

SELF-ESTEEM, COMMUNICATOR STYLE
AND CLASSROOM SATISFACTION

Angela J. Sisson

Submitted to the faculty of the University Graduate School
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree
Master of Arts
in the Department of Communication Studies,
Indiana University

May 2011

Accepted by the Faculty of Indiana University, in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Arts.

Elizabeth M. Goering, Ph.D., Chair

Ronald M. Sandwina, Ph.D.

Master's Thesis
Committee

Nancy Rhodes, Ph.D.

DEDICATION

This work is dedicated to a wide range of supportive, inspirational individuals: to the faculty and staff of the IUPUI Department of Communication Studies, who are generally not only generous but also typically tireless in offering inspiration and encouragement to one another and to students (including me); to students who know or even suspect the value of learning more about themselves for the purpose of having more successful learning experiences; and to my personal support crew, including Kevin Matthew, Janine Andrews, Jennifer Batchelor, and Dana Battin.

In the aforementioned groups, I could endlessly cite the particulars as to why each deserves a spotlight in dedication. Rather than do an inadequate job of covering that, however, let me say the dedications are symbolic of those who enlightened this student and of those who are tireless in the dedication they bring to positive and pure progress – particularly as I’ve had the experience of it from Dr. Elizabeth Goering, an incomparable advisor and instructor; Dr. Nancy Rhodes, a sunny dispositioned, pragmatic volunteer with a dogged commitment to follow-through in statistics and more; the ever-supportive Dr. Ronald Sandwina; Stephen LeBeau, a tireless and inspirational course director with an unerring vision for responding to student needs; and, Kevin Matthew – an irrepressibly critical, challenging supporter.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Thank you to the many people who made this possible. When a fairly direct project takes on a long life, it's with a sigh of relief that I point to supporters who make it possible to complete it!

I am especially grateful to my patient, insightful committee members: Dr. Elizabeth Goering, Dr. Nancy Rhodes, and Dr. Ronald Sandwina. Without their patience, TLC, and expertise, this would simply not be possible; please know your continuous work is appreciated. In this case, Dr. Goering and Dr. Sandwina shaped my thinking in the program from my first classes, and it's a privilege to have benefited from their insights. Dr. Rhodes, on the other hand, only recently made my acquaintance but brought her sociological savvy to develop statistical analytical strategy in a positive ploy to frame factual findings of this project. (I stress to you that the propensity for alliteration is of the author's own flavor.) Simply put, there are not enough ways to thank these individuals; as an instructor myself, I know they are giving a lot day-to-day and giving more when they offer critical feedback for projects like mine!

I am also grateful to those who professionally inspire and support me, including many instructors of communication studies. A few key people in this category include the following: Dr. John Parrish-Sprowl, who shares vast expertise in both health and corporate realms; Dr. Kim White-Mills, who is a tremendous example of juggler as professor, administrator, researcher, and personal goals; and Stephen LeBeau, Mike Polites, Jan DeWester, Rusty Handlon, and Kate Thedwall – each of whom has been an excellent role model, offering encouragement, advice, and opportunity. Likewise,

Jennifer Cochrane offered meaningful advice.

On a personal level, the inspiration to devote 'me time' to graduate school came with more than a nudge from my stubbornly kind partner in life, Kevin Matthew. Kevin deserves tremendous thanks for being supportive during trying times for the both of us. He encouraged my return to school after years away, and it is only with his help through a traumatic burglary, lack of air conditioning with no operable windows and thus 90+ temperatures, surgeries, vehicle sharing, and much more that we reach a point to create a more prosperous future.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

List of Tables	vii
Introduction.....	1
Literature Review and Development of Research Questions	6
Communicator Style Literature	6
Self-Image Literature.....	11
Research Methods.....	16
Subjects.....	16
Data Collection	16
Results.....	21
Discussion.....	30
Limitations of the Study	35
Questions for Future Study.....	35
Concluding Remarks	36
Tables.....	38
Appendices	
Appendix A: Communicator Style Measure.....	42
Appendix B: Current Thoughts (State Self-Esteem Scale).....	47
Appendix C: Course Satisfaction Questions.....	50
References.....	53
Curriculum Vitae	

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1: Communicator Styles	38
Table 2: Self-Esteem Styles.....	38
Table 3: Interaction in and Satisfaction with Public Speaking Class	39
Table 4: Rotated Component Matrix for Factor Analysis	40
Table 5: Communicator Style Regression Coefficients.....	41
Table 6: Self-Esteem Style Regression Coefficients	41

INTRODUCTION

Educators recognize several concerns when focusing on ways to meet student needs. Among these are concerns about student retention and the ability to adapt to student learning styles as students arrive with different technological backgrounds and even with different generational perceptions of education. To further understand the significance of this, consider that as many as one in three freshmen may fail to return for a sophomore year (“Best Colleges,” 2010). The prevalence of these concerns has inspired much research into details of incoming students’ lives and the factors which might connect with their retention – research often prioritized campus by campus. Researchers have sought to maximize understanding of typical factors impacting retention rates, including such factors as whether or not students were from rural or urban communities, whether or not they declared majors, parental education levels and socio-economic status, academic ability, social integration and more. In Florida, for example, a doctoral candidate looked at student retention as connected to a single common academic experience, the public speaking course (Gaythwaite, 2006); while Indiana University-Bloomington completed a much more comprehensive, multi-year examination of its first-year students and included factors such as social integration and academic integration (Office of Institutional Research, 2002). Overall, the issues surrounding student experiences and academic success have become crucial to college attendance growth, and factors which could improve student success are imperative considerations for programs across the board.

A consistent element in first-year student experience – and therefore a stepping-stone in the process toward retention – is student course experiences and what commonalities may be used to attract retention. At many universities, few courses are as common to first-year students as public speaking. Factors which influence this include schools' desire to require public speaking as a foundation before other courses requiring research and oral presentation. In addition, while students generally test into different introductory English or math courses based on ability, such testing is not typical for public speaking classes. Because it is common ground in the freshman experience, the public speaking course is an ideal place to identify what factors may contribute to success or termination of students' academic careers.

Retention concerns have led to various changes on college campuses. Many have focused on attracting students' return by enhancing student comfort and success on campus, usually through linked courses called learning communities (Hotchkiss et al., 2005). For example, many have created learning communities for incoming students designed to help students build networks. At Indiana University Purdue University Indianapolis (IUPUI), for example, learning communities bring together students of like majors so they may get to know one another, faculty, and advisors during foundational courses. Others – usually generically referred to as first-year seminar communities – may simply ensure incoming students are in multiple classes together (usually for the first semester) to bridge gaps between high school environs and university ones, helping students by teaching them of campus resources as well as making sure they develop connections with students and instructors who encourage their success (Evenbeck, 2010).

For some time, researchers have recognized that students consider numerous factors when identifying courses to take; these have ranged from gender-based values (Wilson et al., 1994) to those endorsed by family (Valadez, 2002) to instructor and compatibility with major field (Kerin et al., 1975). Students, professors, and college administrators have recognized that the factors influencing a student's college choices often impact the value which is placed on a student's education in the long term (Light, 2001). Such analyses open the door to analyze factors involving the students themselves – likely factors which the students may not recognize, including self-image and communicator style. As self-image and communicator style are each foundations for our interaction with others, the potential for impact of these influences on student retention appears worthy of examination.

The potential to understand students and their experiences better can broadly enhance educators' abilities to improve success and retention. Students' interactions and choices are connected not only to instructors and educational motives but also to their perception of their possibility to excel. This perception may have a relationship with students' self-image, ranging from self-esteem to views of physical appearance. Likewise, the students' awareness of their communication characteristics may also relate to choices of venue – whether concerning large or small campuses, on-campus experiences, or online ones. In a very basic way, students' self-image may influence expressed communication styles. Either communication style or self-image might impact students' preferences for dealing with others. For example, one might expect that individuals with certain communication styles would prefer to take their public speaking class in the midst of a large campus while others would prefer an off-campus

locale, while still others might prefer an online course. Whether or not there is a relationship among all these factors does not deter the benefit of identifying individual relationships between factors. For example, even if self-image does not correspond to retention, understanding its relationship to communicator style may indirectly enhance efforts to improve retention. Knowing how communicator style, self-esteem, and the students' experience in the classroom interrelate is of value because educators can easily learn to make positive adaptations based on this knowledge. Previous research provides evidence of this practical application. For example, Lee (2000) analyzed participant characteristics, participant self-confidence, and participant-perceived integration into the course and was able to identify specific success factors in participants' discourse during computer conferencing (Lee, 2000). Similarly, a study of teachers' communication styles and effectiveness with adult learners and undergraduate students inspired instructors to modify tactics for greater classroom success (Comadena, 1992).

Understanding any correspondence of or patterns relevant to communication style, self-image, and chosen educational setting may enhance educators' abilities to respond to students' needs. Students' traits and choices in these areas are readily measurable. Students may benefit if educators better understand if or how students' classroom satisfaction links to these variables. In the long-term, this may enhance our understanding regarding student retention and/or connection to learning styles.

