, IFB, and SFB, respectively. The response, acceptance, and attention dimensions (which constitute subscales in each expectation and feedback measure) will be designated by R, AC, and AT, respectively. The four data collection periods will be designated by T₁, T₂, T₃ and T₄.

Reliability of Scales. Ss completed five sets of scales at each period of data collection in the design, indicating prior to each speech their expectations for response from their classmates (PEX) and from their instructor (IEX) and, following the speech, perception of feedback from peer audience (PFB), instructor (IFB), and self-feedback (SFB).

Kuder-Richardson No. 8 reliabilities were calculated for the R, AC, and AT subscales using the "Tescan" program in the Wherry Multivariate Analyses Program Package available at the Ohio State University Computer Center.

In Table 1 are reported the means of the reliabilities for each scale across all administrations of the instrument. The reliability estimates were consistently high, with the lowest estimate, .739, occurring at PFB-AC during the first data collection period.

Prior to and following each speech, Ss rank ordered six variables according to the importance they attached to each in affecting audience response. Reliabilities for the rankings were calculated using the
"Chirat" program available in the Wherry series of programs and are reported in Table 2. Again, it can be seen that the reliability estimates were consistently high.

Comparison of Sections. Because two separate sections of the Communication 105 course taught by two different instructors were used, a test for differences on the basis of class membership was appropriate. The t statistic was employed using the Soupac Computer Package to compare means for responses on each expectation and feedback scale at each of the four speeches. Because 80 separate t statistics were generated, the .01 level was adopted as a test for significance to guard against a Type I error. Results revealed only one comparison (IFB-AC at T3) achieved this level with a two-tailed test.

The Ss' rankings of variables influencing audience response were also analyzed for differences between sections. Blalock (1972) suggests the Komogorov-Smirnov test is appropriate when a substantial number of ties occur in the ranks as was the case in the data collected here. With the alpha level set at .01 to avoid a Type I error due to the large number of comparisons, no statistically significant differences in the ranks were found between the two sections.

Control Group. Six Ss, selected at random, served as a control group to check for a practice effect by not completing the Expectation-Feedback Questionnaire until T2. Their responses to the Feedback-Expectation Questionnaire at T2 were compared using the t statistic to those of six Ss selected randomly from the experimental group. All comparisons fell short of t = 2.145 (df = 14) required for the .01 level of significance, suggesting the practice effect had non-significant effects on the results.
TABLE 1
Means of Kuder-Richardson No. 8 Reliability Estimates for Feedback and Expectation Measures for All Administrations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Acceptance</th>
<th>Attention</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PEX</td>
<td>.897</td>
<td>.888</td>
<td>.890</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IEX</td>
<td>.923</td>
<td>.895</td>
<td>.872</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PFB</td>
<td>.838</td>
<td>.841</td>
<td>.893</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IFB</td>
<td>.856</td>
<td>.881</td>
<td>.851</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SFB</td>
<td>.878</td>
<td>.887</td>
<td>.913</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE 2
Reliability Estimates for Rankings of Variables Influencing Audience Response

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Pre-speech</th>
<th>Post-speech</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Speech 1</td>
<td>.987</td>
<td>.987</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speech 2</td>
<td>.989</td>
<td>.984</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speech 3</td>
<td>.985</td>
<td>.985</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speech 4</td>
<td>.989</td>
<td>.990</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Expectation and Feedback Scores Over Time. Figures 2-6 report the patterns of development for expectations and perceptions of feedback over all four speeches. As in all data reported in this study, the lower the score, the more favorable the expectations for or perceptions of feedback.

As can be seen in Figures 2 and 3, expectations for peer response (PEX) and instructor response (IEX) exhibit highly congruent patterns. In both cases, the attention dimension (AT) consistently occupies the most favorable position across all four speeches, followed by the acceptance (AC) and then response (R) dimensions. Also, AT and AC dimensions exhibit nearly parallel development while the R dimension deviates from the pattern by becoming more rather than less unfavorable following the second speech.

The patterns apparent in the feedback measures are not as readily interpreted. As seen in Figure 4, PFB reveals a movement toward increasingly unfavorable perceptions on all three dimensions. With the exception of R for IFB, however, the initial change is toward more favorable perceptions at T₂ followed by a decline in the favorability of the feedback over the final two speeches. Finally, SFB scores reported in Figure 6 reveal an initial movement toward more unfavorable perceptions for all dimensions followed by a leveling off over the third and fourth speeches. Thus, all three sources of perceived feedback demonstrate separate patterns of development with only the SFB measures achieving a level of stability.
Figure 2: Expectations for Peer Audience Behavior

Figure 3: Expectations for Instructor Audience Behavior
Figure 4: Perceived Feedback from Peer Audience

Figure 5: Perceived Feedback from Instructor Audience
Figure 6: Perceived Feedback from Self
Results of Quantitative Analysis

Hypothesis One. \( H_1 \) suggested that while initially measures of a speaker's evaluation of his own performance (SFB) would have little relationship to measures of expectation for audience response on a subsequent speech (PEX and IEX), the magnitude of the relationship would rise relative to the relationship between other sources of feedback (PFB and IFB) and subsequent expectations as the speaker gained speaking experience.

Biserial correlation coefficients were calculated for each dimension for each juxtaposition of feedback and expectation measures over the speeches employed in the design. A biserial correlation is used when "both of the variables correlated are continuously measurable but one of the two is reduced to two categories" (Guilford, 1965, p. 317). As Guilford further suggests, the reduction to two categories may be a consequence of restrictions placed on the data collection procedures (p. 317). Such was the case with the feedback measures used here which are assumed to tap a continuous variable but were dichotomized to keep the analysis consistent with the cybernetic model. Although perceptions of feedback presumably may range over a continuum of scores, scores above a certain level constitute positive feedback and scores below a certain level constitute negative feedback. Although initially attempted in this analysis, the Pearson product-moment correlation procedure was inappropriate because feedback scores were being correlated with expectations for subsequent speeches. Thus, any tendency for \( S_a \) to respond on the feedback measures by marking an "0" to indicate audience response had been "as expected" would depress the magnitude of the relationship
between feedback and expectation scores. In light of this problem, the biserial correlation procedure became a more viable alternative for testing the hypothesis.

The significance of the biserial correlation coefficients was tested using the formula

\[ z = \frac{r_{bi} h \sqrt{n}}{\sqrt{pq}} \]

where \( h \) = height of the ordinate of the normal curve at the point of division between the \( p \) and \( q \) proportions of the cases, \( p \) and \( q \) are the proportions of individuals in the two categories of the dichotomous variable and \( n \) is the number of cases. Again, the alpha level was set at .01 to guard against Type I errors. The results of this analysis are reported in Table 3.
**TABLE 3**

Biserial Correlations of Feedback Measures with Expectation Measures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Development of Correlation Coefficients</th>
<th>Speech 2</th>
<th>Speech 3</th>
<th>Speech 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Scales Being Correlated</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer Feedback w/ Peer Expectation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Response</td>
<td>-.292</td>
<td>.131</td>
<td>.201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acceptance</td>
<td>-.022</td>
<td>.310</td>
<td>.373</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attention</td>
<td>-.240</td>
<td>.135</td>
<td>-.078</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructor Feedback w/ Instructor Expectation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Response</td>
<td>-.286</td>
<td>.255</td>
<td>.576*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acceptance</td>
<td>-.252</td>
<td>.009</td>
<td>.670*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attention</td>
<td>-.094</td>
<td>.025</td>
<td>.098</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self Feedback w/ Peer Expectation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Response</td>
<td>-.143</td>
<td>.223</td>
<td>.267</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acceptance</td>
<td>-.140</td>
<td>.388</td>
<td>.358</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attention</td>
<td>-.075</td>
<td>.341</td>
<td>.088</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self Feedback w/ Instructor Expectation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Response</td>
<td>-.055</td>
<td>.204</td>
<td>.124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acceptance</td>
<td>-.208</td>
<td>.271</td>
<td>.966**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attention</td>
<td>.005</td>
<td>-.101</td>
<td>-.530*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* *p < .01
** p < .001

N=40  N=37  N=40
As can be seen, significant correlations were found only in the final juxtaposition of feedback and expectation measures. Three of these coefficients are positive and suggest that the perception of feedback more favorable than expected was associated with a more favorable expectation for the subsequent speech. However, one of the significant correlations suggests the opposite, that the perception of feedback more favorable than expected was associated with a less favorable expectation on the subsequent speech. Only two of the significant positive correlations are associated with SFB measures. All four of the significant correlations, however, are associated with expectations for the instructor audience. Finally, it should be noted that while five of the six patterns of coefficients not associated with SFB demonstrate a rise in magnitude over the speeches, only two of the six associated with SFB exhibit a rising pattern. Thus, the data provide only limited support for hypothesis one.

Hypothesis Two. \( H_2 \) suggested that measures of a speaker's evaluation of his own performance (SFB) would be more highly correlated with his perceptions of feedback from audience members who serve an evaluative function (FB) than with those who serve a non-evaluative function (PFB).

The difficulties assumed to exist in using a Pearson product-moment correlation encountered in \( H_1 \) were not present in \( H_2 \) in that the interest was in the differences between coefficients rather than the coefficients themselves. Thus, any depression of coefficients due to the nature of the response alternatives was not considered a factor in the analysis. The \(-2, -1, 0, +1, \) and \(+2\) response alternatives used in the feedback
scales were assigned the values 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5 respectively and Pearson product-moment correlations were calculated for each of the three dimensions at each data collection point. The test for the difference between coefficients was computed using the formula supplied by Blalock (1972, pp. 406-407), with alpha level again set at .01. Blalock cautions that such comparisons are seldom generalizable beyond the population from which data were drawn.

The results reported in Table 4 clearly do not support $H_2$. In fact, in all but one of the comparisons, the correlation of SFB with PFB measures was higher than that for SFB with IFB measures, exactly opposite the prediction. The statistical significance of the differences declined, however, over the four data collection periods.

**Hypothesis Three.** $H_3$ stated that over a series of speeches, a speaker will attach increasing importance to himself relative to other variables in the speaking situation as a factor affecting audience response. Support for the hypothesis would require the rank assigned the "self-as-speaker" variable to become lower (indicating higher importance) over the four speeches.

Table 5 reports the results of this analysis, using Friedman analysis of ranks. A mean rank score for each of the six variables was obtained by dividing the sum of the ranks assigned to each by the number of Ss who provided usable data at each of the four speeches. As can be seen, the relative magnitude of the mean rank remain stable over the four speeches in both the pre- and post-speech measures. "Self-as-speaker" variable was consistently ranked as the fourth most important variable until the last speech when it received the third highest average ranking. In the
TABLE 4

Contrast of Peer and Self Feedback Correlation Coefficients Against Instructor and Self Feedback Correlation Coefficients

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>$r_{SFB,PFB}$</th>
<th>$r_{SFB,IFB}$</th>
<th>$r_{PFB,IFB}$</th>
<th>$t$</th>
<th>df</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Response</td>
<td>Speech 1</td>
<td>Speech 2</td>
<td>Speech 3</td>
<td>Speech 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.307</td>
<td>.667</td>
<td>.563</td>
<td>.537</td>
<td>.436</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-.047</td>
<td>-.030</td>
<td>.370</td>
<td>.531</td>
<td>.364</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-.182</td>
<td>.255</td>
<td>.685</td>
<td>.602</td>
<td>.646</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.391</td>
<td>4.581**</td>
<td>2.013</td>
<td>.052</td>
<td>.819</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>38</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* $p < .01$

** $p < .001$
pre-speech analysis, "topic" was ranked most important with "delivery" ranked second.

Turning to the post-speech ranks, the "self-as-speaker" score declined from third in $T_1$ to fourth in the other speeches. Examination of the other variables show "delivery" was ranked as most important and "topic" as the second most important factor affecting results. The Friedman analysis of ranks was performed on both pre- and post-speech data to test for differences in ranks (1) across the four speeches and (2) between variables at each speech (Kerlinger, 1973, p. 290-292). As reported in Table 5, the resulting chi-square distribution from the ranks across speeches in both pre- and post-speech data was not significant. However, the analysis of the variation of ranks between the variables was highly significant. Thus, the results fail to support $H_3$ in that while the Ss perceived the variables as significantly different in affecting audience response, the variation of rankings across speeches was not significant.

Hypothesis Four. $H_4$ stated that the Ss' report of the extent to which feedback observed during a speech deviated from pre-speech expectations would be negatively correlated with self-reports of speaking experience and that the magnitude of this correlation would decline over a series of speaking experiences. To test this hypothesis, Ss' response to the three feedback measures were correlated with the number of speeches the Ss reported having presented. The absolute value of the reported discrepancy was used, ignoring the direction of the deviation. Support for the hypothesis required significant negative correlations in the initial speeches in that increasing speaking experience would be
TABLE 5

Friedman Analysis of Ranks for Variables Affecting Audience Response

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Average Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Speech 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Members of the audience</td>
<td>3.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaker's delivery</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speech topic</td>
<td>1.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-as-speaker</td>
<td>3.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Room</td>
<td>5.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructor</td>
<td>5.08</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

chi-square column differences = 5.80, df = 3,
chi-square row differences = 97.53, df = 3, $p < .001$

Post-Speech Ranks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Average Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Speech 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Members of the audience</td>
<td>3.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaker's delivery</td>
<td>1.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speech topic</td>
<td>2.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-as-speaker</td>
<td>3.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Room</td>
<td>5.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructor</td>
<td>4.96</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

chi-square column differences = 2.65, df = 3,
chi-square row differences = 96.57, df = 3, $p < .001$
correlated with less perceived discrepancy. The results of the analysis are reported in Table 6.

The results fail to achieve the necessary .01 level of significance. However, a pattern is again suggested in that all but one of the correlation coefficients are negative at $T_1$. More importantly, the coefficients decline in size over the four speeches and approach a zero-order magnitude at $T_4$.

**Hypothesis Five.** $H_5$ stated that measures of self-reported speaking experience would be negatively correlated with the rank the speaker assigned to the "self-as-speaker" variable as a factor affecting audience feedback. The more experience the speaker had, the lower the numerical rank (indicating greater importance) he would assign to the variable.

To test the hypothesis, $S_a$'s self-report of experience in public speaking were correlated with the rank $S_a$ assigned to all six variables, with rank treated as the $S_a$'s score on the variable.

The results of this analysis are reported in Table 7. Attention is directed first to the coefficients contained in row four of the table, where the magnitude and signs of the correlations provide support for the hypothesis. Both pre- and post-speech measures for the first speech and pre-speech measures for speeches 2 and 4 speech experience were associated at a significant level with the importance attached to "self-as-speaker."

Examination of the other rows suggests a number of additional patterns. First, no coefficient in the "Topic," "Room," or "Instructor" rows achieved a statistically significant level. Only two coefficients
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feedback Measure Correlated with Experience</th>
<th>Correlation Coefficient</th>
<th>Speech 1</th>
<th>Speech 2</th>
<th>Speech 3</th>
<th>Speech 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Response</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.2547</td>
<td>.0527</td>
<td>.1565</td>
<td>.0716</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer Feedback Acceptance</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.3529*</td>
<td>.1429</td>
<td>.0036</td>
<td>.1074</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer Feedback Attention</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.1541</td>
<td>.2890*</td>
<td>.1973</td>
<td>.0842</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructor Feedback Acceptance</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.1233</td>
<td>-.1339</td>
<td>-.2318</td>
<td>-.0118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructor Feedback Attention</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.0342</td>
<td>.0514</td>
<td>.0748</td>
<td>.0585</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self Feedback Acceptance</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.1842</td>
<td>.1582</td>
<td>.0346</td>
<td>-.0993</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self Feedback Attention</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.2567</td>
<td>-.0252</td>
<td>.1500</td>
<td>-.0857</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*P < .05

N=26  N=39  N=39  N=41

Correlations of Self-Reports of Speaking Experience with Perceived Discrepancy of Feedback from Pre-Speech Expectations
TABLE 7

Correlations of Speaking Experience with Rank
Assigned Variables Affecting Audience Response

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Speech 1</th>
<th></th>
<th>Speech 2</th>
<th></th>
<th>Speech 3</th>
<th></th>
<th>Speech 4</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>pre</td>
<td>post</td>
<td>pre</td>
<td>post</td>
<td>pre</td>
<td>post</td>
<td>pre</td>
<td>post</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Members of Audience</td>
<td>.301*</td>
<td>.126</td>
<td>-.045</td>
<td>-.108</td>
<td>-.136</td>
<td>-.125</td>
<td>-.035</td>
<td>-.165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delivery of Speech</td>
<td>.241</td>
<td>.216</td>
<td>-.131</td>
<td>.057</td>
<td>.186</td>
<td>-.055</td>
<td>-.257</td>
<td>-.317*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-as-Speaker</td>
<td>-.443**</td>
<td>-.319*</td>
<td>-.384*</td>
<td>-.181</td>
<td>-.217</td>
<td>-.088</td>
<td>-.300*</td>
<td>-.040</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Room</td>
<td>.160</td>
<td>.164</td>
<td>-.217</td>
<td>-.236</td>
<td>.049</td>
<td>.050</td>
<td>-.105</td>
<td>-.054</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructor</td>
<td>.097</td>
<td>.208</td>
<td>.019</td>
<td>-.039</td>
<td>.021</td>
<td>.055</td>
<td>.077</td>
<td>-.085</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N=40      N=36      N=39      N=36

*p < .05    **p < .01
other than those in the "Self-as-speaker" row achieved even a .05 level of significance. The pre-speech ranks of the "Audience" variable in the first speech achieved a significant positive correlation with measures of experience, suggesting that increasing levels of experience are correlated with a perception of the audience as a less important variable (indicated by a higher numerical rank assigned to it) in affecting the response. The magnitude of the correlation became increasingly negative over the post-speech measures in the remaining speeches. A comparison of this coefficient with the coefficient for the "Self-as-speaker" coefficient obtained in the pre-speech measures for yielded at $t$ of $-3.4209$ (df=39), significant at the .01 level for a two-tailed test, revealing a significant difference.

Another pattern is the change over time in the magnitude and sign of the coefficients. While the coefficients for "Topic," "Room," and "Instructor" reveal little change, the coefficients for "Delivery" become increasingly negative and begin to approach a significant level by the last measure. The coefficients for "Self-as-speaker" remain negative, however, over the speeches, although the post-speech measures decline in size.

**Summary of Quantitative Results.** The analysis presented above provide little direct support for the first four hypotheses while hypothesis five is supported. However, while the results do not achieve the necessary level of significance, they do suggest a pattern over the four-speech presentations. The qualitative data will now be examined in an effort to uncover the reasons why quantitative data do show trends in support of the hypotheses but failed to produce statistical significance
in most instances. These qualitative data may prove useful in designing subsequent research.

**Qualitative Analysis**

In contrast to the statistical analyses, this section will report the results of an analysis of the essays Ss wrote expressing in their own words what expectations they held for audience response.

The following instructions were placed on the first page of the questionnaire booklet:

> When you present your speech today, how do you expect the audience to react while you are speaking? Write anything that comes to mind. Recall your previous experiences in speaking when writing out your expectations for today's reaction from your audience. Write your answer below. Your statement may take any form you wish.

Thus, Ss wrote the essays prior to completing any scales and prior to giving the speech.

The qualitative analysis was initiated to provide (1) information apart from the quantitative measures into the process by which speakers use feedback from previous speeches to develop expectations for subsequent speeches, (2) additional validation of the quantitative analyses which supported the hypotheses or alternative explanations for those quantitative results which did not support the hypotheses, and (3) heuristically derived hypotheses for subsequent studies of feedforward in the public speaking task.