Overall, an understanding of factors associated with student retention may be clearer if students' choices are reviewed; it may also be that student communication style and self-image impact the environments students choose (for example, online

versus on campus), the satisfaction students find upon course completion, and much more. For example, the correspondence of communication style and self-esteem may impact students' ambitions. This study will explore the relationship between communicator style, self esteem, and success in the public speaking classroom.

LITERATURE REVIEW AND DEVELOPMENT OF RESEARCH QUESTIONS

Scholars have explored many questions related to communicator styles and communicator image, including research that explores not only identification of terms for this study but also real-world applications of similar study. For example, researchers have used different definitions of communicator style and have broken study of self-image into distinct components. Additional literature in each area provides results of how individuals' styles or self-images may or may not correlate with other aspects of their lives. For the material studied herein, two bodies of literature are relevant: communicator style and self- image. What follows below is an overview for each that defines the concept, establishes reliable measures of the construct, and relates it to student success.

Communicator Style Literature

Communicator style literature covers several communicator style analyses. Communicator style uses labeling to identify patterns of behavior and characteristics associated with the ways individuals share expression in the process of interaction. It may reflect a communicator's self-perception or an observer's perception.

As discussed here, communication style is studied with a tool developed by Robert Norton (1978). While many views of communication style were considered in the context of this study, his Communicator Style Measure (CSM) was chosen because of his specific consideration of communication style as

“the way one verbally, nonverbally, and paraverbally interacts to signal how literal meaning should be taken, interpreted, filtered, or understood” (Norton, 1978, 99).

Norton's Communicator Style Measure (1978) is a standout in its simple application. Norton's CSM categorizes communicator style results into multiple independent variables (impression-leaving, contentious, open, dramatic, dominant, precise, relaxed, friendly, animated, and attentive), and one dependent variable (communicator image). The tool asks participants to identify their own communication style characteristics using a five-option Likert-type scale. Originally based on material from a collaboration started in 1972, Norton refined the tool over several years (Norton, 1978).

Styles indicated reflect a range of ways in which students may categorize their personal perception of communication effectiveness. Norton's styles essentially reflect the following characteristics (Norton, 1978):

1. Impression-leaving: the communicator is remembered primarily for what is said and how it is said
2. Contentious: the communicator is prone to arguments and finds it difficult to walk away from an argument
3. Open: the communicator is prone to reveal emotions and information about self without reservations
4. Dramatic: the communicator manipulates stylistic devices (ranging from voice to stories, for example) to highlight or understate content of communication
5. Dominant: the communicator talks frequently, comes on strong, and often takes charge
6. Precise: the communicator strives to avoid ambiguity and ensure clarity of communication
7. Relaxed: the communicator is calm and collected, not inclined to be show nervousness under pressure
8. Friendly: the communicator is tactful, encouraging of others, and inclined to display admiration
9. Animated: the communicator frequently uses gestures, facial expressions, and eye contact in communication
10. Attentive: the communicator shows he or she likes listening to other(s) and provides indicators to speaker(s) that this person is paying attention

11. Communicator image: the communicator with a positive sense of his or her communication abilities; comfortable when speaking to groups or members of the opposite sex

Study, tools, and theories associated with communicator style have been broadly embraced and used. Ratings of communication styles (Bryant, 2002), identification of communication styles with the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator (Opt & Loffredo, 2003), and an overview of communication styles and culture (Gire, 2006) are but a few lenses through which communication styles have been analyzed. The ways that communication style affects social performance (Brandt, 1979) and even apprehension of others (Hansford, 1988) have also been studied. Sometimes this reflects self-rating; other times, studies involve more objective communicator style assessment by people who observe subjects' styles of communication.

Communication researchers have explored the impact of communicator style on interaction in a wide array of contexts. Schrader et al. (2001), for instance, established results with the CSM in the context of health care providers. The CSM's broad usages span even to sales; in Parrish-Sprowl et al. (1994), it was used to identify communicator style as a factor in sales success.

Another body of literature within communicator style research has explored the relationship between other constructs and communicator style. For example, deVries (2005) invaluable shares understanding of a broad concept of communicator style definitions, as well as an understanding of researchers' approaches when studying students. Likewise, study linking communicator style and other traits has set a precedent for communication researchers interpreting the implications of communicator style in relation to other key factors. For example, Snavelly and McNeill

(2008) looked at communicator style and social style to test their relationship in a comprehensive study of 852 individuals; they found that a factorial analysis of these could offer prediction of self-esteem. Duran and Zakahi (1987) studied the potential link between communicator style and communicator satisfaction in hopes of identifying whether certain communication skills have a positive impact on students; they found that student communication performance corresponded with social confirmation and attentiveness and that students' self-understanding of communication performance was less clear in predicting student communication satisfaction than objective analysis of the performance and satisfaction by others. In a paper presented for the Speech Communication Association, Norton himself – originator of the CSM – tied communicator style to college students' attractiveness and effectiveness (1979); here, effectiveness at tasks was directly related to CSM dominance variables, and attractiveness was indirectly related to it. Overall, the CSM is a recognizable tool able to capture individuals' communicator style perceptions for a variety of purposes and offers researchers an easy means of studying this trait.

For a broader understanding of the roots of communicator style as an important trait, researchers explored it in many settings and as it related purely to the individual. Noteworthy was the Horvath (1995) study that looked at biological origins of communicator style. Horvath focused on both identical and fraternal twins and found there were predictable relationships between temperament and communicator style, and identical twins were most likely to share the same communicator style. This set the tone for understanding that communicator style and other traits may correspond reliably.

Some literature does touch on the impact of communicator style on education, the context most relevant to this particular study. For example, Brandenburg (1985) studied the relationship of communicator style to effectiveness in collegiate business education, finding that instructors whose communication style was predominantly “friendly/animated” corresponded to a relevant level of student attainment of their instructional objectives (McCannon & Stitt-Gohdes, 1995). Edwards (2007) helped us understand computer-mediated communication’s role in student perception of both instructors and course content, indicating students report greater affective learning and state motivation if shared information is positive. Additionally, Comadena et al. (1990) established that communicator styles influence classroom learning and that adult learners are even more likely than traditional undergraduates to be impacted by instructor communication style.

Some research has looked specifically at communication behaviors of students in the public speaking classroom. Gaythwaite (2006) looked at fifty-seven students in these different types of public speaking courses in order to identify potential relationships between course retention (assessed as completion), course success (assessed by course grade), self-efficacy, self-regulation, and critical thinking. Her results indicated a personal characteristic – self-efficacy – did positively correspond with course grade, though no variable corresponded with course completion. This opens researchers to further dialogue and study concerning other individual characteristics which may influence success and retention.

Self-Image Literature

As a point of study, self-image has been interpreted in several ways. Self-esteem is often a key focus for such study; many researchers assess self-esteem as the stem from which self-image grows. The exploration of self-esteem and the related self-image has been explored with different perspectives concerning the roots of self-esteem.

Assessment of communicator image calls upon researchers to understand the root of perceptions for communicator image, primarily as reflected in self-esteem. Two notably opposing views have attempted to discern this: the Self-Esteem Contingency Theory of Crocker and Wolfe (2001) and the Sociometer Theory of Leary and Baumeister (2000). Self-Esteem Contingency Theory promoted the idea that people derive their overall self-esteem from different domains. The Sociometer Theory surmised peoples' self-esteem "is a barometer of one's past, present, and future perceived relational value" (Anthony et al., 2007), responsive to shifts and tied specifically to the ways we're perceived in social roles. Whether self-esteem is derived one way or the other, self-esteem is the foundation from which communicator image grows.

Assessing communicator image has occasionally been controversial and is typically an arena sparking questions. Researchers have been divided in their areas of research and even in their interpretations of what is significant. Some focus on the image of the communicator as it relates to disorders regarding communicator image, whereas others assess communicator image with an eye toward self-perception internally. The Derriford Appearance Scale (DAS-59) (Carr et al., 2000) focuses on problems faced by those acknowledging problems in personal appearance. Thompson (2004) used an

update of Cash and Labarge's 1996 Appearance Schemas Inventory (ASI, updated as the ASI-R) tool and others to identify ways in which body image assessments could improve. Amidst a research emphasis on body fixations, Cash developed multiple tools to assess communicator image. These reflect varying degrees of image-related issues and body conditions.

With the importance of self-esteem established and re-established over time in such works as "Personality Correlates of Self-Esteem" (Robins et al., 2001), tools have been developed to help researchers assess self-esteem. The 23-item JFS takes a multidimensional approach (Janis & Field, 1959). A popular one – the 10-item Rosenberg Self-Esteem Scale (Rosenberg, updated 1979) – focuses on a global perspective. More recently, the 20-item State Self-Esteem Scale (SSES) (Heatherton & Polivy, 1991) pulled and modified concepts from several common tools. Its goal was to represent multiple factors of self-image (social, appearance, and performance). This mirrors the CSM in that it has since been adapted for use in a variety of studies and settings. As a tool which reflects multiple aspects of self-image, the SSES was chosen for this study. Its multiple factors indicate understanding of self-image as associated with more than an individual's sense of physicality.