No pre-determined method was established for analysis of the essays; rather, the method evolved in the process of reading the essays. Those essays written at the first administration of the scales were read with the following questions in mind:
1. What indicators in the essay suggest the subject has an expectation for audience response?

2. What indicators suggest the subject is relying on responses to past speeches to develop the current expectations?

3. What indicators suggest the writer is using self-feedback processes to establish an expectation?

4. Does the writer have different expectations for peer audience and instructor?

5. What words were used to describe the expected response?

A pattern began to emerge in reading the essays in that many described expectations and then offered reasons for their statements; for example:

I think the class will try to be polite and show interest for the first speech since we are all in the same boat. But for the later speeches I think they will become more critical since we've had exposure to speaking. I would hope that the material is interesting enough that they would listen.

My experiences with public speaking in the past have been both good and bad. I find the hardest thing associated with speaking in front of people finding (sic) a topic in which I am confident I know enough to speak convincingly about.

In presenting my speech to the class I expect a very passive audience, they will be somewhat interested but I don't expect a large amount of feedback such as questions afterwards.

In past experience I've felt most of the students are more involved in examining the individual and how they present the speech instead of the subject they are presenting. They seem to notice if the person is very nervous or if they seem relaxed and confident.

In essays two and three speakers relied on past experiences to provide an explanation for the expectation. Also, it must be noted that in essay three, the implication of a "passive" audience providing no "feedback" suggests that feedback is conceptualized as overt response rather than the information which the audience's passivity itself provides.
Based on these observations, the method of analysis evolved so that after each essay was read, notes were made concerning how speakers described expected audience response and then justified or explained this expectation. For example, in the first essay cited above the speaker expected the audience to be "polite" because it would empathize with the speaker ("We are all in the same boat."). In the second, the speaker expected the audience to "listen" because past speaking experiences had revealed that an interesting topic would generate such a response.

The method provided for an uncovering of answers to the initial questions but also allowed for an assessment of the rules by which speakers developed expectations for audience response. The method thus sought to provide (1) an identification of the expected response, (2) the reasons on which the expectation was premised and (3) the rationale by which these two were related. Essays for each group of speeches were read in one sitting. The groups of essays were read in the sequence in which they were written.

Rather than include all the completed essays in this research, the following section will quote from the essays to support the analysis. The complete essays are available to other investigators.

Essay One. The first group of essays was written at the time of the initial collection of data, when the first speech had been assigned but was not imminent. Although a few speakers expected their audience to be bored, the most prevalent expectation was for an "attentive" audience which would make eye contact with the speaker and would ask questions at the end of the speech. The following provided a sample of this theme:
I expect the majority of the audience to show interest and pay attention to what I say. This will help me to get my points across. I also expect a certain amount of disinterest, distractions, etc. Hopefully this will be minimal.

During a short, interested speech, I expect everyone's attention and all eyes focused on me. During my speech I would like people to ask questions and I will try to answer them.

I hope that while I speak the audience will be interested in what I have to say and will show this through their non-verbals.

Speakers also expressed an expectation that the audience would be "polite and show interest for the first speech since we are all in the same boat." Others suggested the audience would be apprehensive in that it would sympathize with the speaker:

I expect my audience will be a bit apprehensive at the beginning of my speech because of the "attack of nerves" that I will display . . . . But, hopefully . . . my audience will become increasingly more comfortable and attentive as the speech progresses.

Similar expressions revealed the expectation was premised on the belief of audience empathy:

Since my speeches will be present in a classroom situation in which everyone will have to speak sooner or later, I expect the audience to be objective and open-minded to the ideas I may express. This comes to my mind mainly because I think that most of the audience will listen to my speech as they would want others to listen to them.

I would hope that others would show me consideration, as I would them, in being attentive. I do not expect the listener to have the same interests or hold the same values but to listen to the views I am trying to express.

Some expressed an expectation that the audience's attentiveness would not be sincere:

Depending upon how well I choose the topic, I'll get a range of response from bright attentiveness to snoring. On an average "interest topic," I maintain a conservative expectation
of audience response. That is, one-fourth will be very attentive and interested, one-half will be politely quiet with eyes to the front but whose minds may be 1000 miles away, and one-fourth somewhat bored (half of which will openly show their boredom by fidgeting, talking, etc.).

I imagine that the students will be quiet and attentive but I don't actually believe that they will be truly interested in what I present.

A limited number of speakers recalled past speaking experiences to support their expectations. Most recalled their nervousness in previous experiences to suggest they would be nervous again. Others revealed the operation of an internal feedback loop, stating that in the past they had not shown enthusiasm while the speaker had spoken too softly or with a dialect, had strayed from his intended outline or had realized that the audience responds well to an interesting topic.

In summary, the first essays revealed that speakers expected audience response to vary along an attentive-inattentive dimension and that overt expressions of attention would not be sincere. This expectation was premised on an anticipated establishment of an empathic relationship between the speaker and audience or on the selection of an interesting topic. Speakers made no expression of what initiative they would take in establishing the empathic relationship but rather relied on the good will of fellow students to support them. References to a self-feedback loop were limited to general statements about speech anxiety or references to speech delivery.

**Essay Two.** Speakers wrote their second essays immediately prior to presentation of their first in-class speech. Thus, no appearance before the classroom audience intervened between the first and second essays. However, some had an opportunity to observe others speak in class. The
second essays closely resembled those written earlier. Speakers again expected an empathic audience which would "respect my viewpoints," "try to understand," "cope with my nervousness," or "pay attention, even if they are not interested." For some, the expectation for interest was for an overt response:

I hope my audience will be interested in what I have to say and will show this by facial expressions, comments, laughing, etc. I do not want anybody to be daydreaming, fidgety or staring out the window. Hopefully, they will understand what I'm saying and if not will ask questions.

Others suggested that questions at the end of the speech would be a sign of audience interest:

Hopefully most of the audience will be interested in my speech. The best indication to me that my speech got across is the questions and comments which follow my speech.

One speaker, who apparently had observed speeches by classmates, developed expectations for particular audience members:

It seems that the same people keep responding in the question and answer sessions after each speech. I imagine if I have any questions it will be from these same people but I hope others will participate.

As with the first essays, many speakers expected audience response to be contingent on the interest generated by the topic.

I expect the majority of the class to pay attention to my speech. The topic I chose is an interesting one and one which I happen to know a great deal about.

I know my topic forwards and backwards and feel I can tell about it with enough enthusiasm to hold the audience's interest.
In summary then, the qualitative analysis of essay two revealed little change in the expectations held for audience response over the first set of essays.

**Essay Three.** The third essay, written prior to the first practice session suggested that the highly generalized expectation for an "interested" or "attentive" audience had begun to crystallize into a more differentiated image. Several speakers expected the audience to provide a highly overt response:

I feel that the class may be upset over the issue. Many will feel that I'm attacking an Institution that has become important to our society. They will be a little restless because they want to express their own views.

Because of the controversial topic which I am going to speak on and because of the fact most college students should be fairly aware of the topic, I feel the response should be high. By this I mean many may agree and some will disagree and speak up appropriately.

I expect the audience to be slightly shocked and very moved while I am telling the story and giving them facts on the mercy killing of infants.

Others expected an uninterested or bored audience:

Because of the fact that I have had little time for preparation the audience might appear a little bit bored or disinterested.

I think the audience will become bored with my presentation of facts, names and numbers. I do not think we were given adequate time to research the subject and then write a speech and polish it.

While I am speaking, I expect the audience to react apathetically to somewhat favorably.

Consistent with the theme expressed in the first two essays, speakers recognized that overt indicators of audience attentiveness may be differentiated from interest level:
Since it's such a small audience I expect the group to appear interested since there will be diffusion of responsibility in the group that one would find in a large group. The atmosphere will be more personal and intimate and so I assume the audience will act interested and alert.

I expect them to pay attention, and to be somewhat uninterested due to the subject matter of my speech.

As seen in excerpts of several essays previously cited, speakers expected the topic to be significant in affecting response. Others expressed this theme also:

I think the audience will be interested and attentive because I have chosen a topic which is not overly talked out and yet one that is an important issue today.

During my speech I expect my audience to be somewhat interested because I feel the topic I have chosen affects all of us as consumers. They will probably not offer a lot of response because the fact I'm introducing should be fairly new to them unless they are familiar with consumer economics.

The audience members will probably be quite interested in my speech, since it will be an interesting topic to them. . . .

Thus, many speakers revealed that their analysis of the topic was derived in part from how they thought the audience would respond to it.

Several speakers revealed they had begun to recall responses to the previous speech as a guide in developing expectations. Often this recall involved topic selection:

While I am speaking, I expect the audience to react apathetically to somewhat favorably. The reaction will probably be more favorable this time for me because I will be discussing a topic the audience can better adapt to. For instance most of them, I am sure, have heard more about (in some form or another) the SST, . . . than hardly anything at all about the game of chess (sic).
From my experience in giving my first speech in this class, the students were even more attentive, intrigued and expressive than I expected. I believe this was due to the topic I selected more than anything else.

I feel that the topic I selected for this speech doesn't have the mass appeal of my first speech. Due to the number of girls in my practice speech group, (3 girls and 1 boy), I feel they will be taking the opposite position and being less attentive, intrigued, and comprehending less of the material (sic). This is due to the fact that most girls take a view opposite of mine on gun control.

I think since the audience will be considerably smaller they will be more attentive and I'm sure many of them don't know what the ERA is and will be interested to hear. I think that they will listen attentively to my supporting factors. Actually the speech topic can affect everyone.

Evidently the highly generalized expectations for audience attentiveness from the T1 had crystallized into a more differentiated response in which topic selection was linked to audience interest. Some essays revealed this linkage was derived from feedback in previous speeches.

**Essay Four.** The fourth essays were written prior to the second practice session in which considerable subject attrition occurred. In the session Ss were again to present the speech they had developed for the first practice session with revisions they believed were appropriate.

As with essay three, speakers revealed an expectation for a differentiated response rather than a highly generalized notion of "attentiveness." However, the essays provided additional insight in that two themes dominated the rationales, (1) the continuing linkage of speech topic and audience interest and (2) the increasing use of self-feedback processes.
The linkage in the speakers' thinking between topic and expected audience response became more evident than it had been in previous essays. One expected the audience to be interested because his topic was "new" while another suggested the audience "will probably be familiar with my topic and may have already formed opinions." This apparent linkage led another to reveal an expectation for a differentiated response:

I expect that the audience will be attentive. They will be interested but I also feel they will be unbelieving. I believe that they will accept my material but won't accept my conclusion. They will like my argument but their preconceived ideas will be strong to change.

In addition to these apparent linkages of audience and topic, the essays suggested speakers had apparently begun to understand the linkage via a process of self-evaluation:

I have given this speech once before so I should be at ease while giving it. The audience should also be attentive since this will be the first time any of them have heard it.

Another had learned to evaluate his speech in light of the audience's interests:

I expect the audience to be attentive because I have made the speech so that it pertains to everyone. By starting with a common ground subject I hope everyone will be brought closer to my central idea and increase their interest in what I have to say. The facts I present should show the audience the knowledge I have on the subject.

Perhaps the most significant development in essay four was the indication of a linkage of self-evaluation with expectation:

I think the audience will be very interested in my topic, especially since my group this morning will be all females. I have changed my introduction and hope that it will receive a positive response. It's a little unusual.
I also think the audience will understand my speech a lot better than last time, based on some improvements I have made suggested (sic) by my classmates.

I thought on my first practice speech that the response would be affected by the ratio of girls to boys, but found it made little difference, if any. I imagine my second practice speech will be slightly less interesting to the audience than my first practice speech because of only one point of view being presented on the proposal.

One speaker suggested "the audience may be lulled into a stupor, and thus not listen to my speech, because of my monotone. I have always had this problem but I think it's worse with this speech because I'm not really interested in this kind of speech or topic." Others indicated that they had changed the speech from the previous practice session: "I have polished up from my last practice speech and have learned a few do's and don'ts that will hopefully add to a satisfactory delivery."

Some speakers suggested they would work to correct observed weaknesses in an effort to achieve an expected response:

I expect the audience to react in a manner commensurate to the quality of my speech. The tonal quality of my voice, my body language, the use of appropriate gestures will enable me to do a better job of swaying the audience to my convictions on the legalization of prostitution.

I expect the audience to be attentive and initially interested in what I'll be saying. How long I hold their interest depends on how effective I am in delivering my speech. I know now at this stage of the course the areas I need to improve and tomorrow I will attempt to put much emphasis on these problem areas where I am so weak. I really do expect them (the audience) to be of a serious disposition and I must do all I can to be serious while I am delivering my speech.
I am hopeful they will enjoy it (the speech) because I think I have some good material, but I recognize the flaws that I don't think I can correct unless I present the speech. The advantage of a practice speech is that audience feedback will be verbal following my speech so that I don't necessarily have to pick up the immediate audience feedback.

In summary, by the third speech speakers had developed specific expectations for the audience reactions, premised on a recognition of how the audience would respond to the speech topic. However, the most significant development in essay three was the increased indication of a self-feedback loop. They had apparently begun to evaluate their own speaking ability as part of the process of generating expectations.

**Essay Five.** The fifth set of essays was written prior to delivery of the issues message to the entire class. These essays indicated continued use of a self-feedback loop:

My gestures, although they are unconscious, usually seem to please some members of the audience, so they will probably do so today, especially since I will be able to concentrate more fully on what I am saying (having had several "practices").

Another was aware of vocal characteristics. "The audience will probably be a bit annoyed by how fast I give my speech because of monotone I will give it in." This suggested a conflict between self-feedback and other sources of feedback:

I could remedy the fastness by cutting out some part of the speech but everything is necessary. I guess more and more practice would take care of the monotone. When giving my second practice speech, though, to my ears I was varying my pitch and sound...but on the grading sheets they told me to try to stop speaking in a monotone.

They also revealed an awareness of the structural properties of their speech:
My speech is structured in such an order that the audience will hopefully have no doubt following it. I made sure to get my transitions in after every main topic to reinforce my ideas that I wanted to come across.

Others were less specific but also made reference to the structure of the speech: "I expected the audience to understand what I was proposing because of the way I explained the proposal." Another suggested that the introduction to the speech will be something the audience does not expect and "hopefully will attract the audience to listen."

Perhaps because students were again speaking to the entire class, they expected speech anxiety to interfere with communication with the audience: "I fear speaking in front of people and I think my nervousness may make my opinion harder to put across." Another stated: "I feel I will somehow 'blow it' due to being nervous and shaky." However, he went on to suggest that an empathetic response from the audience would be an aid: "I expect a certain amount of attentiveness because they'll be expecting the same from me." Others expressed similar concerns about anxiety but also revealed how the internal feedback loop may have been in operation and in conflict with other feedback sources:

My problem while speaking is not to let my nervousness show. During my two practice speeches I was told I showed no nervousness. Yet my insides are quivering and nervous as I speak. If the nervousness does show, this audience (the class) will be with me and understand my problem. The problem I need to solve is to be calm while speaking. I feel that my job of the future will bring me before public audiences and these people may not tolerate any mistakes in my speaking performance.

I expect the audience to react to me as a speaker this time with more confidence in my speaking ability. The two practice sessions before some members of our class and two TA's really helped me in getting used to presenting this speech. And I think the six class members who heard my presentations will know more of what to expect in my final version and thus I think they will react with more understanding and attention rather than any boredom.
In summary, the dominant theme of the final set of essays was the use of self-feedback processes for establishing expectations. Speakers became more specific in their references to self-observation. A number of themes already noted, the empathic relationship, the importance of topic selection, were also mentioned.

Summary of qualitative data. The qualitative analysis was not intended to provide direct support for the five hypotheses. Rather, it was initiated to (1) provide information not available in the quantitative data, (2) validation for the quantitative findings and (3) insights for further research. The analysis fulfills all three functions.

In light of the failure to find support for four of the five hypotheses, the qualitative data provides highly useful information by revealing a number of trends in the development of expectations. First, the essays revealed a movement on the part of the speakers away from expressions of abstract and undifferentiated expectations to more coherent and systematic statements of expectations. Thus, while in the early essays, speakers were anticipating a merely "interested" or "attentive" audience, later essays revealed expectations for more specific audience behaviors. Expectations also incorporated the possibility of audience acceptance or rejection of ideas in addition to audience attentiveness and responsiveness. Additionally, speakers revealed the development of expectations for a variety of responses from audience members rather than the undifferentiated expectation that all would be attentive.

Second, speakers apparently began the series of speeches hoping their audience would empathize with them. They saw their audience as fellow initiates into the difficulties of speaking in public. This empathy
theme suggests the speakers saw themselves as dependent on the audience emotionally. By the end of the series of speeches, however, statements of this dependency had diminished in number, suggesting the polarization of speaker and audience (Eisenson et al., 1963) had occurred. Apparently for the students, the speaker role had become differentiated from the audience role to the extent the speaker no longer needed to rely only on audience empathy in developing expectations.

A third theme derived from the essays but not uncovered in the quantitative data was that apparently speakers developed a concept of "generalized other" for their audience. The essays revealed that over the series of speeches, speakers began to think of their audience in terms of how it would respond to their topic. In Mead's (1934) terms, this process is similar to the development of a generalized other. Also in Mead's terms, the topic took on the characteristics of a "significant symbol" in that speakers began to respond to it as they thought their audience would.

Finally, the essays revealed, contrary to the quantitative data, that speakers developed a self feedback loop to assess their own speaking abilities. Little reference was made to any self-monitoring processes in the early essays. However, in the later essays, speakers revealed they had begun to observe their own speaking and then use these observations as a basis for developing expectations for subsequent speeches.

In its second function of providing explanations for those hypotheses not supported in the quantitative data, the qualitative analysis presents troublesome if not interesting results. First, the analysis suggests that the self feedback loop developed more fully than is revealed in the
analysis for hypothesis one. The later essays contain numerous references to self-evaluation used by the speakers to develop expectations, yet the quantitative analysis reveals a limited number of significant correlations between self feedback and expectation measures. However, it should be noted that while the quantitative analysis revealed "topic" to be perceived as most important during all pre-speech rankings of variables, the references to topic did not appear until the later essays in the qualitative data.

The essays provide little additional explanation or validation for the analysis of the fourth and fifth hypotheses. Only a few speakers made references to previous speaking experiences in the early essays while the trends in the data for the fourth hypothesis and the results of the analysis of the fifth hypothesis suggest that previous experience does affect perceptions of audience feedback.

The qualitative analysis also fulfills a third function by suggesting new areas of research. These areas along with the interpretation and implications of the findings of the qualitative data will be discussed in the final chapters.

The essays do provide an explanation for the findings of hypothesis two. Contrary to the hypothesized relationship, the quantitative findings for hypothesis two revealed that self feedback measures were more highly related to perceptions of peer rather than instructor feedback. This difference declined in magnitude to nonsignificant levels over the series of speeches. The essays reveal that early in the series speakers relied on the establishment of an empathetic relationship with the audience to develop expectations. Thus, the discovery of this empathetic
relationship, which diminished in importance as polarization of speaker and audience roles occurred, may have accounted for the findings for hypothesis two.

Similarly, the qualitative analysis reveals a trend partially consistent with the results of hypothesis three, which found "topic" to be ranked across as pre-speech measures as the variable most important in affecting audience response. The essays revealed the importance speakers attached to topic selection in the development of expectations.