Research related to self-image ranges from studies on self-esteem throughout the lifespan (Trzeniewski et al., 2003, using the aforementioned SSES) to self-esteem's part in group identification (Major et al., 2003) to self-esteem's role in such things as self-threats (Heatherton & Vohs, 2000) and bulimia (Vohs et al., 2001). Self-image study has been evaluated with emphasis on different aspects of the individual, which has led to the use of tools capturing an array of self-portraiture and its effects on life.

Self-image literature broadly continues to explore such diverse topics as health state preferences (Mathias et al., 1997, using the Fleming tool), social acceptance (Anthony et al., 2007, using Sociometer theory), personality (Robins et al., 2001), and personal goals (Heimpel, 2006). One application by Major et al. (2003) addressed the relationship between self-esteem and group identification and situational identity. Their research indicates that people who see themselves as part of a group and feel responded to as part of a group (versus perceiving response as more personal) are inclined to identify themselves with a self-image different from those who see themselves as being individually judged.

As with communicator style research, considerable self-esteem literature has focused on the educational context. There are a few ways in which researchers have sought to understand the relationship between communicator style and communicator image as it relates to students and their choices. Edwards et al. (2007) studied whether or not computer-mediated communication concerning instructors influenced student reaction to instructors and classes. They found a distinct correlation when testing whether or not students receiving positive information would report more positive perceptions of an instructor and learning. This is a meaningful glimpse at the significance of perceptions influencing interaction in education. Another important study touching on educational venue and factors impacting classroom discourse was Lee's (2000) paper for the AECT 2000 International Convention. Lee's study discusses how distance learning is now desirable and how factors which affect its effectiveness can be scrutinized. The dimensions of Lee's study are not only outlined to include such factors as instructor and self-image and self-confidence of students but also to

help us understand this in relation to a mixed learning format – a graduate course involving both face-to-face and online idea exchange. A crucial conclusion is that positive self-confidence facilitates learners’ active participation. In essence, this establishes that image-related perceptions impact education.

While research supports the claim that elements of self are related to academic success, the concept of self in the holistic sense appears to have been overlooked or taken for granted in recent studies. In other words, research examines components of issues which may be helpful, but it does not fully examine the nature of students’ self-image and communication tendencies in regard to their influence of choice of where and how a student will connect with others for educational purposes.

Research in other contexts has provided a positive framework for learning about implications of self-image, communication style, and venue preference. Areas studied reflect a range of perceptions about the application of studying each facet of individuals’ lives. Through depth and analysis of study into these perceptions and interpretations, communication scholars excel in identifying significant information helpful to human interaction. Researchers have done an excellent job of establishing separate bits of knowledge particular to each issue without yet fully identifying connections and meanings of the connections. Overall, the span of information is broad but not deep.

The findings of existing research and the quality of assessment tools now make it possible to connect more dots in order to explore our understanding of the factors which contribute to student satisfaction in the classroom and its contribution to student retention. A correlation between social and academic integration and student retention

has been made (Office of Institutional Research, 2002), opening the door to further inquiry into the influence on retention of factors pertinent to an individual's interaction style and perception of self. The public speaking classroom is a logical site for this research because it is a common ground for students. Though much research has been done with these tools in other areas, this piece provides a new, compelling context for understanding the student factors that may influence classroom satisfaction in a venue common to first-year students.

Specifically, this study seeks to answer the following research questions.

1. What is the relationship between communicator style and student experiences in the public speaking classroom?
2. What is the relationship between self-image and student experiences in the public speaking classroom?

RESEARCH METHODS

This study relied on data collected in Spring 2009 at a large, urban Midwestern university with roughly 30,000 students. The data reflects administration of three different questionnaires to a sampling of public speaking students.

Subjects

Sixty students in five separate introductory public speaking courses taught by two different instructors participated in the study. These volunteers completed the surveys anonymously following their final exams. Students were instructed not to provide their names, and the surveys were given anonymous codes for analysis. The introductory public speaking course at this university is primarily geared toward an audience of first-year students; however, it should be noted that the course enrollment represents a broad array of students, as the course is available to upperclassmen, traditional students, and nontraditional students. The students in this sample were part of roughly fifty sections of the course taught that semester. The participants received no incentives for their participation.

Data Collection

Instruments

Three tools were necessary to carry out this research. The first was the Communicator Style Measure (CSM) (Norton, 1978). The second survey was the State Self-Assessment Scale (SSES) (Heatherton & Polivy, 1991), and the third was a brief tool developed for this study with questions about student satisfaction and interaction

in the course, the Interaction & Satisfaction Survey (I&S). The survey instruments are included in Appendices A-C.

The Communicator Style Measure has been used in multiple settings. In initial development of it, Norton identified three types of relationships necessary for reliably indicating communicator styles: clustering, dimensionality, and predictors of communicator image. The “clustering” places communicator styles into two groups: dominant, dramatic, animated, contentious and impression leaving group together, and attentive, friendly, and relaxed group together. “Dimensionality” focuses on the premise that we can expect at least one underlying dimension in the structure that will point to this hypothesis:

“if a person communicates in a style that is dramatic, dominant, animated, contentious, and impression leaving, then that person tends not to communicate in a style that is attentive, friendly, and relaxed.” (Norton, 1978, 101)

“Predictors of communicator image” focuses on the premise that the dominant communicator asserts the biggest toolkit with which to “interactively control conversations.” (Norton, 1978, 102)

Norton then described initial studies which enlisted introductory communication classes as subjects. These subjects were given the Communicator Style Measure-102 items (CSM-102), which have a seven-point Likert-type scale ranging from “very strong agreement” to “very strong disagreement.” The second study replicated the first, with the exception that two changes were made to the original CSM: five items were used instead of ten, and a four-point scale was used instead of a seven-point scale.

Even though these changes had occurred in the questionnaire format, the findings from the earlier study confirmed that

“there is a correspondence between a definitional system for a universe of observations and an aspect of the empirical structure of those observations, together with a rational [sic] for such a relationship.”
(Norton, 1978, 110)

For this study, we used a condensed, 52-question version using a five-point scale.

Overall, Norton’s measure proved to be a reliable measure to analyze communicator style.

The State Self-Esteem Scale is a newer instrument using only twenty items with a five-point Likert-type scale in which responses range from “not at all” to “extremely.” Designed using modified questions from the 1959 Janis-Field Feelings of Inadequacy Scale with influences from other tools, it was initially used in five studies in order to address its validity. The questionnaire shows sensitivity to three areas of self-esteem self-reporting: performance, appearance, and social. These studies helped ascertain the instrument distinguishes state self-esteem from mood. It depicts esteem profiles in various ages of undergraduates (ranging from 17-57). Throughout these studies, construct validity was a focus. The results were that the SSES

“is psychometrically sound and that it displays considerable concurrent and discriminant validity in the laboratory, in the classroom, and in clinical settings.” (Heatherton & Pollivy, 1991)

The final instrument used was developed specifically for the study, a 23-item questionnaire called Interaction & Satisfaction. It uses a five-point Likert-type scale with most responses to range from “strongly disagree” to “strongly agree.” The study was designed to concentrate on four key areas common to academia: class discussion,

public speaking, connecting outside class (with the instructor), and fitting in (socially and academically). Within each of the four, the instrument requested self-reporting of both comfort and behavior. When analyzing responses, factor analysis was used to identify clear patterns related to these. In addition, the instrument featured items asking about classroom satisfaction and anticipated course grade.

Procedures

Students were approached with the option to voluntarily fill out the study after they had completed the course's final exam. The three tools were stapled together in a packet for them. Once volunteers completed the instruments, they were directed to a designated collection box for the anonymous submission of their packets. No records were kept regarding which packets came from which classes.

Data Analysis Strategy

As noted in this study, research focused on identifying possible relationships between student satisfaction, interaction in the course and communicator style and self-esteem. Throughout the study, the outcome variable is satisfaction as measured on the Interaction & Satisfaction survey. Interaction in class, communication style, and self-esteem were treated as the independent variables.

The CSM and SSES questionnaires were coded according to the instructions accompanying each instrument. The interaction items on the I&S questionnaire were factor analyzed to identify meaningful clusters related to students' interaction in the public speaking classroom.

Descriptives (means and standard deviations) were computed for communicator styles, self-esteem styles, the interaction clusters included in the I&S survey, and each

of the interaction and satisfaction items. Then, Pearson correlations were used to identify significant relationships for that same array of items. After that, t-tests examined the means for further relationships. Finally, regression analyses were done to analyze effects.

RESULTS

The analysis completed for this study involved looking for possible relationships among classroom interaction, communicator styles, self-image, and satisfaction with the class. Mean satisfaction reported across all sections was 4.00 with a standard deviation of .84. Tables 1, 2, and 3 provide descriptive summaries for each of these.

The first step was to factor analyze the interaction variables on the Interaction & Satisfaction survey. A Principal Component Analysis with a Varimax rotation of the 20 interaction questions from the Interaction & Satisfaction survey was conducted. The rotation converged in seven iterations, and the results of the solution are shown in Table 4. The identified factors were used as independent variables for subsequent analyses.

Seven items loaded onto Component 1. These items are all related to: the comfort and behavior associated with student engagement in conversation. These items include questions such as “I initiate discussion with my peers.” This factor was labeled “Discussion.”

Six items loaded onto Component 2. These items are all related to: the comfort and behavior associated with student aptitude and application of public speaking skills and goals. These items include questions such as “I believe I have improved my public speaking skills while taking this class.” This factor was labeled “Public Speaking.”

Four items loaded on Component 3. These items are all related to: the comfort and behavior associated with student engagement with peers and with the

instructor outside the classroom. These items include questions such as “I am comfortable asking follow-up questions outside of class.” This factor was labeled “Outside Class.”

Three items loaded on Component 4. These items are all related to: the comfort and behavior associated with fitting in socially and academically with those in this particular course. These items include questions such as “I am comfortable being the center of attention in a class.” This factor was labeled “fitting in.”

The next step was to identify the means and standard deviations of all items. An analysis of these descriptive results reveals some noteworthy findings. Within the sample, per the mean score for each communicator style (see Table 1), the dominant communicator styles were Friendly, Attentive, and Impression-Leaving. By contrast, Relaxed and Open communicators styles were represented least. Because of the systemic nature of communication, we know that the interaction of any individual affects and is affected by the interaction of others in the group. Thus, knowing the composite make-up of the group is of value. To measure this, communication style was assessed in a second way, as the number of students in the sample for whom each style was the preferred or highest ranking style. Interestingly, one gets a slightly different sense of the communication styles represented in the sample using this alternative measure. By this measure, the most-represented styles in this sample were Friendly and Contentious-Argumentative, followed by an equal representation of Impression-Leaving, Attentive, and Precise. These results indicate that Friendly, Attentive, and Impression-Leaving styles are the most prevalent in this sample since they are at top of

the list using both measures. However, the prevalence of the lower-ranked Argumentative-Contentious style in this sample should not be overlooked.

Table 2 provides a summary of the results related to self-esteem, providing a profile of the sample on this variable. The dominant self-esteem style indicated was related to Performance and the lowest was related to Appearance. These results may indicate that an academic setting draws on individuals' desire to perform well and that the communication skills associated with being outgoing and desirous of fitting in are perceived as effective or desirable here, whereas academia may be perceived to de-emphasize a relaxed form of communication, open communication, and any emphasis on appearance.

There are also noteworthy findings in a review of responses concerning student interaction and satisfaction in the public speaking classroom (see Table 3). Overall, students report considerable comfort interacting in the classroom, including comfort interacting with the instructor ($\bar{x} = 4.4$), comfort interacting with classmates ($\bar{x} = 4.2$), comfort asking questions outside of class ($\bar{x} = 4.2$), comfort participating in class discussion ($\bar{x} = 4.1$), and comfort participating in discussion outside of class ($\bar{x} = 4.1$). The responses associated with comfort with the various tasks typically merited higher responses than did responses concerning task completion associated with the behaviors. In other words, students report relatively high levels of comfort with a variety of interaction behaviors, but they do not necessarily perform those behaviors. This is noteworthy because it suggests that a student's failure to act in a particular way is not linked to discomfort associated with the action.

Pearson correlations were used to provide a preliminary indication of the relationships between communicator styles, self-esteem styles, and the factors used to understand interaction and satisfaction. Of particular interest for this study are the correlations between classroom satisfaction and the other variables. Several communicator styles correlate positively and significantly with classroom satisfaction, including Friendly ($r = .557$), Attentive ($r = .514$), Animated ($r = .433$), Dramatic ($r = .349$), Open ($r = .323$), Dominant ($r = .457$), and Communicator Image ($r = .299$). In addition, one self-esteem dimension, Appearance, is positively and significantly associated with classroom satisfaction ($r = .366$). Interestingly, the only classroom interaction variable that correlated positively with classroom satisfaction was public speaking behavior ($r = .457$).

Another interesting set of findings relates to the variables that are statistically correlated with comfort in the classroom. For example, our results indicate a significant and positive correlation between comfort with public speaking and the Impression-Leaving ($r = .415$), Relaxed ($r = .448$) and Dramatic ($r = .296$) communicator styles; whereas, the Friendly ($r = .309$), Impression-Leaving ($r = .378$), Relaxed ($r = .452$), Animated ($r = .359$), Open ($r = .463$), Dramatic ($r = .353$), Dominant ($r = .474$), and Communicator Image ($r = .355$) styles correlated positively and significantly with the comfort associated with the fitting in comfort variable. These findings are important because one would expect persistence in college to link with how comfortable students feel in their classrooms.

T-tests were used to determine if there were statistically significant differences in the mean scores on the comfort and behavior variables between students highly

satisfied with the class and those who were not. Results were significant for the following variables: public speaking behavior ($t(50) = 2.151, p < .036$), public speaking comfort ($t(51) = 2.27, p < .028$), and fitting in behaviors ($t(51) = 2.51, p < .015$). As one might expect, in each case, the mean for highly satisfied students was higher than for not highly satisfied students (for public speaking behavior, $\bar{x} = 4.44$ for highly satisfied students and 3.93 for not highly satisfied students; for public speaking comfort, $\bar{x} = 4.41$ and 3.86; for fitting in behavior, $\bar{x} = 3.67$ and 2.88).

Research Question 1: What is the relationship between communicator style and student experiences in the public speaking classroom?

The first research question this study sought to answer was what relationship might exist between communicator style and student experience in the public speaking classroom. Certain communicator styles consistently appear to have a relationship with satisfaction in the public speaking classroom.

As noted above, Pearson correlation results provide preliminary evidence that communicator style does, indeed, impact the student's experience in public speaking classes. Specifically, through correlations, it was observed that comfort with public speaking is not necessarily correlated with classroom satisfaction, but it is strongly correlated with other class behaviors. Also, no communicator style helps understand habits related to connecting outside of class. While multiple styles correlate with comfort and behavior, noteworthy is that the Impression-Leaving communicator style is significantly correlated with more comfort and behavior variables than any other communicator style; in fact, the only two I&S variables with which it is not significantly correlated are comfort with in class discussions and comfort connecting

outside of class. The Impression-Leaving style, of course, is characterized as one remembered primarily for what is said and how it is said.

Several communicator styles correlate with classroom satisfaction: Friendly ($r = .557$), Attentive ($r = .514$), Animated ($r = .433$), Dramatic ($r = .349$), Open ($r = .323$), Dominant ($r = .457$), and Communicator Image ($r = .299$). One self-esteem style, Appearance ($r = .366$), showed a significant correlation with satisfaction. The communicator styles which do not correlate with classroom satisfaction are as follow: Precise ($p < .236$), Impression-Leaving ($p < .106$), Relaxed ($p < .105$), and Argumentative-Contentious ($p < .788$). The esteem styles which did not show a correlation are Performance ($p < .111$) and Social ($p < .269$).

In an effort to further understand the relationship between communicator style and classroom satisfaction, t-tests were conducted to determine if there was a significant difference in the mean scores on communicator style between students who were highly satisfied and students who were not. Results reveal statistically significant differences for 8 of 11 communicator styles: Animated, Attentive, Communicator Image, Dominant, Dramatic, Friendly, Impression-Leaving, and Relaxed. The Animated style score was $t(50) = 3.222$, $p < .002$, with a mean of 3.96 for the highly satisfied and 3.42 for lesser satisfied students. The Attentive style score was $t(50) = 3.481$, $p < .001$, with a mean of 4.18 for the highly satisfied and 3.53 for lesser satisfied students. The Communicator Image style score was $t(50) = 2.644$, $p < .011$, with a mean of 4.01 for the highly satisfied and 3.44 for lesser satisfied students. The Dominant style score was $t(50) = 3.179$, $p < .003$, with a mean of 3.70 for the highly satisfied and 2.97 for lesser satisfied students. The Dramatic style score was $t(50) = 2.077$, $p < .043$,

with a mean of 3.74 for the highly satisfied and 3.27 for lesser satisfied students. The Friendly style score was $t(50) = 3.734$, $p < .000$, with a mean of 4.26 for the highly satisfied and 3.55 for lesser satisfied students. The Impression-Leaving style score was $t(50) = 2.024$, $p < .048$, with a mean of 3.98 for the highly satisfied and 3.57 for lesser satisfied students. The Relaxed style score was $t(50) = 2.136$, $p < .038$, with a mean of 2.88 for the highly satisfied and 2.50 for lesser satisfied students.

While the Pearson correlations and t-tests provide a strong indication of the relationships between communicator style and satisfaction in the classroom, regression analyses were completed to explore this more completely (see Table 5). The regression analyses indicated clear significance of styles associated with the classroom experience. Examination of communication styles and student satisfaction demonstrated more relationships. Two communicator styles showed relevant positive relationships: the Dominant style, with a significance of .006 (t-score of 2.89); and the Friendly style, with a significance of .025 (t-score of 2.31). By contrast here, one style showed a statistically significant negative relationship with student satisfaction: Impression-Leaving (significance of .008, t-score of -2.789). Table 5 shows the complete results of this regression of coefficients. This analysis explored relationships with the CSM's ten independent variables and omitted potential relationships with the dependent variable of communicator image, which is more completely captured with the SSES.