**Summary**

The quantitative results of this research provided support for only one hypothesis: that speaker experience would be positively correlated with ratings of self as a factor affecting audience response. No support was found to suggest a speaker's self evaluation will be more closely associated with feedback from an evaluator rather than feedback from peers, that a speaker's assessment of the impact he had in affecting audience response will rise relative to other factors in the speaking situation or that speaking experience will be negatively correlated with perceived discrepancy between pre-speech expectations and perceived audience response. The analysis for these hypotheses reveal, however, trends over the data collection period which were in line with two of the hypotheses. The qualitative analysis further substantiated these trends and provided additional information about the development of expectations.
CHAPTER 4

INTERPRETATION AND CONCLUSIONS

Infante and Fisher (1974) concluded that little is known about the pre-speech cognitive states of the public speaker. The rationale for this study argued that little is known of the process by which a speaker's expectations for audience response develop as audience feedback is received. Is it now possible to suggest that more is known about this neglected research area? Although the quantitative results provided full support for only one of five hypotheses, the qualitative data and the patterns revealed in the quantitative results offer evidence that speakers do indeed use feedback to alter (or form) expectations of subsequent responses.

The final task will be to (1) summarize the theory, hypotheses and procedures, (2) discuss the results of quantitative and qualitative analyses, (3) interpret the significance of the results in light of the theoretical rationale, and (4) suggest what important research questions remain to be explored.

Review of Rationale and Hypotheses. This study stemmed from an interest in communicator expectations for receiver response as a construct necessary to understanding communication as process. While implicitly recognized in communication literature, the construct is seldom appropriately operationalized, resulting in a truncated view of
the communication process.

The rationale rested on three sources: the literature of audience analysis, Mead's symbolic interactionism and systems theory. Casting the audience in an active rather than passive role (Bauer, 1964), theorists in audience analysis have suggested that the development of an expectation for audience response is a critical task for the public speaker (Clevenger, 1966; Colburn and Weinberg, 1976; Holtzman, 1970; Williams, 1964). Holtzman was the most explicit adopting Boulding's (1956) systems analysis to argue that the speaker possesses an image of the audience which governs his preparation for speaking.

Systems theory, with its demand for (1) a holistic rather than atomistic analysis and (2) a process, rather than one-shot orientation, in research design, was shown to be appropriate to understanding communication phenomena. Coupled with Mead and audience analysis, cybernetics suggested two propositions: (1) communication research should account for all variables which have measurable effect on the interaction of source and receiver and (2) feedback provides information through internal and external channels by which a source assesses his efforts in communication and develops expectations for subsequent receiver feedback. The definition of expectation was derived from Boulding (1956) and Laszlo (1969) as the subjective projection which the speaker has for the manner in which his audience will respond to his message. This "image" is first shaped and then altered or confirmed as a result of incoming information provided by receiver feedback.
The third proposition, that communication is a purposeful and goal-governed process in which the communicator selects from an array of possible strategies based on his expectations when generating a message, was derived from Mead (1934). In Mead's terms, the speaker develops a generalized other to represent his anticipated audience which, with repeated speaking experiences, becomes more highly structured for the speaker, enabling him to develop more stable expectations. In this process, the speaker also develops a self-as-speaker concept which enables him to identify who he is relative to his audiences. With the development of these concepts the speaker begins to employ significant symbols, those communication patterns which the speaker expects will arouse in the audience the same response which they arouse in himself (Mead, 1934). As with systems thinking, feedback processes are fundamental to Mead's analysis in that the self-concept cannot arise without a response from others. The response gives rise to the generalized other.

The practical syllogism (VonWright, 1971) suggested a logic appropriate to explaining how expectations work. The syllogism does not mandate a conclusion but rather allows for choice in that what the public speaker recognizes as necessary for communicating with an audience will govern his preparation. As audience analysis literature suggests, the development of expectations for audience response is one such action which the speaker ought to recognize as important.

An examination of previous studies uncovered few which focused solely on expectations but several in which the construct was assumed to be a variable mediating feedback processes. Unfortunately, these studies truncated the communication process by failing to account for
both feedback and expectation as the cybernetic model demands (Clement and Frandsen, 1976; Smith, 1973). Nevertheless, previous studies did suggest (1) expectations have an effect on the pre-speech state of the speaker, (2) feedback observed while speaking affects expectations or subsequent audience response, (3) expectations affect the interpretation of the feedback received, and (4) the process notion of communication and the role of communicator choice have been ignored in previously employed research design. Five hypotheses were suggested:

\[ H_1 \] Correlations between measures of a speaker's self-evaluation of a speaking performance and that speaker's expectations for audience response on a subsequent speech will exhibit a greater rise in magnitude relative to other sources of feedback as the speaker gains speaking experience.

\[ H_2 \] Measures of a speaker's evaluation of his own performance will be more highly correlated with the observed feedback of audience members who serve an evaluative rather than those who serve a non-evaluative function.

\[ H_3 \] Over a series of speeches, a speaker will attach increasing importance to himself relative to other variables in the speaking situation as a factor affecting audience response.

\[ H_4 \] A speaker's experience in public speaking will be negatively correlated with the discrepancy between pre-speech expectations and perceived audience response.

\[ H_5 \] A speaker's assessment of his experience in giving speeches will be positively correlated with his rating of self as a factor affecting audience response.

**Review of methodology.** In a repeated measures design, Ss presented four speeches to four different audiences composed of classmates and instructors in an introductory public speaking course. Prior to each speech, Ss completed two identical sets of bipolar adjective scales, which had been developed in three pilot studies, to tap their expectations of how peer and instructor audiences would respond during their speech.
Following each speech, Ss completed three sets of the same scales to tap their perceptions of peer and instructor response as well as their response to themselves. Use of a control group, which did not complete the scales in the initial two data collection periods, revealed no evidence of a practice effect for repeated completions of the scales. Ss also wrote prior to each speech a brief essay in which they described their expectations for audience response. Thus, in the study both quantitative and qualitative data were collected.

Review of findings. The quantitative analysis provided full support for hypothesis five only, suggesting that experience in public speaking was positively correlated with the importance attached to self as a factor affecting audience response. Partial support was found for hypothesis one in that SFB measures were found to demonstrate a significant relationship with expectation measure on two of three dimensions. Also, the trend in the data for hypothesis four suggested that public speaking experience is associated with less discrepancy between pre-speech expectations and perceived audience response. Results for hypothesis three revealed Ss consistently ranked Topic and Delivery as the most important variables affecting audience response before and after a speech respectively, contrary to predictions.

Analysis of the qualitative data proved to be heuristically rich, revealing that Ss initially expected a highly homogeneous audience response along an attentive-inattentive dimension, premised on the establishment of an empathic relationship with the audience. Final essays revealed development of a more differentiated and complex expectation in which anticipated audience acceptance or rejection was
Discussion of Quantitative Results

Only hypothesis five received full support in the statistical analysis. Consistent with Mead's analysis of the development of the self-concept, experience in speaking was initially associated with the assignment of a higher rank of importance to the self-as-speaker variables as a factor affecting audience response. This association declined to non-significant levels over the series of speeches, suggesting previous experience declines in importance as new experience is gained in a communication task.

The quantitative data provide less convincing support for the other four hypotheses. In hypothesis one, SFB perceived as more favorable than expected demonstrated a significant positive correlation with favorable expectations on a subsequent speech in only the acceptance dimension. Additionally, the attention dimension revealed a significant negative correlation for the correlation of SFB and IEX measures. Additionally, significant positive correlations were found for the response and acceptance dimensions when IFB was matched with IEX. These results were contrary to predictions which had suggested the SFB loop would become most closely associated with expectations for feedback. Also, the rise in magnitude of correlations which was predicted was not found in the third set of analysis in the SFB measures although it was found in the PFB and IFB analyses. A rise in the magnitude of correlations was found in all cases in the second analysis.
Consistent with the analysis of the essays, the findings here suggest a SFB loop was operating in the final speeches. However, while the essays suggest that Ss paid little attention to the instructor audience, the results here suggest that instructor feedback as well as self feedback were useful in the development of expectations for the instructor audience.

Two explanations may be offered to account for the inconsistency. First, the feedback measures may have been inadequate. Chapter two relates the difficulties encountered in developing measures with adequate distributions. The scales, which offered those speakers whose perceptions of feedback had been in line with expectations only one response alternative, may have suppressed the possibility of finding significant relationships. Further, the reduction of the data to a dichotomy may have greatly increased the possibility of a Type II error.

However, the validity provided by the factor analyses and pilot studies, the consistently high reliabilities for the scales, the fact that the only significant correlations were all at the .001 level and were all found in the third analysis, and the trend for the coefficients to rise in magnitude over the three analyses provide support for rejecting this interpretation. Most important, however, is the pattern of correlations for the attention dimension in the third analysis. Recalling the essays which suggested that Ss expected the audience to feign attention while responding, the pattern of zero and negative correlations provide a strong argument for rejecting an explanation based on the inappropriateness of the scales. If as the essays suggest the Ss expected feigned attentiveness, then responses on the attentive dimension
would not correlate with expectations.

A second explanation is that while the essays tapped the Sa' responses for the total audience, the scales compartmentalized the audience and that the instructor component was more predictable than the peer component in that process. As will be pointed out below in the discussion of hypothesis two, the discrepancy in size for the components may have been a factor. Thus, when asked to write about "the audience," Ss saw the audience as one unit. However, when the scales separated the audience into two components, the Ss found the instructor component the most predictable in developing expectations for response and acceptance.

The findings for hypothesis one, when looked at in conjunction with findings for hypothesis two, suggest the SFB loop may have been in the formation stage, relying heavily on PFB for development, during the four speeches used in the design. Although the SFB loop was forming, speakers found the instructor audience more predictable when asked to form expectations about it. Also, at the time the fourth measure of expectations was taken, speakers were anticipating a speech before their regular classroom instructor. Further, they had received responses to their speech in two practice sessions from two persons identified as public speaking instructors. Thus, instructor feedback may have been the most useful measure for making predictions for instructor expectations.