Research Question 2: What is the relationship between self-image and student experiences in the public speaking classroom?

The second research question this study sought to answer was what relationship might exist between self-esteem style and student experience in the public speaking classroom. Results captured the relationship of performance and appearance styles with the classroom experience in different ways, while the social self-esteem style didn't seem to have a significant relationship with the classroom experience.

Correlations indicated that the performance aspects of self-esteem have a positive relationship with comfort and behavior in classroom discussion, as well as behaviors related to classroom fitting in with others. Pearson's r for comfort in classroom discussion is .262, while it is .328 for behavior in classroom discussion. The Pearson r for a correlation between fitting in and performance is .398, with the lowest p value for esteem associated with interaction and satisfaction ($p < .002$). This indicates that students positively associate their satisfaction fitting in with others, comfort talking in class, and behaviors talking in class with their performance.

T-test results indicated significant difference on the appearance dimension of self-image between students who were highly satisfied with the class and those who were not. The result is $t(50) = 2.61$, $p < .012$, with a mean of more satisfied people as 4.02 versus 3.38 for lesser satisfied students.

While the Pearson correlations and t-tests provide a strong indication of the relationships between self-esteem style and satisfaction in the classroom, regression analyses were completed to explore this more completely (see Table 6). The regression analyses showed the statistical significance of self-esteem/communicator image in

correlation with student satisfaction as singularly related to performance. The significance is .021 with a t-score of 2.31. Of note by contrast is that social self-esteem factors show an insignificant relationship in a negative way: .082 significance, with a t-score of negative -2.78.

DISCUSSION

This study focused on several overall goals. An important one was to understand factors related to classroom satisfaction because of its potential to influence retention and issues related to retention. Another was to examine how communicator style and self-esteem style may influence student experiences in the classroom and therefore lead to decisions and habits regarding persistence of students in the classroom. The public speaking classroom provided a setting in which these goals could be addressed with a diverse array of students exposed to similar conditions.

To achieve those research goals, this study sought to address two research questions. These questions explored an understanding of the following two things: (1) what relationship communicator style might have with student experiences in the public speaking classroom; and (2) what relationship self-esteem style might have with student experiences in the public speaking classroom. In essence, the study results suggest that there is a relationship between student satisfaction in courses and one aspect of student self-esteem and that there are relationships between student satisfaction and some communicator styles. The SSES aspect which correlates positively with classroom satisfaction is performance. There are two CMS styles which demonstrate positive correspondence with course satisfaction: Dominant and Friendly styles. An additional CMS style, Impression-Leaving, corresponds negatively with course satisfaction.

The aforementioned results help us understand that while communicator style and communicator image/self-esteem do not interact in their relationship with student

satisfaction, certain communicator styles and image factors can certainly influence classroom satisfaction, which sets the stage for our understanding of what may incline students to return to classrooms in future.

Ostensibly, the results of this study indicate that individuals with high Performance self-esteem seem to report greater satisfaction with their public speaking classroom experience. While the significance of Dominant and Friendly communicator styles as they connect with classroom satisfaction is indicative of a desire for greater social connectivity, perhaps more important is the significance of the negative correlation between classroom satisfaction and the Impression-Leaving communicator style. Interestingly, the Impression-Leaving style is closely related to most ways in which students are comfortable and behave in the classroom; an exception is with comfort in classroom discussion. Therefore, Impression-Leaving communicators, who typically strive for opportunities to make a singular mark, may not find their place to do it within the framework of classroom discussion. The classroom is instead more satisfying to those who seek connections with others, whether as leaders (Dominant style) or acquaintances (Friendly style). Regarding communicator self-image, this study demonstrates that classroom satisfaction is positively associated with the factor perhaps most educators would like: performance. Self-esteem style seems to influence behavior more than comfort, and the exception that performance is most important exists for classroom satisfaction, where appearance esteem matters. In essence, this leads to a situation in which students are more satisfied when they enter a classroom looking for ways to do well and to connect fully, versus scenarios in which they prefer to manipulate content. Also, the strong correlations between satisfaction, public speaking

(both comfort and behavior), and fitting in behavior seem to reflect priorities developed for public speaking classes in particular.

This loose but dramatic profile merits discussion and elaboration as it corresponds to classroom success for students and instructors. For example, researchers may contemplate what is implied by the unique relationships of elements in this study. In addition, future researchers may want to consider how the results reflected the variables of the study. Overall, the results were significant and understanding even the elements can help educators and researchers perceive a dynamic for improving a student-friendly climate.

The fact that performance self-esteem has a significant relationship with student satisfaction, while appearance and social self-esteem do not, points to students' associating a positive classroom experience with their own sense of well-being in that setting. The thrust of SSES questions is on the current state of esteem. SSES performance-related questions also focus on student feelings, whether of frustration or satisfaction. This may sociologically mimic the mirroring attitudes long accepted as a typical way individuals radiate attitudes from a dominant positive or negative, as with the once-popular book *I'm OK, You're OK* (identifying transactional analysis for the masses) (Harris, 1973). Transactional analysis indicates people interact with motivations born of roles they play (as parent, child, or adult), reflexively communicating responses as a result of initiated dialogue. Transactional analyses share a pragmatic explanation for individuals' desire to assess and relate. In this manner, performance self-esteem may reflect internal desire to respond to a situation in a like manner; if they perceive self as feeling satisfied, they extend perception and

assessment of the classroom as satisfactory by extension. If a person performs well, then it may be second nature to express positive feelings and satisfaction concerning the setting.

Correspondences with communication styles are a bit more complicated, and it's important to remember how Norton defined particular styles he labeled (Norton, 1978). The Impression-Leaving style is inclined to focus on creating memorable communication through both word choice and means of content delivery. The Friendly style is inclined to stroking others and may vary in intensity of friendliness, from amiability to intimacy, depending on context. The Dominant style is prone to taking charge of interaction at all levels (psychological, physical, nonverbal, etc.). Hence, satisfaction in the classroom is associated with those reaching out in interaction rather than manipulating content.

Considering that classroom satisfaction is positively related to perception of performance rather than social connection, the next step to understanding possible implications of this study is to recognize how and/or why the aforementioned communicator styles may also have distinct relationships with course satisfaction. Reflecting on the communicator styles which show relationships with classroom satisfaction, it appears each is strongly tied to interaction; Impression-Leaving styles want to interact to control image, while Friendly is consumed with a need for positive interaction and Dominant is focused on controlling interaction. Therefore, a best case scenario in education may be when a course does emphasize ways for students to connect positively through their performance, through activity and interaction.

This study offers an encouraging foundation for future research, particularly with regard to ways educators can maximize satisfaction for a broader array of communicator styles. The public speaking classroom is an excellent setting for understanding classroom satisfaction for a broad array of students, yet the fears associated with public speaking may influence which students are inclined to have more positive experiences. Keeping this in mind, the public speaking classroom could be revisited for study of student satisfaction when instructors initiate new activities to stroke the needs of additional communicator styles. For example, instructors might work to integrate activities which might target satisfaction for communicator styles which did not significantly correlate with classroom satisfaction, like Relaxed and Impression-Leaving styles. Specifically, instructors might conduct untimed, ungraded activities which allow students to shine, ostensibly providing relaxed environs in which particular students can stand out in the manner they desire. Similarly, other types of classroom settings may be ideal for identifying in which settings other communicator styles are better satisfied. For example, it may be that Argumentative-Contentious communicator styles find classrooms allowing debate to be more satisfying; this might be worthy of examination in political science or philosophy classrooms. There are many possibilities for expanding upon the learnings from this study.

Retention concerns are multifaceted, and understanding student comfort in the classroom is one crucial way to ensure that social integration and academic integration are addressed. When educators create learning communities to bridge the gap, they assist with this comfort and integration. Now knowing that there is a significant relationship between classroom satisfaction, a desire to perform, and a desire to

connect, they can be even more certain of particular goals these communities should foster to maximize benefits. Similarly, in a classroom, educators can better understand what benefits (for example, positive results from positive performance) to play up and what environmental factors (for example, social connections) to enhance in order to aid student comfort and – long-term – retention results.

Limitations of the Study

In the course of completing this study, it became apparent that pros and cons of the design might provoke thought more than conclusion for future researchers. Two basic reasons for this are rooted in the scope of the study and the analysis baseline. The scope of the study, enlisting students at an urban, primarily commuter campus and of a small sample size, may leave room to investigate results with alternative participants. Likewise, the baseline used in the study, a common denominator of a public speaking class, which typically exacerbates student apprehension, could lack the neutrality that may be valuable to additional study. That baseline is also important to consider because the course focuses on performance-related issues and may unnaturally emphasize student performance esteem. While these findings may not relate to other classroom settings, they offer considerable value for designing pedagogy in public speaking classrooms.