The results for hypothesis two were opposite predictions. Measures of SFB were more consistently associated with measures of PFB rather than IFB. Here the essays provide substantiation for the unexpected
results by revealing that students expected the audience to empathize with them. Thus, the PFB measures would more likely be associated with peer rather than instructor responses. Also, speakers did not differentiate the audience into two components in the essays. Thus, the larger of the two audience components, apparently had a greater impact on the development of the SFB loop. Recall that the largest difference in correlation coefficients was found for the first and fourth speeches in which speakers addressed an audience of 20-25 peers and one instructor. A less significant and a non-significant difference were found for the second and third speeches, respectively. Recall the third session had high attrition of students which reduced the size discrepancy between peer and instructor audiences which may help account for the results.

Although hypothesis three was not supported, the high ranks assigned to the Topic and Delivery variables is consistent with later essays which revealed speakers were evaluating their own presentations and using their topic as a means of developing expectations. The consistency of the ranks over all four speeches is troublesome, however, in that the early essays did not reveal a focus on topic or self-evaluation. Speakers may initially be more concerned with anxiety and thus express concern with an empathic relationship with the audience in the early essays while at the same time recognizing the importance of topic selection in marking scales. Thus, an articulation of Topic and Delivery concerns may develop only as a function of experience. Also, the four speech parameters may have been too short to find the predicted movement in the Self-as-speaker variable. Ss may have perceived that variable as
relatively stable. It may change only gradually as more experience is gained.

While results for hypothesis four do not achieve the necessary levels of significance, they do exhibit a pattern in line with predictions. Correlations at $T_1$ between measures of experience and measures of perceived discrepancy between pre-speech expectations and observed feedback are negative, suggesting greater experience is associated with less discrepancy between expected and observed feedback. Thus, more experienced speakers reported less surprise in their observations of audience response. The correlations then steadily recede to zero levels, suggesting differences in previous speaking experience becomes less important after experience is gained in a particular speaking task. Such results are consistent with systems theory which suggests an organism learns to adapt to and make more useful projections into its environment.

**Discussion of Qualitative Data**

Essays written prior to each speech are useful in that they supplement the quantitative analysis, as revealed in the previous section, and independently provide insight into the process of expectation formation. This independent function is primarily heuristic, due to the subjective nature of the analysis performed.

The essays suggest students relied on the development of an empathic relationship between themselves and their audience in the initial stages of expectation formation. This empathy theme became less pronounced as SS gave more speeches in that expectations were more often premised on topic selection and self-evaluation in later essays. Three observations are relevant here. First, the basis by which the polarization of audience
and speaker (Eisenson, et al., 1963; Woolbert, 1916) occurs appears to change over time for the novice speaker. Initially, Sa saw themselves as one with the audience in that they were all "in the same boat."

Polarization was not complete. Yet, in the final essays, speakers apparently differentiated themselves from the audience by (1) recognizing audience response could take several forms, (2) premising the expectation on the topic as separate from their subjective relationship with the audience, and (3) accounting for previous audience feedback which provided both favorable and unfavorable information about their performances. The essays suggest the polarization became more complete with experience.

In keeping with the Eisenson et al. model, the essays also reveal the recognition by speakers of a circular response pattern. Initial essays give little indication that they were making use of previous audience responses to establish expectations while later essays clearly contain references to the reactions of audience members. Likewise, later essays reveal self-evaluation patterns on the part of speakers, suggesting the feedback process Eisenson et al. described is truly circular, with the response of the audience affecting the speaker's response to himself. Under the Meadian analysis the importance of receiving responses is seen in that speakers did not begin to polarize themselves from the audience until after they received responses from that audience. Apparently, the audience as generalized other does not form until the speaker recognize the importance of its response.
The second important observation is that the generalized other finds its locus in topic selection. In the later essays, speakers revealed that expectations were premised in large measure on their analysis of how the audience would respond to their topic. The speaker's topic had assumed a function analogous to that which Mead assigns to the significant symbol (1934, p. 47). Apparently, speakers had learned to assume an attitude toward their topic which they believed was similar to the one their audience would take toward it. Assumption of such an attitude then allowed the speakers to develop expectations for audience response. Using Cushman's analysis of the significant symbol as a model, speakers had learned to (1) place themselves in the position of the individuals to whom the topic was addressed and (2) view the content of the topic from that position. For a speech intended to be persuasive, topic selection would become important in developing expectations for audience response. However, since much public communication is persuasive in nature, the observation remains useful.

Finally, the failure to find a differentiation in the essays between peer and instructor audiences seems significant in that the use of separate scales for each clearly demanded speakers make such a differentiation. A number of explanations can be offered. The quantitative results suggest audience size as a factor. Because the instructors, including classroom instructors, were graduate students little removed from students in age, the speakers may have viewed the audience as one rather than two units. Finally, while practice session instructors did offer criticism, they did not assign grades. Thus, students may not have considered them as serving a function different from that of the peer
audience. This explanation would hold, however, only for the practice sessions in that the regular classroom instructors who were the peer audience for speeches one and four, did not assign grades.

Two different explanations are suggested by the empathic theme expressed in initial essays. It may be that speakers saw their peer audience as "real" audience with the instructor playing the "teacher" role of the one who listens in to make sure the assignment is completed correctly but remains someone unique to the situation. Similarly, it may be students saw the peer audience as the source of the empathic response while instructors were critics incapable of providing such a response. The results of hypothesis one would support this explanation.

Finally, it may be that speakers saw the audience as one unit and addressed it as such. If so, the dichotomy incorporated into the design was inappropriate. The evidence revealed in the essays merely raises the issue of components of audience response and provides no basis for drawing conclusions.

In conclusion, the essays provide information useful to interpreting the quantitative results of the study and raise a number of issues of heuristic value. They also provide insight into the polarization and generalized other concepts.

Conclusions

What are the implications of this study for understanding the function of communicator expectations for receiver response in the public speaking situation? Failure to find more empirical support for the hypotheses limits the certainty with which conclusions can be stated. However, enough evidence has been presented to warrant several conclusions. The
first is in agreement with Borman and Shapiro (1962) concerning the importance of feedback, but moves well beyond their work in its implications to suggest that communicator expectations for audience response develop over time as feedback is received. The second major conclusion suggests that topic selection functions as a useful tool in making predictions about audience behavior. Several pedagogical and methodological conclusions will also be presented.

The first major conclusion suggests that the developmental process takes several forms and occurs over time with increased speaking experience. It reveals a movement away from an initial, highly homogeneous and undifferentiated set of expectations, premised on a vaguely defined but hoped for empathetic relationship with the audience, and toward more highly structured and differentiated expectations. These later expectations allow for a variety of responses and reveal a linkage of topic selection and self-evaluation. The essays revealed a development of what Mead called a generalized other in that the expectations eventually evolved to take the form of the attitude which the speaker assumed the audience held for him and his topic. In cybernetic thinking, a projection (Laszlo, 1969, 1972) or an image (Boulding, 1956) emerged and underwent considerable change as feedback was gained.

Given the empathetic theme, the audience-speaker polarization process (Eisenson et al., 1963) does not emerge full blown in the first speech but is dependent on an additional component of the Eisenson, et al. model, circular response. As Mead and systems theory suggest, feedback is a prerequisite to the development of the generalized other. This generalized other is the product of the polarization process.
The quantitative data of hypotheses one and four generally support the developmental nature of the communicator expectation concept. The rising magnitude of correlation coefficients for PEX and IEX measures revealed for hypothesis one suggest that expectations become more firmly tied to feedback as speaking experience is gained. Analysis for hypothesis four revealed that while previous speaking experience was initially associated with less discrepancy between expectations and perceived feedback, the association declines to zero levels over a series of encounters with audiences. Results of these analyses suggest the developmental nature of the image or projections which speakers had for audience response, and point to the importance of circular feedback in that development.

The conclusion is congruent with the theorists of audience analysis (Clevenger, 1966; Colburn and Weinberg, 1976; Holtzman, 1970; and Williams, 1964) who suggest that audience analysis is not a "one-shot" affair but rather part of a continuing strategy of interaction with an audience. The conclusion also suggests expectation formation occurs quite naturally in that even novice speakers are capable of generating some form of a projection. More important, however, is the conclusion that with very little experience the elemental projections assume more differentiated states. As Holtzman (1970) and Williams (1964) suggested, audience analysis is better treated not as simply a task of examining the audience's demographic characteristics but rather as a task of developing prognoses or images for audience response. This study lends support to their positions by revealing that these processes occur in a dynamic, not static, fashion as experience is gained. Demographic factors may be
useful to a speaker but should be viewed as only a partial conceptualization of the audience analysis process.

These conclusions are in accord with Miller's (1964) observations that speakers perceive audience feedback not as a discrete event but rather a sequence of events in which expectations play an important role. However, this study moves beyond Miller's paradigm by allowing speakers a higher level of choice in topic selection, incorporating a process orientation and examining variables in a more complete paradigm. Also, the study adds to Rhodes and Frandsen's (1975) conclusion that training in feedback utilization enhances a speaker's ability by suggesting that speakers may develop use of the circular response component without training. This development may not be as focused or useful to the speaker as the training proposed by Rhodes and Frandsen, but the development is not limited to such instances. By using a process orientation, this study provides an advance over previous work.

A second major conclusion is the discovery of the apparent function of the topic as a significant symbol. Mead's analysis suggests the significant symbol and generalized other concepts are closely linked so that the communicator uses significant symbols in communicating with the generalized other. The essays reveal the emergence of a generalized other when speakers premised their expectations on topic selection, responding to the topic as they believed the audience would respond. The topic thus became an anchor or referent for the speakers.

In Mead's terms, it might be said that such an anchor functions as the Me for the speaker in that it guides his action in specific situations. However, as the speaker develops this Me, he also develops a
unique response to the Me, the I. As a form of self feedback, the I emerges to allow the speaker a form of self-response. This I-Me interaction is clearly revealed in the results for hypothesis three where Topic was ranked as the most important variable prior to each speech while Delivery was so ranked following each speech. The results lend credence to Mead's analysis in that the development of significant symbols involves two phases: the individual using the gestures places himself in the position of the person addressed and then, from the point of view of that person, views his gesture (Cushman, 1969, p. 6).

This statement is in accord with several previous studies (Brown, 1970; Brown & Garland, 1971; Hazen & Kiesler, 1975; Schramm & Danielson, 1958; and Zimmerman & Bauer, 1956) which found topic selection to be a prominent variable in the pre-speech cognitions of speakers. This position is in opposition to Infante and Fisher's (1974) conclusion, however, that topic selection has no impact on such cognitions. This study avoids the restrictions imposed by previous designs in providing a process orientation and a choice on the part of the speakers. This design provides phenomenologically derived evidence to support the usefulness of the previous examinations of topic selection.

This study also goes beyond Jensen's (1969) findings concerning the multidimensional nature of audience feedback. In keeping with Mead and cybernetic theory, the study reveals the responsiveness dimension as probably the most important element of perceived feedback for speakers. Speakers appeared to rely on overt audience response, even when it was believed to be feigned, to develop the polarization and circular response patterns characteristic of the audience situation.
In light of the logic of the practical syllogism (Von Wright, 1971), the establishment of the contingencies between expectations and both topic selection and self-feedback appears to be the activity which the speaker considers instrumental to a desired end. As revealed in the initial essays and regression equations, the establishment of these contingencies is not mandated at the first encounter with the audience. Rather, the speaker learns these steps are important as he gains experience. Apparently, the polarization and circular response patterns are not mandated either, but develop as the speaker learns their usefulness to the achievement of his goals.

Two conclusions concerning pedagogy can be stated. First, the appearance of the empathic premise for the establishment of expectancies, while useful to the major findings, deserves attention in its own right. An instructor may use this premise to aid the speaker in making the transition from the accustomed position of communication receiver to the new and perhaps uncomfortable role of communication source. The premise lends credence to the often suggested strategy for dealing with speech anxiety: think of the audience as a friend. Also, this finding suggests the instructor might, after initial assignments, develop speaking tasks in which the audience is not perceived in an empathic role to provide more realistic practice for the variety of audiences the student may encounter beyond the classroom.

Second, the importance of audience responsiveness to the establishment of the self-as-speaker, generalized other, and significant symbol concepts suggests the instructor could establish methods by which overt audience reaction is encouraged. Holtzman described listeners as engaged
in "audiencing" (1970, p. 1). Perhaps introductory courses should provide a counterpart to the feedback instructor Rhodes and Frandaen (1975) propose, teaching those skills important for understanding this audiencing function.

Additional conclusions concern the methodological implications of the study. First, the study reveals that problems of incorporating a process orientation, while taxing, are not insurmountable. The most difficult problem, the attrition of $S_a$, is not inherent in such designs. Also, the study reveals the usefulness of collecting both quantitative and qualitative data. Without the essays, this study would add little to the understanding of expectations. Even with significant quantitative data, qualitative data can contribute to the validity of the interpretations.

Implications for Future Research

Given the original nature of this research, the disappointing lack of significant quantitative results and the highly heuristic implications of the qualitative results, further research seems warranted. Such research could extend in several directions.

First, a number of variations could be applied to the design employed. A larger $N$ is mandated and the four speech parameter could be expanded to see if the developmental nature of expectations could be tapped quantitatively. Also, the nature of the speaking task and composition of the audience could be varied so that speakers would give the same speech to several different audiences or several different speeches to the same audience.
A useful extension of the study would be to use realistic situations outside the classroom. For example, lawyers, ministers, salesmen, and teachers often speak in situations in which audiences change but the nature of the communication task does not. Presumably these public speakers, both novice and experienced, develop expectations for the manner in which audiences will respond. Use of longitudinal research would enable the researcher to explore in such realistic settings many of the questions raised in this study.

Refinement of data collection techniques would also be a useful extension of this research. The availability of a multi-method approach to data collection would reduce the problems of repeated measures designs by allowing the researcher to collect data with a variety of methods such as scales, interviews, and content analysis. Further development of the scales is also warranted since differences between quantitative and qualitative data were uncovered.

Future research could also profitably examine changes in the content of speeches over a series of interactions between a speaker and audience. Content analysis of the transcribed recordings of several presentations of a single speech or different speeches might be useful to exploring Black's (1970) notion of the "second persona."

Summary

This study examined audience analysis at the conceptual level using a Meadian and cybernetic perspective as a means for understanding the functions of communicator expectations and receiver feedback. At the empirical level, expectations and feedback were examined by collecting
both quantitative and qualitative data. Despite a failure to achieve established levels of significance for all but one hypothesis, the qualitative analysis augmented by trends in the quantitative data, suggested two major conclusions. First, a speaker's expectations progress from a highly undifferentiated and simplistic state, in which source and receiver are partially polarized, to a more differentiated and complex state in which the audience begins to emerge as a generalized other. A circular response pattern is suggested in the speaker's evaluative use of his own performance and his cognizance of audience response. Second, topic selection functions in a manner similar to a significant symbol by enabling the speaker to assume the audience's position and thereby develop expectations for their response. The research also generated implications for public speaking instruction and research methodology in a process paradigm. The rationale developed here for the expectation construct and the richness of the heuristic findings warrant further research.
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APPENDIX A

Factor Analysis Employed in Development of Measuring Instrument
### TABLE 8

Factor Analysis of Initial Three-Factor Solution with Items Deleted

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Adjective Pair</th>
<th>Factor 1</th>
<th>Factor 2</th>
<th>Factor 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>restless-still</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>not expressive-expressive</td>
<td>-.69</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>curious-not curious</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>-.23</td>
<td>-.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>motivated-not motivated</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fidgety-not fidgety</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>not responding-responding</td>
<td>-.72</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>accepting-rejecting</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>-.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>communicative-not communicative</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unconcerned-concerned</td>
<td>-.50</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>reinforcing-not reinforcing</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>intrigued-not intrigued</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>-.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>approving-disapproving</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td>-.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>agreeing-disagreeing</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>disbelieving-believing</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>-.71</td>
<td>-.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>not understanding-understanding</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>-.67</td>
<td>.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rewarding-not rewarding</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>comprehending-not comprehending</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>not discerning-discerning</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>-.25</td>
<td>.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>listening-not listening</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>-.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>inattentive-attentive</td>
<td>-.21</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>expecting-not expecting</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>-.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bored-interested</td>
<td>-.68</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pleased-not pleased</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>-.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>open-closed</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>-.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>oriented-disoriented</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td>.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>warm-cold</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>-.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>not trusting-trusting</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-.65</td>
<td>.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>smiling-frowning</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>-.16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Eigenvalue | 11.36 | 1.62 | 1.37 |
| Variance   | 65.49% | 9.34% | 7.90% |
TABLE 9

Correlation Matrix for
Audience Feedback Factors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Responsiveness</th>
<th>Acceptance</th>
<th>Attentiveness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Responsiveness</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acceptance</td>
<td>.706</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attentiveness</td>
<td>.415</td>
<td>.432</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX B

Samples of Questionnaires
Questionnaire used in collecting data on students' experience in public speaking
One excellent way to prepare for a speech is to develop an expectation for the way the audience will respond to you while you are speaking.

When you present your speeches in this course, how do you expect your audience will respond to you while you are speaking?

In the space below, describe your expectation. Recall your previous experiences in speaking and/or any other experiences you have in communicating which you think will be helpful in establishing an expectation.

Your statement may take any form you wish:
Now, on the scales below, indicate what expectations you have for the way the audience will react while you are presenting your speeches in this class.

Circle one number on each line, using the following number system:

If you expect the audience to be **totally** like the word, circle a 1.
- mostly like the word, circle a 2.
- somewhat like the word, circle a 3.
- slightly like the word, circle a 4.
- not at all like the word, circle a 5.

There are two sets of scales: one for your classmates and one for your instructor.

I EXPECT THAT WHILE I AM SPEAKING IN THIS CLASS, MY CLASSMATES' REACTIONS WILL INDICATE THAT THEY ARE:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>totally</th>
<th>mostly</th>
<th>somewhat</th>
<th>slightly</th>
<th>not at all</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>comprehending</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>attentive</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>intrigued</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>expressive</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>accepting</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>responsive</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>restless</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fidgety</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>believing</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I EXPECT THAT WHILE I AM SPEAKING IN THIS CLASS, MY INSTRUCTOR'S REACTIONS WILL INDICATE THAT HE/SHE IS:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>totally</th>
<th>mostly</th>
<th>somewhat</th>
<th>slightly</th>
<th>not at all</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>comprehending</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>attentive</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>intrigued</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>expressive</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>accepting</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>responsive</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>restless</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fidgety</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>believing</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
We would like to learn what kind of public speaking experience students in 105 have. Please answer the questions below describing your experiences in public speaking.

Did you have a specific course in high school devoted to public speaking and communication? _____yes _____no
If yes, briefly describe the kinds of speeches you presented:

Did you have a unit in public speaking as part of a course in English or another subject in high school? _____yes _____no
If yes, briefly describe the kinds of speeches you presented:

Did you participate in speech contests such as debate or oral interpretation in high school? _____yes _____no

Have you had to present speeches in any college level course (other than this one)? _____yes _____no
Briefly describe your experiences:

What kinds of experience have you had in presenting speeches in situations outside the classroom (for example, speeches to clubs, organizations, student council, church)?