Questions for Future Study

Though a broad body of researchers have highlighted various ways in which communicator style and communicator image are important, communication research has a lot of opportunity to explore both the relationship of these and the possible implications of their relationship. Prior works offer essential lessons regarding the

significance of these traits and the means to study them. Communication researchers have noticeably tapped related topics and completed research which proactively signals that understanding such trait relationships provides a meaningful framework for understanding variables in the relationships, including not only those in the general populace but especially those with professional relationships, like healthcare providers with patients and students with instructors. The adaptation of these studies has illustrated the vast ways in which it may be helpful to see the particular relationship of these for students in varying educational venues and conditions. Overall, the practical outcomes of the study are that it may help instructors design teaching strategies which will better appeal to an array of communicator styles and may encourage instructors to test new ways to promote classroom satisfaction.

Concluding Remarks

This IUPUI-based study offered a small sample but clear results: students with high Performance self-esteem tend to have a more satisfying classroom experience, which is likely to lead them toward longer-term achievements in academia peer. This is also the case for those who have Dominant or Friendly communicator styles. This may allow educators to create classrooms which foster these communicator styles, which will in turn foster retention. Likewise, it may help educators address students without those styles, encouraging them to provide those students with extra attention in order to have satisfying experiences and the desire to stay in school.

This study elicited clear trends with the use of established tools and a clear baseline survey, but as indicated earlier the study's limitations suggest room for further exploration. The tools used to understand student traits – Norton's CSM and

Heatherton & Polivy's SSES – are each succinct assessments of multiple dimensions of respective traits. Keeping in mind the distinct relationships this study illuminated, it seems feasible there may not simply be value in revisiting this material with other populations but also in seeing if relationships exist with other student traits. For example, while a causal relationship may not be evident with elements identified in this study, it may be valuable to investigate traits which may or may not relate to these. In the meantime, it is worthwhile for educators to take from this study the need for enhancing student opportunity to focus on performance esteem-validation assignments as a tool for enhancing student connection to a course and therefore enriching the student experience in a way which minimizes concerns for how the student feels he or she should convey his or her image.

TABLE 1:
COMMUNICATOR STYLES

Style	Mean	Std. Deviation	N*
Friendly	3.863	.739	13
Impression-Leaving	3.742	.704	6
Relaxed	2.675	.636	--
Contentious-Argumentative	3.421	1.093	10
Attentive	3.751	.771	6
Precise	3.661	.768	6
Animated-Expressive	3.613	.702	4
Dramatic	3.386	.910	4
Open	2.896	.876	--
Dominant	3.277	.876	1
Communicator Image	3.667	.781	4

* N = the number of subjects for whom this communicator style was the preferred or highest rank style.

TABLE 2:
SELF-ESTEEM STYLES

Style	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
Performance	3.717	.699	27
Social	3.501	.920	13
Appearance	3.663	.885	21

TABLE 3:

INTERACTION IN AND SATISFACTION WITH PUBLIC SPEAKING CLASS

Question or Cluster Name	Mean	Std. Deviation
A1 participate in discussion	3.915	1.087
A2 comfort participating in class discussion	4.068	1.158
B1 participate in discussion outside class	3.750	1.144
B2 comfort participating in discussion outside class	4.067	1.148
C1 initiate discussion with peers	3.750	1.129
C2 comfort initiating discussion with peers	3.983	1.112
D1 interact with instructor	3.933	1.148
D2 comfort interacting with instructor	4.367	1.008
E1 ask questions outside class	3.517	1.255
E2 comfort asking questions outside class	4.167	.977
F1 choose courses based on perceived ability to fit in	2.333	1.398
F2 choose courses based on requirements and objectives	3.833	1.107
G1 value objectives of pub spkg course	3.950	.999
G2 comfort with objectives of pub spkg course	4.083	.889
H1 sometimes center of attention in class	3.200	1.132
H2 comfort with being center of attention in class	3.633	1.235
I comfort explaining and demonstrating things to peers	3.983	1.097
J comfort seeing and interacting with classmates frequently	4.200	.917
K belief that public spkg skills have improved during class	4.271	.980
L belief that confidence in pub spkg abil has improved during class	4.333	.951
M satisfaction with class (5=high, 1=low)	4.113	.954
N anticipated grade (A=5, F=1)	4.259	.762
O satisfaction with grade for class (5=high, 1=low)	3.915	1.193
Class Discussion: Comfort	4.114	.983
Class Discussion: Behavior	3.808	.955
Public Speaking: Comfort	4.089	.863
Public Speaking: Behavior	4.198	.852
Connecting Outside Class: Comfort	4.167	.977
Connecting Outside Class: Behavior	3.762	.943
Fitting In: Comfort	2.983	.765
Fitting In: Behavior	3.200	1.132
Satisfaction with Class	4.092	.8383

TABLE 4:
 ROTATED COMPONENT MATRIX
 FOR FACTOR ANALYSIS

Question Name	Components			
	1	2	3	4
B2 comfort participating in discussion outside class	.890	.054	.125	.071
C2 comfort initiating discussion with peers	.800	.172	.071	.406
C1 initiate discussion with peers	.776	.208	.139	.174
A2 comfort participating in class discussion	.775	.150	.133	.342
B1 participate in discussion outside class	.772	.148	.046	-.340
A1 participate in discussion	.748	.253	.239	.110
D2 comfort interacting with instructor	.685	.148	.527	.183
K belief that public spkg skills have improved during class	.225	.890	.046	-.070
L belief that confidence in pub spkg abil has improved during class	.260	.841	.185	.026
G2 comfort with objectives of pub spkg course	.124	.752	.199	.404
G1 value objectives of pub spkg course	.038	.733	.148	.121
J comfort seeing and interacting with classmates frequently	.414	.606	.294	.187
I comfort explaining and demonstrating things to peers	.202	.577	.344	.539
E2 comfort asking questions outside class	.226	.218	.777	.135
E1 ask questions outside class	.359	.142	.757	-.194
D1 interact with instructor	.557	.154	.675	-.158
F2 choose courses based on requirements and objectives	-.117	.275	.632	.317
H2 comfort with being center of attention in class	.197	.326	.155	.739
F1 choose courses based on perceived ability to fit in	-.135	.087	.174	-.662
H1 sometimes center of attention in class	.050	.383	.233	.525

TABLE 5:
COMMUNICATOR STYLE REGRESSION COEFFICIENTS

Model	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients		
	B	Std. Error	Beta	t	Sig.
Friendly	.403	.174	.353	2.31	.025
Impression-Leaving	-.556	.199	-.465	-2.78	.008
Relaxed	.297	.172	.224	1.72	.090
Contentious	-.048	.128	-.062	-.37	.711
Attentive	.247	.172	.227	1.44	.156
Precise	.177	.162	.161	1.08	.282
Animated	-.022	.230	-.019	-.09	.923
Dramatic	-.038	.151	-.041	-.251	.803
Open	-.187	.147	-.195	-1.27	.208
Dominant	.473	.164	.492	2.89	.006

TABLE 6:
SELF-ESTEEM STYLE REGRESSION COEFFICIENTS

Model	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients		
	B	Std. Error	Beta	t	Sig.
Performance	.451	.189	.2386	2.31	.021
Social	-.312	.176	-.1775	-2.78	.082
Appearance	.163	.157	.1036	1.72	.305

APPENDIX A: COMMUNICATOR STYLE MEASURE

(Norton, 1978)

Respondents were instructed as follows:

You have impressions of yourself as a communicator. The impressions include your sense of the way you communicate. This measure focuses upon your sensitivity to the way you communicate, or what is called your communicator style. The questions are not designed to look at *what* is communicated; rather, they explore the way you communicate.

Because there is no such thing as a 'correct' style of communication, none of the following items has a right or wrong answer. Please do not spend too much time on the items. Let your first inclination be your guide.

The following scale is used for each item:

YES! = strong agreement with the statement

Yes = agreement with the statement

? = neither agreement nor disagreement with the statement

no = disagreement with the statement

NO! = strong disagreement with the statement

1. I am comfortable with all varieties of people.

NO! no ? yes YES!

2. I laugh easily

NO! no ? yes YES!

3. I readily express admiration for others.

NO! no ? yes YES!

4. *What* I say *usually* leaves an impression on people.

NO! no ? yes YES!

5. I leave people with an impression of me which they definitely tend to remember.

NO! no ? yes YES!

6. To be friendly, I habitually acknowledge verbally other's contributions.

NO! no ? yes YES!

7. I am a *very* good communicator.

NO! no ? yes YES!

8. I have some nervous mannerisms in my speech.
NO! no ? yes YES!
9. I am a very relaxed communicator.
NO! no ? yes YES!
10. When I disagree with somebody I am very quick to challenge them.
NO! no ? yes YES!
11. I can always repeat back to a person *exactly* what was meant.
NO! no ? yes YES!
12. The sound of my voice is *very easy* to recognize.
NO! no ? yes YES!
13. I am a very precise communicator.
NO! no ? yes YES!
14. I leave a *definite* impression on people.
NO! no ? yes YES!
15. The rhythm of flow of my speech is sometimes affected by my nervousness.
NO! no ? yes YES!
16. Under pressure I come across as a relaxed speaker.
NO! no ? yes YES!
17. My eyes reflect *exactly* what I am feeling when I communicate.
NO! no ? yes YES!
18. I dramatize a lot.
NO! no ? yes YES!
19. I always find it *very easy* to communicate on a one-to-one basis with strangers.
NO! no ? yes YES!
20. Usually, I *deliberately react* in such a way that people *know* that I am listening to them.
NO! no ? yes YES!
21. Usually I do not tell people much about myself until I get to know them well.
NO! no ? yes YES!

22. *Regularly* I tell jokes, anecdotes and stories when I communicate.
NO! no ? yes YES!
23. I tend to *constantly* gesture when I communicate.
NO! no ? yes YES!
24. I am an *extremely* open communicator.
NO! no ? yes YES!
25. I am vocally a loud communicator.
NO! no ? yes YES!
26. In a small group of strangers I am a *very good* communicator.
NO! no ? yes YES!
27. In arguments I insist upon very precise definitions.
NO! no ? yes YES!
28. In most social situations I generally speak very frequently.
NO! no ? yes YES!
29. I find it extremely easy to maintain a conversation with a member of the opposite sex *whom I have just met*.
NO! no ? yes YES!
30. I like to be strictly accurate when I communicate.
NO! no ? yes YES!
31. Because I have a loud voice I can easily break into a conversation.
NO! no ? yes YES!
32. *Often* I physically and vocally act out what I want to communicate.
NO! no ? yes YES!
33. I have an assertive voice.
NO! no ? yes YES!
34. I readily reveal personal things about myself.
NO! no ? yes YES!
35. I am dominant in social situations.
NO! no ? yes YES!

36. I am very argumentative.
NO! no ? yes YES!
37. Once I get wound up in a heated discussion I have a hard time stopping myself.
NO! no ? yes YES!
38. I am always an *extremely* friendly communicator.
NO! no ? yes YES!
39. I really *like* to listen *very carefully* to people.
NO! no ? yes YES!
40. Very often I insist that other people document or present some kind of proof for what they are arguing.
NO! no ? yes YES!
41. I try to take charge of things when I am with people.
NO! no ? yes YES!
42. It bothers me to drop an argument that is not resolved.
NO! no ? yes YES!
43. In most social situations I tend to come on strong.
NO! no ? yes YES!
44. I am very expressive nonverbally in social situations.
NO! no ? yes YES!
45. The *way* I say something *usually* leaves an impression on people.
NO! no ? yes YES!
46. Whenever I communicate, I tend to be very encouraging to people.
NO! no ? yes YES!
47. I actively use *a lot* of facial expressions when I communicate.
NO! no ? yes YES!
48. I *very frequently* verbally exaggerate to emphasize a point.
NO! no ? yes YES!
49. I am an *extremely attentive* communicator.
NO! no ? yes YES!

50. As a rule, I openly express my feelings and emotions.

NO! no ? yes YES!

51. Out of a random group of six people, including myself, I would probably have a better communicator style than (circle one choice):

5 of them 4 of them 3 of them 2 of them 1 of them None of them

APPENDIX B: CURRENT THOUGHTS (STATE SELF-ESTEEM SCALE)

(Heatherton and Polivy, 1991)

Respondents were instructed as follows:

This is a questionnaire designed to measure what you are thinking at this moment. There is, of course, no right answer for any statement. The best answer is what you feel is true of yourself at this moment. Be sure to answer all of the items, even if you are not certain of the best answer. Again, answer these questions as they are true for you **RIGHT NOW**.

Each item is scored on a 5-point scale (1=not at all, 2=a little bit, 3=somewhat, 4=very much, and 5=extremely).

Please circle your answer, where 1=not at all and 5=extremely.

1. I feel confident about my abilities.

1 2 3 4 5

2. I am worried about whether I am regarded as a success or failure.

1 2 3 4 5

3. I feel satisfied with the way my body looks right now.

1 2 3 4 5

4. I am frustrated or rattled about my performance.

1 2 3 4 5

5. I feel that I am having trouble understanding things that I read.

1 2 3 4 5

6. I feel that others respect and admire me.

1 2 3 4 5

7. I am dissatisfied with my weight.

1 2 3 4 5

8. I feel self-conscious.

1 2 3 4 5

9. I feel as smart as others.

1 2 3 4 5

10. I feel displeased with myself.

1 2 3 4 5

11. I feel good about myself.

1 2 3 4 5

12. I am pleased with my appearance right now.

1 2 3 4 5

13. I am worried about what other people will think of me.

1 2 3 4 5

14. I feel confident that I understand things.

1 2 3 4 5

15. I feel inferior to others at this moment.

1 2 3 4 5

16. I feel unattractive.

1 2 3 4 5

17. I feel concerned about the impression I am making.

1 2 3 4 5

18. I feel that I have less scholastic ability right now than others.

1 2 3 4 5

19. I feel like I'm not doing well.

1 2 3 4 5

20. I am worried about looking foolish.

1 2 3 4 5

APPENDIX C: COURSE SATISFACTION QUESTIONS

Interaction & Satisfaction (Sisson & Goering, 2009)

Directions for questions A-L: please read the following items carefully and identify your level of agreement with each based on experiences in this class.

Statement and rating: Please read the statement and rate your level of agreement with it, where the scale is as follows:

1=I strongly disagree; 2=I disagree; 3=unsure; 4=I agree; 5=I strongly agree
Please circle the number which best reflects your rating.

A. 1) I participate regularly in class discussion.

1 2 3 4 5

2) I am comfortable participating in class discussion.

1 2 3 4 5

B. 1) I engaging in frequent discussions with classmates before and after class.

1 2 3 4 5

2) I am comfortable engaging in frequent discussions with classmates before and after class.

1 2 3 4 5

C. 1) I initiate discussion with my peers.

1 2 3 4 5

2) I am comfortable initiating discussion with my peers.

1 2 3 4 5

D. 1) I interact with my instructor.

1 2 3 4 5

2) I am comfortable interacting with my instructor.

1 2 3 4 5

- E. 1) I assert follow-up questions out of class.
- 1 2 3 4 5
- 2) I am comfortable asserting follow-up questions out of class.
- 1 2 3 4 5
- F. 1) At least occasionally, I choose courses based on how I believe I will fit in with others in a given setting.
- 1 2 3 4 5
- 2) I choose courses based on requirements and objectives alone.
- 1 2 3 4 5
- G. 1) I value the objectives of a public speaking course.
- 1 2 3 4 5
- 2) I am comfortable with the objectives of a public speaking course.
- 1 2 3 4 5
- H. 1) Out of necessity to accomplish course objectives, I am sometimes the center of attention in a class.
- 1 2 3 4 5
- 2) I am comfortable being the center of attention in a class.
- 1 2 3 4 5
- I. I am comfortable with explaining things to and demonstrating things for my classmates.
- 1 2 3 4 5
- J. I am comfortable seeing and interacting with my classmates frequently.
- 1 2 3 4 5

K. I believe I have improved my public speaking skills while taking this class.

1 2 3 4 5

L. I believe I have increased my confidence in my ability speak in public while taking this class.

1 2 3 4 5

Statement and rating: For the final questions, please circle the most appropriate answer.

M. My satisfaction with this class is

high; I am very satisfied

somewhat high; I am somewhat satisfied

undecided

somewhat low; I am somewhat dissatisfied

low; I am very dissatisfied

N. My anticipated grade for this class is closest to a(n)

A B C D F

O. My satisfaction with my grade in this class is

high; I am very satisfied that it reflects my learning

somewhat high; I am somewhat satisfied that it reflects my learning

undecided

somewhat low; I am unsure it reflects my effort or learning

low; I believe it does not reflect my effort or learning

REFERENCES

- Anthony, D., Holmes, J.G., & Wood, J.V. (2007). Social acceptance and self-esteem: Tuning the Sociometer to interpersonal value. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 92*(6), 1024-1039.
- Brandenburg, M. (1985). *Communicator style and its relationship to effectiveness in collegiate business education*. Oklahoma State University. Doctoral Thesis.
- Brandt, D.R. (1979). On linking social performance with social competence: Some relations between communicative style and attributions of interpersonal attractiveness and effectiveness. *Human Communication Research, 5*, 223-237.
- Birkes, D. & Dodge, Y. (1993). *Alternative Methods of Regression*. Malden, MA: Wiley-Interscience.
- Bryant, B. (2002). Effective Communication skills: How do you rate?. *Hosteur, 11*(1), 12-14.
- Cash, T.F. & Labarge, A.S. (1996). Development of the Appearance Schemas Inventory: A new cognitive body-image assessment. *Cognitive Therapy and Research, 20*, 37-50.
- Comadena, M.E., Semlak, W.D., & Escott, M.D. (1992). Communicator style and teacher effectiveness: adult learners versus traditional undergraduate students. *Communication Research Reports, 9*(1), 57-63.
- Carr, T. with Harris, D., & James, C. The Derriford Appearance Scale (DAS-59): A new scale to measure individual responses to living with problems of appearance. (2000). *British Journal of Health Psychology, 5*, 201-215.