Based on your answers above and any other experiences you have had in presenting a speech to an audience, about how many public speeches would you say you have presented prior to taking this course?

NOTE: Public speeches here includes all situations similar to what you will be doing in this course—that is, preparing a message in advance and standing before a group of listeners to present that message so that their attention was focused on you and you could observe their response to you.

The number of times I have given a speech in public is (circle the most appropriate answer):

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 more than 20 (please give an approximate number:____)
Questionnaire used in collecting data during the in-class personal interest speech and in-class issues speech
Communication 105

Speaker Questionnaire

On the following pages you will be asked a number of questions about your experience in speaking to the class today. Please answer each question as best you can—making sure your response reveals your true feelings.

You will answer some of the questions before you speak and some after you speak.

1. When you present your speech today, how do you expect the audience to react while you are speaking? Write anything that comes to your mind. Recall your previous experiences in speaking in developing your expectations for today's reaction from your audience.

Write your answer below. Your statement may take any form you wish:
Now, on the scales below, indicate what expectations you have for the way your audience will react while you are presenting your speech.

Circle one number on each line, using the following number system:

If you expect the audience to be totally like the word, circle a 1. mostly like the word, circle a 2. somewhat like the word, circle a 3. slightly like the word, circle a 4. not at all like the word, circle a 5.

There are two sets of scales, one for your classmates and one for your instructor:

I EXPECT THAT WHILE I AM SPEAKING TODAY, MY CLASSMATES' REACTION WILL INDICATE THAT THEY ARE:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>totally</th>
<th>mostly</th>
<th>somewhat</th>
<th>slightly</th>
<th>not at all</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>attentive</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>comprehending</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>intrigued</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>expressive</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>accepting</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>responsive</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>restless</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fidgety</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>believing</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I EXPECT THAT WHILE I AM SPEAKING TODAY, MY INSTRUCTOR'S REACTION WILL INDICATE THAT HE/SHE IS:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>totally</th>
<th>mostly</th>
<th>somewhat</th>
<th>slightly</th>
<th>not at all</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>attentive</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>comprehending</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>intrigued</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>expressive</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>accepting</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>responsive</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>restless</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fidgety</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>believing</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please go on to the next page....
What factors do you think will be most important in determining the audience response when you speak today?

Rank the factors that are listed below, giving the one that you think will be most important a rank of "1," the factor that you think will be second in importance a "2" and so forth until you have ranked all factors.

If there is a factor that you think is important but has not been listed, be sure to include it under the "other" heading and rank it.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Factor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The members of the audience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>My speech delivery—how I present the speech</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The topic on which I speak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Me as the speaker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The room in which I will speak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The instructor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Stop. Please do not complete the rest of the form until you have finished speaking.
On the scales below, indicate how you perceived the audience's feedback. Obviously, there are no right or wrong answers—simply use the scales to indicate what you observed while you were speaking.

Circle one number on each line, using the following system:

If, for example, on the first line you perceived the audience to be:
- much more attentive than you had expected, circle a +2
- more attentive than you had expected, circle a +1
- about the same as you had expected, circle a 0
- less attentive than you had expected, circle a -1
- much less attentive than you had expected, circle a -2

Follow the same procedure for each line. Note there are three sets of scales, one for your classmates' responses, one for your instructor's responses and one for a self-evaluation.

### WHILE I WAS SPEAKING, THE REACTIONS OF MY CLASSMATES INDICATE TO ME THAT THEY WERE:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attitude</th>
<th>much more</th>
<th>more</th>
<th>as expected</th>
<th>less</th>
<th>much less</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>attentive</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>comprehending</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>intrigued</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>expressive</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>accepting</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>responsive</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>restless</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fidgety</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>believing</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### WHILE I WAS SPEAKING, THE REACTIONS OF MY INSTRUCTOR INDICATE TO ME THAT HE/SHE WAS:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attitude</th>
<th>much more</th>
<th>more</th>
<th>as expected</th>
<th>less</th>
<th>much less</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>attentive</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>comprehending</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>intrigued</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>expressive</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>accepting</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>responsive</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>restless</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fidgety</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>believing</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please go on to the final page......
IF I HAD BEEN A MEMBER OF THE AUDIENCE LISTENING TO MY OWN SPEECH, I THINK MY RESPONSE WOULD HAVE INDICATED THAT I WAS:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>much more</th>
<th>more</th>
<th>as expected</th>
<th>less</th>
<th>much less</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>attentive</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>comprehending</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>intrigued</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>expressive</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>accepting</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>responsive</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>restless</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fidgety</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>believing</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What factors do you think were more important in determining the response you received when speaking today?

Again, rank them, giving the most important factor a rank of "1," the second most important a rank of "2," etc.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Factor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The members of the audience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>My delivery how I presented the speech</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The topic on which I spoke</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Me as the speaker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The room in which I spoke</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The instructor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

____________________________________
Questionnaire used in collecting data during practice sessions
Communication 105

Expectation-Feedback Questionnaire

Practice Sessions for Issues Speech

On the following pages you will be asked a number of questions about your experience in presenting your issues speech during the practice sessions. Please answer each question as best you can—making sure your response reveals your true feelings.

Be sure to bring this form with you when you come to the ______ practice session on ____________.

Answer the first 3 pages before you speak. Then, after you have spoken, answer the last two pages.

1. When you present your speech during the practice session, how do you expect the audience to react while you are speaking? Write anything that comes to mind. Recall your previous experiences in speaking.

   Your statement may take any form you wish:
Now, on the scales below, indicate what expectations you have for the way your audience will react while you are presenting your speech.

Circle one number on each line, using the following number system:

If you expect the audience to be totally like the word, circle a 1. Mostly like the word, circle a 2. Somewhat like the word, circle a 3. Slightly like the word, circle a 4. Not at all like the word, circle a 5.

There are two sets of scales, one for your classmates and one for the person who is serving as your instructor for today.

I EXPECT THAT WHILE I AM PRESENTING MY ISSUES SPEECH, MY CLASSMATES' REACTIONS WILL INDICATE THAT THEY ARE:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attentive</th>
<th>Totally 1</th>
<th>Mostly 2</th>
<th>Somewhat 3</th>
<th>Slightly 4</th>
<th>Not at all 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comprehending</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intriged</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expressive</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accepting</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsive</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restless</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fidgety</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Believing</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I EXPECT THAT WHILE I AM PRESENTING MY ISSUES SPEECH, THE INSTRUCTOR'S REACTION WILL INDICATE THAT HE/SHE IS:

| Attentive       | 1         | 2        | 3          | 4          | 5            |
| Comprehending   | 1         | 2        | 3          | 4          | 5            |
| Intriged        | 1         | 2        | 3          | 4          | 5            |
| Expressive      | 1         | 2        | 3          | 4          | 5            |
| Accepting       | 1         | 2        | 3          | 4          | 5            |
| Responsive      | 1         | 2        | 3          | 4          | 5            |
| Restless        | 1         | 2        | 3          | 4          | 5            |
| Fidgety         | 1         | 2        | 3          | 4          | 5            |
| Believing       | 1         | 2        | 3          | 4          | 5            |

Please go on to the next page....
What factors do you think will be most important in determining the audience response when you speak during the practice session?

Rank the factors that are listed below, giving the one that you think will be most important a rank of "1," the factor that you think will be second in importance a "2" and so forth until you have ranked all factors.

If there is a factor that you think is important but has not been listed, be sure to include it under the "other" heading and rank it.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Factor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>The members of the audience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>My speech delivery—how I present the speech</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>The topic on which I speak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Me as the speaker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>The room in which I will speak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>The instructor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Stop. Please do not complete the rest of the form until you have finished speaking.
ANSWER THE FOLLOWING QUESTIONS AFTER YOU HAVE SPOKEN.

On the scales below, indicate how you perceived the audience's feedback. Obviously, there are no right or wrong answers—simply use the scales to indicate what you observed while you were speaking.

Circle one number on each line, using the following system:
If, for example, on the first line you perceived the audience to be:
much more attentive than you had expected, circle a +2
more attentive than you had expected, circle a +1
about the same as you had expected, circle a 0
less attentive than you had expected, circle a -1
much less attentive than you had expected, circle a -2

Follow the same procedure for each line. Note there are three sets of scales, one for your classmates' responses, one for your instructor's responses and one for a self-evaluation.

WHILE I WAS SPEAKING, THE REACTIONS OF MY CLASSMATES INDICATE TO ME THAT THEY WERE:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>much more</th>
<th>more</th>
<th>as expected</th>
<th>less</th>
<th>much less</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>attentive</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>comprehending</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>intrigued</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>expressive</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>accepting</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>responsive</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>restless</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fidgety</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>believing</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

WHILE I WAS SPEAKING, THE REACTIONS OF MY INSTRUCTOR INDICATE TO ME THAT HE/SHE WAS:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>much more</th>
<th>more</th>
<th>as expected</th>
<th>less</th>
<th>much less</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>attentive</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>comprehending</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>intrigued</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>expressive</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>accepting</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>responsive</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>restless</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fidgety</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>believing</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please go on to the final page.....
IF I HAD BEEN A MEMBER OF THE AUDIENCE LISTENING TO MY OWN SPEECH, I THINK MY RESPONSE WOULD HAVE INDICATED THAT I WAS:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attitude</th>
<th>Much More (+2)</th>
<th>More (+1)</th>
<th>As Expected (0)</th>
<th>Less (-1)</th>
<th>Much Less (-2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Attentive</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comprehending</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intrigued</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expressive</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accepting</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsive</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restless</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fidgety</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Believing</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What factors do you think were more important in determining the response you received when speaking today?

Again, rank them, giving the most important factor a rank of "1," the second most important a rank of "2," etc.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Factor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The members of the audience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>My delivery—how I presented the speech</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The topic on which I spoke</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Me as the speaker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The room in which I spoke</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The instructor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other ______________________________</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

__________________________________________