- Comadena, M.L., Semlak, W.D., & Escott, M.D. (1990). Communication style and teacher effectiveness: A comparative study of the perceptions of adult learners and traditional undergraduate students. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Speech Communication Association (76th, Chicago, IL, November 1-4, 1990).
- Crocker, J. & Wolfe, C.T. (2001). Contingencies of self-worth. *Psychological Review*, *108*, 593-623.
- de Vries, R. A lexical study of communication adjectives: The dimensionality of communication styles. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the International Communication Association (2005, New York, NY).
- Duran, R. & Zakahi, W. (1987). Communication performance and communication satisfaction: What do we teach our students?. *Communication Education*, *36*(1), 13-22.
- Edwards, C. et al. (2007). The influence of computer-mediated word-of-mouth communication on student perceptions of instructors and attitudes toward learning course content. *Communication Education*, *56*(3), 255-277.
- Evenbeck, S. (2010). Learning Communities: A Holistic Approach to Underserved Student Success. Presented at the IHEP Summer Academy 2010 (Albuquerque, NM).

- Gaythwaite, E. (2006). *Metacognitive self-regulation, self-efficacy for learning and performance, and critical thinking as predictors of academic success and course retention among community college students enrolled in online, telecourse, and traditional public speaking courses*. Dissertation for University of Central Florida (Orlando, FL).
- Gilchrist, E. Communicator style: A study of college students. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the National Communication Association (86th, Seattle, WA, Nov. 9-12, 2000).
- Gire, V. (2006). Culture and communication style. *The Review of Communication*, 6 (1-2), 124-130.
- Hansford, B.C. (1988). Self-reports and observations of dominant communicator style and communication apprehension. *Communication Research Reports*, 5(1), 44-51.
- Hansford, B. & Hattie, J. (1989). Perceptions of communicator style and educational environments. *Australian Journal of Education*, 33, 53-67.
- Hansford, B.C. & Hattie, J.A. (1987). Perceptions of communicator style and self-concept. *Communication Research*, 14, 189-203.
- Harris, T. (1973). *I'm OK, You're OK: a practical guide to transactional analysis*. London, England: Jonathan Cape Publishing.
- Heatheron, T.F. & Polivy, J. (1991). Development and validation of a scale for measuring state self-esteem. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 60(6), 895-910.

- Heatherton, T.F. & Vohs, K.D. (2000). Interpersonal evaluations following threats to self: Role of self-esteem. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 78(4), 725-736.
- Heimpel, S.A., Elliot, A., & Wood, J.V. (2006). Basic personality dispositions, self-esteem, and personal goals: An approach-avoidance analysis. *Journal of Personality*, 74, 1293-1319.
- Horvath, C.W. (1995). Biological origins of communicator style. *Communication Quarterly*, 43(4), 394-428.
- Hotchkiss, J.L., Moore, R., & Pitts, M.M. (2005). *Freshman Learning Communities, College Performance, and Retention, Working Paper Series 2005-22*. Atlanta, GA: Federal Reserve Bank of Atlanta.
- Janis, I.L. & Field, P.B. (1959). Sex differences and factors related to persuasibility. In C.I. Hovland & I.L. Janis (Eds.), *Personality & persuasibility* (pp. 55-68), New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Kerin, R., Harvey, M. & Crandall, N.F. (1975). *The Journal of Educational Research*, 68(5), 175-177.
- Leary, M.R. & Baumeister, R.F. (2000). The nature and function of self-esteem: Sociometer theory. In M.P. Zanna (Ed.), *Advances in experimental social psychology* (vol. 32, pp. 1-62). San Diego, CA: Academic Press.
- Lee, I.-S. Factors affecting learners' discourse participation in a computer conferencing. Paper presented at the AECT 2000 International Convention (Long Beach, CA, Feb. 16-20, 2000).

- Light, R.J. (2001). *Making the Most of College: Students Speak Their Minds*. Harvard University Press: Cambridge, MA.
- Mabry, E. (2001). Ambiguous self-identification and sincere communication in CMC. In *Say Not to Say: New Perspectives on Miscommunication*. Anolli, L., R. Ciceri and G. Riva (eds.). IOS Press.
- Major, B., Quinton, W.J., & Schmader, T. (2002). Attributions to discrimination and self-esteem: Impact of group identification and situational ambiguity. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 39, 220-231.
- Mathias, S.D., Williamson, C.L., Colwell, H.H., Cisternas, M.G., Pasta, D.J., Stolshek, B.S. et al. Assessing health-related quality-of-life and health state preference in persons with obesity: a validation study. *Quality of Life Research*, 6, 311-322.
- McCannon, M. & Stitt-Gohdes, W.L. (1995). Effective teaching: Perceptions of secondary business education teachers. *Journal of Vocational and Technical Education*, 11(2), 34-43.
- Norton, R.W., Schroeder, A.B., & Webb, J. Communicator style as a predictor of effectiveness and attractiveness: A developmental study. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Speech Communication Association (65th, San Antonio, TX, November 10-13, 1979).
- Norton, R. (1983). *Communicator style: Theory, applications, and measures*. Beverly Hills: Sage.
- Norton, R.W. (1978). Foundation of a communicator style construct. *Human Communication Research*, 4, 99-112.

- Office of Institutional Research. (2002). *Factors Influencing Retention Behavior at IUB: The Role of Ability, Financial Aid, and Academic and Social Integration*. Report for Indiana University-Bloomington via Dean of Faculties (.pdf accessed online).
- Opt, S. & Loffredo, D. (2003). Communicator image and Myers-Briggs Type Indicator extraversion-introversion. *The Journal of Psychology, 137*(6), 560-568.
- Parrish-Sprowl, J., Carveth, R., & Senk, M. (1994). The effect of compliance-gaining strategy choice and communicator style on sales success. *Journal of Business Communication, 31*(4), 291-310.
- Robins, R.W., Tracy, J.L., Trzesniewski, K., Potter, J., & Gosling, S.D. (2001). Personality correlates of self-esteem. *Journal of Research in Personality, 35*, 463-482.
- Rosenberg, M. (1979). *Conceiving the Self*. New York: Basic Books.
- Rosenberg, M. (1965). *Society and the adolescent self-image*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Rubin, R.B. & Graham, E.E. (1988). Communication correlates of college success: An exploratory investigation. *Communication Education, 37*(1), 14-27.
- Schrader, E.L. & Schrader, D.C. Health care provider communicator style and patient comprehension of oral contraceptive use. *Journal of the American Academy of Nurse Practitioners, 13*(2), 80-83.
- Sisson, A.J. & Goering, E. *Interaction & Satisfaction*. 2009. Study instrument.
- Snively, W.B. & McNeill, J.D. (2008). Communicator style and social style. *Journal of Leadership and Organizational Studies, 14*(3), 219-232.

- Thompson, J.K. (2004). The (mis)measurement of body image: ten strategies to improve assessment for applied and research purposes. *Body Image, 1*, 7-14.
- Trzesniewski, K., Donnellan, M.B., & Robins, R.W. (2003). Stability of self-esteem across the life span. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 84*(1), 205-220.
- U.S. News and World Report*. "Best Colleges: Average Freshmen Retention Rates: National Universities." Accessed July 8, 2010.
<http://colleges.usnews.rankingsandreviews.com/best-colleges/national-freshmen-least-most-likely-return>
- Valadez, J.R. (2002). The Influence of Social Capital on Mathematics Course Selection by Latino High School Students. *Hispanic Journal of Behavioral Sciences, 24*(3), 319-339.
- Vohs, K., Voelz, Z.R., Pettit, J.W., Bardone, A.M., Katz, J. Abramson, L.Y. et al. Perfectionism, body dissatisfaction, and self-esteem: An interactive model of bulimic symptom development. *Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology, 20*(4), 476-497.
- Wilson, J.S., Bartosik Stocking, V., & Goldstein, D. (1994). Gender differences in motivations for course selection: Academically talented students in an intensive summer program. *Sex Roles, 31*(5), 349-367.
- Worley, D. et al. (2007). Instructional communication competence: Lessons learned from award-winning teachers. *Communication Studies, 58*(2), 207-222.

CURRICULUM VITAE

Angela J. Sisson

Education

Indiana University

Master of Arts, 2011

Major: Communication Studies, *Concentration:* Corporate Communication

Franklin College

Bachelor of Arts, 1993

Majors: Journalism and French

Highlights: Magazine editor; newspaper features editor; radio station program director with oversight of not only programming but training and scheduling staff of 60+

Internships:

The Hudson Institute (policy research organization) 1992-1993

Gaddy & Gaddy, Attorneys at Law 1992

Professional Instructional Experiences

IUPUI, SLA-Department of Communication Studies, Adjunct Instructor 2007-present

IUPUI, Speaker's Lab-Graduate Mentor (management team) 2008-2009

Indianapolis Public Schools, Instructional Assistant
and Substitute Teacher 1993-1995,
2006-2007

Wayne Township Public Schools, Substitute Teacher 2006

Indiana Business College (currently Harrison College),
Part-time Instructor 1993-1996

Franklin College (program for community youth),
French Language Instructor 1991-1993

Conference and Symposia Experience

Joseph Taylor Symposium, IUPUI 2008

CSCA-Wisconsin 2008

Memberships/Affiliations

Central States Communication Association, member

IUPUI-Graduate Communication Club, member and event planner